

September 21, 2017

JN: 160578

Forrest Ebbs  
Community Development Director  
City of Antioch  
200 H Street  
Antioch, CA 94509

**Subject: City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Update - Traffic Considerations and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Consistency Review**

Dear Mr. Ebbs:

Michael Baker International has completed the traffic considerations and EIR consistency review for the City of Antioch's General Plan Land Use Element Update.

The primary purpose of performing this traffic considerations review is to determine if the proposed 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update traffic characteristics are consistent with the EIR documentation for the currently adopted 2003 General Plan. This evaluation compares the vehicular trips generated from the currently adopted 2003 General Plan to the proposed 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update. The comparison shows the proposed 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update results in an overall reduction in vehicle trips compared to the currently adopted 2003 General Plan. Since the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update is anticipated to generate less traffic, then the traffic-related impacts identified in the City's 2003 General Plan EIR would be either maintained or reduced.

**Land Use Consistency**

The City of Antioch encompasses approximately 50 square miles, including the area of its jurisdictional boundaries as well as its sphere of influence. The City is situated between the San Francisco Bay Area and Central Valley. State Highway 4, which runs east to west, bisects the City and connects it to Interstate 680 and western Contra Costa County.

The City of Antioch has experienced several decades of growth as a predominately residential community. With the exception of the northeastern and waterfront portions of the City, residential uses and, particularly, single-family detached residential uses are the most prominent land use in the City. Commercial uses are distributed throughout the City along major thoroughfares and in higher concentrations on Somersville Road near the Somersville Towne Center mall, in Downtown Antioch, and along the Lone Tree Way, 18<sup>th</sup> Street, and A Street corridors. The

northeast corner of the City is dominated by active and inactive industrial lands that reflect the City's industrial roots and the potential for a resurgence of industrial users and accompanying jobs, while balancing existing open space.

A key consideration in defining the type, intensity, location, and mix of future land uses is achieving a balance between local employment and housing. The Antioch General Plan seeks to achieve such a balance as a means of addressing issues of traffic congestion, air quality, and energy conservation. The Land Use Element Update seeks to ease congestion and improve regional air quality by providing patterns of land use that support the use of transit. Such "transit-oriented" development consists of high density, mixed-use development adjacent to transit nodes. Such transit nodes are proposed within the Downtown Specific Plan Area and within the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan.

Seven areas within the Antioch General Plan study area have been identified for focused policy analysis and direction. The purpose of these "Focus Areas" is to provide policy direction specific to each area, including appropriate land use types and development intensity, based upon analysis of the particular opportunities and constraints affecting each area. The Land Use Element Update proposes to reduce residential and non-residential land uses within a few of the Focus Areas in an effort to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. Non-residential land uses include commercial, office, business park and industrial.

**Table 1** provides a comparison between the 2003 General Plan Land Uses and proposed General Plan Land Use Update for the entire Planning Area (City Limits and Unincorporated Area).

**Table 1**  
**Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Comparison**

	Single Family Residential (Dwelling Units)	Multi-Family Residential (Dwelling Units)	Commercial / Office (Square Feet)	Business Park / Industrial (Square Feet)
2003 General Plan	39,834	14,947	38,961,863	53,293,588
2017 General Plan	35,862	11,912	33,417,298	33,337,128
Difference (+/-)	-3,972	-3,035	-5,544,565	-19,956,460
Change (%)	-9.9%	-20.3%	-14.2%	-37.4%

As shown in the comparison table, a reduction in both residential and non-residential land uses are proposed as part of the Land Use Element Update. Throughout the City of Antioch, a reduction of 3,972 single family and 3,035 multi-family dwelling units are proposed. Compared to

the 2003 General Plan, the overall 2017 General Plan shows a total reduction of 5,544,565 square feet of commercial/office and a total reduction of 19,956,460 square feet of business park/industrial. Refer to **Appendix A** for a detailed list of land uses and quantities for both the 2003 and 2017 General Plan.

### Trip Generation Consistency

The documentation for the City's 2003 General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR) does not include a detailed breakdown of future land uses. The General Plan combines the commercial and office square footages and combines the business park and industrial square footages. For purposes of this analysis, Michael Baker has assigned the general office trip rate to the commercial/office portion of the General Plan (2003 & 2017) and assigned the business park trip rate to the business park/industrial portion of the General Plan which provides a conservative analysis.

**Table 2** summarized the Institution of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standard trip generation rates for the land uses considered in this analysis.

**Table 2**  
**ITE Trip Generation Rates**

Land Use	ITE Code	Trip Rate	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
			Rate	In	Out	Rate	In	Out
Single Family Homes	210	9.52 / DU	0.75 / DU	25% : 75%		1.00 / DU	63% : 37%	
Apartment	220	6.65 / DU	0.51 / DU	20% : 80%		0.62 / DU	65% : 35%	
General Office	710	11.03 / KSF	1.56 / KSF	88% : 12%		1.49 / KSF	17% : 83%	
Business Park	770	12.44 / KSF	1.4 / KSF	85% : 15%		1.26 / KSF	26% : 74%	

Source: 2012 ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition

The trip generation for the 2003 General Plan Land Use Element is shown in **Table 3**. The 2003 General Plan land uses are estimated to generate a total of 1,571,339 daily trips with 172,891 AM peak hour trips and 174,304 PM peak hour trips.

**Table 3**  
**2003 General Plan Trip Generation**

Land Use	Intensity	ADT	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
			Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound
Single Family Homes	39,834 DU	379,220	29,876	7,469	22,407	39,834	25,095	14,739
Apartment	14,947 DU	99,398	7,623	1,525	6,098	9,267	6,024	3,243
General Office	38,961.863 KSF	429,749	60,781	53,487	7,294	58,053	9,869	48,184
Business Park	53,293.588 KSF	662,972	74,611	63,419	11,192	67,150	17,459	49,691
2003 General Plan Total Trip Generation		1,571,339	172,891	125,900	46,991	174,304	58,447	115,857

ADT = Average Daily Traffic

DU = Dwelling Unit

KSF = 1,000 Square Feet

**Table 4** shows the trip generation estimated for the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update. As shown, the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update is estimated to generate 1,203,928 daily trips with 131,775 AM peak hour trips and 135,044 PM peak hour trips.

**Table 4**  
**2017 General Plan Trip Generation**

Land Use	Intensity	ADT	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
			Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound
Single Family Homes	35,862 DU	341,406	26,897	6,724	20,172	35,862	22,593	13,269
Apartment	11,912 DU	79,215	6,075	1,215	4,860	7,385	4,801	2,585
General Office	33,417.298 KSF	368,593	52,131	45,875	6,256	49,792	8,465	41,327
Business Park	33,337.128 KSF	414,714	46,672	39,671	7,001	42,005	10,921	31,084
2017 General Plan Total Trip Generation		1,203,928	131,775	93,486	38,289	135,044	46,779	88,265

ADT = Average Daily Traffic

DU = Dwelling Unit

KSF = 1,000 Square Feet

**Table 5** provides a trip generation comparison between the 2003 and 2017 General Plan Land Use Element.

**Table 5**  
**Trip Generation Comparison**

Comparison	ADT	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
		Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound
2003 General Plan Total Trip Generation	1,571,339	172,891	125,900	46,991	174,304	58,447	115,857
2017 General Plan Total Trip Generation	1,203,928	131,775	93,486	38,289	135,044	46,779	88,265
<b>Trip Difference (+/-)</b>	<b>-367,411</b>	<b>-41,116</b>	<b>-32,414</b>	<b>-8,702</b>	<b>-39,260</b>	<b>-11,668</b>	<b>-27,592</b>
<b>Trip Reduction (%)</b>	<b>-23.4%</b>	<b>-23.8%</b>	<b>-25.7%</b>	<b>-18.5%</b>	<b>-22.5%</b>	<b>-20.0%</b>	<b>-23.8%</b>

ADT = Average Daily Traffic

DU = Dwelling Unit

KSF = 1,000 Square Feet

**Table 5** shows that the overall planned development for the City's 2017 General Plan is generating approximately 367,411 less daily trips, 41,116 less AM peak hour trip and 39,260 less PM peak hour trips compared to the 2003 General Plan. As such, the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update would be expected to maintain or reduce traffic-related impacts identified in the City's 2003 General Plan EIR.

If you have any questions pertaining to the analysis results summarized in this letter, please call me at (760) 603-6244.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Robert A. Davis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'R' and 'D'.

Robert Davis  
Senior Project Manager  
Transportation Planning Services

## Appendix A

### City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Quantities (2003 & 2017)

**TABLE 2003.4B**  
**(2003 General Plan Land Use Within City Limits)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	2,787	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	5,049	-	-	-
Medium Low Density Residential	22,333	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	831	1,247	-	-
High Density Residential		6,509	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31,000</b>	<b>7,756</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	281,788	-
Neighborhood Community Commercial	-	-	4,563,853	-
Office	-	-	2,154,679	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,000,320</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-		4,687,009
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	279	606,885	
Public Institutional	-	-	-	5,968,350
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>606,885</b>	<b>5,968,350</b>
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
A Street Interchange Focus Area	124	-	2,121,125	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	1,100	250	1,135,000	2,152,300
Eastern Waterfront Employment	12	248	25,000	23,412,469
Ginochio Property	-	-	-	-
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	1,135	1,385	1,712,175	5,688,163
Roddy Ranch	600	100	225,000	-
Hillcrest Station Area		2,500	2,500,000	
Sand Creek Focus Area	3,537	433	1,240,000	-
Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area	-	-	8,667,751	4,195,114
Western Gateway Focus Area	-	460	215,216	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,508</b>	<b>5,376</b>	<b>17,841,267</b>	<b>35,448,045</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37,508</b>	<b>13,410</b>	<b>25,448,472</b>	<b>46,103,404</b>

**Population**

**Employed Population**

**Total Jobs**

**Retail Jobs**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

**128,222**

**71,800**

**67,100**

**14,995**

**52,105**

**0.93**

<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

**TABLE 2003.4C**  
**(2003 General Plan Land Use in Unincorporated Areas)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential		-	-	-
Low Density Residential		-	-	-
Med Low Density Residential		-	-	-
Medium Density Residential		-	-	-
High Density Residential		-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>		-	-	-
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood Commercial	-	-	-	-
Commercial Office	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-	-	-
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	-	-	-
Public Institutional	-	-	-	-
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
"A" Street Interchange	-	-	-	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	-	-	-	-
Eastern Employment Areas	-	-	-	2,995,070
Ginochio Property <sup>1</sup>	400	-	-	-
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	-	-	-	-
Roddy Ranch	-	-	-	-
Hillcrest Station Area	-	-	-	-
Sand Creek	-	-	-	-
Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area	1,926	358	8,667,751	4,195,114
Western Gateway	-	1,179	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2,326</b>	<b>1,537</b>	<b>8,667,751</b>	<b>7,190,183</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,326</b>	<b>1,537</b>	<b>8,667,751</b>	<b>7,190,183</b>

**Population**

**4,476**

**Employed Population**

**2,506**

**Total Jobs**

**5,777**

**Retail Jobs**

**220**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**5,557**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

**2.31**

<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.



**TABLE 2003.4D**  
**(2003 General Plan Land Use Within Planning Area-City Limits and Unincorporated Areas)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	2,787	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	5,049	-	-	-
Medium Low Density Residential	22,333	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	831	1,247	-	-
High Density Residential	-	6,509	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31,000</b>	<b>7,756</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	281,788	-
Neighborhood Community Commercial	-	-	4,563,853	-
Office	-	-	7,000,320	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,845,961</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-	-	4,687,009
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	279	606,885	-
Public Institutional	-	-	-	5,968,350
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>606,885</b>	<b>5,968,350</b>
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
"A" Street Interchange	124	-	2,121,125	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	1,100	250	1,135,000	2,152,300
Eastern Employment Areas	12	248	25,000	26,407,539
Ginochio Property <sup>1</sup>	400	-	-	-
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	1,135	1,385	1,712,175	5,688,163
Roddy Ranch	600	100	225,000	-
Hillcrest Station Area	-	2,500	2,500,000	-
Sand Creek	3,537	433	1,240,000	-
Somersville Road Corridor	1,926	358	17,335,501	8,390,227
Western Gateway	-	1,639	215,216	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8,834</b>	<b>6,913</b>	<b>26,509,018</b>	<b>42,638,228</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39,834</b>	<b>14,947</b>	<b>38,961,863</b>	<b>53,293,588</b>

**Population**

**Employed Population**

**Total Jobs**

**Retail Jobs**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

**132,698**

**74,306**

**72,877**

**15,215**

**57,662**

**0.98**

<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

**TABLE 2017.4B**  
**(2017 General Plan Land Use Within City Limits)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b><i>Residential</i></b>				
Estate Residential	915	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	4,944	-	-	-
Medium Low Density Residential	22,333	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	831	1,247	-	-
High Density Residential	-	4,817	-	-
<b><i>Subtotal</i></b>	<b>29,023</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b><i>Commercial</i></b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	341,449	-
Neighborhood Community Commercial	-	-	4,563,853	-
Office	-	-	2,154,679	-
<b><i>Subtotal</i></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,059,981</b>	<b>-</b>
<b><i>Industrial</i></b>				
Business Park	-	-		8,647,651
<b><i>Special</i></b>				
Mixed Use	-	279	606,885	606,885
Public Institutional	-	-	-	-
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b><i>Subtotal</i></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>606,885</b>	<b>606,885</b>
<b><i>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></i></b>				
A Street Interchange Focus Area	124	-	2,110,165	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	1,100	250	1,135,000	2,152,300
Eastern Waterfront Employment Focus Area	12	248	268,051	13,688,023
Ginochio Property Focus Area	-	-	-	-
Downtown Specific Plan Focus Area	1,065	1,221	3,927,420	82,019
Roddy Ranch	600	100	225,000	-
Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan Focus Area		2,500	2,500,000	
Sand Creek Focus Area	3,537	433	1,240,000	-
Western Antioch Commercial Focus Area	-	358	9,224,280	-
Western Gateway Focus Area	-	460	215,216	-
<b><i>Subtotal</i></b>	<b>6,439</b>	<b>5,570</b>	<b>20,845,130</b>	<b>15,922,342</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35,462</b>	<b>11,912</b>	<b>28,511,996</b>	<b>25,176,877</b>

**Population**

**Employed Population**

**Total Jobs**

**Retail Jobs**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

**150,175** <sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

**84,098**

**107,378**

**21,476**

**85,902**

**0.72**

**TABLE 2017.4C**  
**(2017 General Plan Land Use in Unincorporated Areas)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	-	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	-	-	-	-
Medium Low Density Residential	-	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	-	-	-	-
High Density Residential	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>		-	-	-
0				
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood Community Commercial	-	-	-	-
Office	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-
0				
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-	-	-
0				
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	-	-	-
Public Institutional	-	-	-	-
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-
0				
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
A Street Interchange Focus Area	-	-	-	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	-	-	-	-
Eastern Waterfront Employment Focus Area	-	-	-	2,798,786
Ginochio Property Focus Area	400	-	-	
Downtown Specific Plan Focus Area	-	-	-	-
Roddy Ranch	-	-	-	-
Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan Focus Area	-	-	-	-
Sand Creek Focus Area	-	-	-	-
Western Antioch Commercial Focus Area	-	358	9,224,280	-
Western Gateway Focus Area	-	1,179	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	400	1,537	9,224,280	2,798,786
<b>TOTAL</b>	400	1,537	9,224,280	2,798,786

**Population**

**Employed Population**

**Total Jobs**

**Retail Jobs**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

6,141<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

19,237

3.92

**TABLE 2017.4D**  
**(2017 General Plan Land Use Within Planning Area-City Limits and Unincorporated Areas)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	915	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	4,944	-	-	-
Medium Low Density Residential	22,333	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	831	1,247	-	-
High Density Residential	-	4,817	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>29,023</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
0				
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	341,449	-
Neighborhood Community Commercial	-	-	4,563,853	-
Office	-	-	7,059,981	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,965,283</b>	<b>-</b>
0				
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-	-	8,647,651
0				
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	279	606,885	-
Public Institutional	-	-	-	5,968,350
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>606,885</b>	<b>14,616,001</b>
0				
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
A Street Interchange Focus Area	124	-	2,110,165	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	1,100	250	1,135,000	2,152,300
Eastern Waterfront Employment Focus Area	12	248	268,051	16,486,808
Ginochio Property Focus Area	400	-	-	-
Downtown Specific Plan Focus Area	1,065	1,221	3,927,420	82,019
Roddy Ranch	600	100	225,000	-
Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan Focus Area	-	2,500	2,500,000	-
Sand Creek Focus Area	3,537	433	1,240,000	-
Western Antioch Commercial Focus Area	-	358	9,224,280	-
Western Gateway Focus Area	-	460	215,216	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,839</b>	<b>5,570</b>	<b>20,845,130</b>	<b>18,721,128</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35,862</b>	<b>11,912</b>	<b>33,417,298</b>	<b>33,337,128</b>

<b>Population</b>	<b>151,443</b>	<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The
<b>Employed Population</b>	<b>84,808</b>	actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is
<b>Total Jobs</b>	<b>150,804</b>	dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate
<b>Retail Jobs</b>	<b>30,161</b>	development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.
<b>Non-Retail Jobs</b>	<b>120,643</b>	
<b>Jobs/Population Ratio</b>	<b>1.00</b>	

**TABLE 2003 vs. 2017 - 4B**  
**(Difference between 2003 and 2017 General Plan Within City Limits)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	(1,872)	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	(105)	-	-	-
Medium Low Density Residential	-	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	-	-	-	-
High Density Residential	-	(1,692)	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>(1,976)</b>	<b>(1,692)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	59,661	-
Neighborhood Community Commercial	-	-	0	-
Office	-	-	(0)	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>59,661</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-	-	3,960,641
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	-	(0)	606,885
Public Institutional	-	-	-	(5,968,350)
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(5,361,465)</b>
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
A Street Interchange Focus Area	-	-	(10,961)	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	-	-	-	-
Eastern Waterfront Employment	-	-	243,051	(9,724,446)
Ginochio Property	-	-	-	-
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	(69)	(164)	2,215,244	(5,606,143)
Roddy Ranch	-	-	-	-
Hillcrest Station Area	-	-	-	-
Sand Creek Focus Area	-	-	-	-
Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area	-	358	556,529	(4,195,114)
Western Gateway Focus Area	-	-	0	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>(69)</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>3,003,863</b>	<b>(19,525,703)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(2,046)</b>	<b>(1,498)</b>	<b>3,063,524</b>	<b>(20,926,527)</b>

**Population**

**Employed Population**

**Total Jobs**

**Retail Jobs**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

**21,953**

**12,298**

**40,278**

**6,481**

**33,797**

**-0.21**

<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

**TABLE 2003 vs. 2017 - 4C**  
**(Difference between 2003 and 2017 General Plan in Unincorporated Areas)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Unit)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	-	-	-	-
Low Density Residential	-	-	-	-
Med Low Density Residential	-	-	-	-
Medium Density Residential	-	-	-	-
High Density Residential	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>		-	-	-
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood Commercial	-	-	-	-
Commercial Office	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park	-	-	-	-
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use	-	-	-	-
Public Institutional	-	-	-	-
Open Space	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
"A" Street Interchange	-	-	-	-
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	-	-	-	-
Eastern Employment Areas	-	-	-	(196,284)
Ginochio Property <sup>1</sup>	-	-	-	-
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	-	-	-	-
Roddy Ranch	-	-	-	-
Hillcrest Station Area	-	-	-	-
Sand Creek	-	-	-	-
Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area	(1,926)	-	556,529	(4,195,114)
Western Gateway	-	-	-	-
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>(1,926)</b>	-	<b>556,529</b>	<b>(4,391,398)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(1,926)</b>	-	<b>556,529</b>	<b>(4,391,398)</b>

<b>Population</b>	<b>1,665</b>	<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.
<b>Employed Population</b>	<b>933</b>	
<b>Total Jobs</b>	<b>18,269</b>	
<b>Retail Jobs</b>	<b>4,589</b>	
<b>Non-Retail Jobs</b>	<b>13,680</b>	
<b>Jobs/Population Ratio</b>	<b>1.61</b>	

**TABLE 2003 vs. 2017 - 4D**  
**(Difference between 2003 and 2017 General Plan Within Planning Area - City Limits and Unincorporated Areas)**

<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Single-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial/ Office (sq.ft.)</b>	<b>Business Park/ Industrial (sq.ft.)</b>
<b>Residential</b>				
Estate Residential	(1,872)			
Low Density Residential	(105)			
Medium Low Density Residential				
Medium Density Residential				
High Density Residential		(1,692)		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>(1,976)</b>	<b>(1,692)</b>		
<b>Commercial</b>				
Convenience Commercial			59,661	
Neighborhood Community Commercial			0	
Office			59,661	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>119,322</b>	
<b>Industrial</b>				
Business Park				3,960,641
<b>Special</b>				
Mixed Use			(0)	
Public Institutional				
Open Space				
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>(0)</b>	
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>				
"A" Street Interchange			(10,961)	
East Lone Tree Specific Plan				
Eastern Employment Areas			243,051	(9,920,730)
Ginochio Property <sup>1</sup>				
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	(69)	(164)	2,215,244	(5,606,143)
Roddy Ranch				
Hillcrest Station Area				
Sand Creek				
Somersville Road Corridor	(1,926)		(8,111,222)	(8,390,227)
Western Gateway		(1,179)	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>(1,996)</b>	<b>(1,343)</b>	<b>(5,663,888)</b>	<b>(23,917,101)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(3,972)</b>	<b>(3,035)</b>	<b>(5,544,566)</b>	<b>(19,956,460)</b>

**Population**

**Employed Population**

**Total Jobs**

**Retail Jobs**

**Non-Retail Jobs**

**Jobs/Population Ratio**

**18,745**

**10,502**

**77,927**

**14,946**

**62,981**

**0.02**

<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1	Introduction and Regulatory Guidance .....	1.0-1
1.2	Lead Agency.....	1.0-1
1.3	Environmental Analysis .....	1.0-1
1.4	Findings .....	1.0-2
1.5	Conclusions.....	1.0.2
1.6	Mitigation and Monitoring Program.....	1.0.2

**2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION****3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

3.1	Project Location.....	3.0-1
3.2	Project Background .....	3.0-1
3.3	Existing Land Uses.....	3.0-1
3.4	Project Components.....	3.0-4
3.5	Project Approvals .....	3.0-12

**4.0 CEQA CHECKLIST**

4.1	CEQA Checklist .....	4.0-1
4.2	Explanation of Checklist Evaluation Categories .....	4.0-1
I.	Aesthetics .....	4.0-21
II.	Agriculture Resources .....	4.0-24
III.	Air Quality .....	4.0-27
IV.	Biological Resources .....	4.0-34
V.	Cultural Resources.....	4.0-26
VI.	Geology and Soils.....	4.0-37
VII.	Greenhouse Gases.....	4.0-35
VIII.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	4.0-44
IX.	Hydrology and Water Quality .....	4.0-50
X.	Land Use and Planning.....	4.0-56
XI.	Mineral Resources.....	4.0-61
XII.	Noise .....	4.0-62
XIII.	Population and Housing .....	4.0-66
XIV.	Public Services.....	4.0-68
XV.	Recreation.....	4.0-70
XVI.	Transportation/Traffic .....	4.0-72



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

XVII	Tribal Cultural Resources .....	4.0-78
XVIII	Utilities and Service Systems.....	4.0-80
XIX	Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	4.0-84

## 5.0 REFERENCES

## APPENDICES

Appendix XX

## TABLES

Table 3.0-1	Proposed General Plan Residential Buildout Change .....	3.0-9
Table 3.0-2	Proposed General Plan Commercial/Office and Business Park/Industrial Buildout Change .....	3.0-10
Table 4-1	Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR .....	4.0-3
Table 4-2	Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Comparison.....	4.0-74
Table 4-3	ITE Trip Generation Rates .....	4.0-75
Table 4-4	2003 General Plan Trip Generation.....	4.0-75
Table 4-5	2017 General Plan Trip Generation.....	4.0-76
Table 4-6	Trip Generation Comparison.....	4.0-76

## FIGURES

Figure 3.0-1	Project Location Map .....	3.0-2
Figure 3.0-2	Existing Land Use Map .....	3.0-4
Figure 3.0-3,	Proposed 2017 Land Use Element Map .....	3.0-5

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This Addendum, checklist, and attached supporting documents have been prepared to determine whether and to what extent the City of Antioch General Plan Update Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2003072140) remain sufficient to address the potential impacts of the proposed Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Update Project (project), or whether additional documentation is required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.).

### 1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary responsibility over a proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15051 provides criteria for identifying the lead agency. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15051(b) (1), “the lead agency will normally be the agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose.” Based on the criteria above, the City of Antioch (City) is the lead agency for the proposed project.

### 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (a) provides that the lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report or Negative Declaration (ND) if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or ND have occurred (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164 (a)).

An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR or ND (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (c)). The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the Final EIR and MND prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (d)). An agency must also include a brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR or ND pursuant to Section 15162 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (e)).

Consequently, once an EIR or ND has been certified for a project, no subsequent EIR or ND is required under CEQA unless, based on substantial evidence:

- 1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or ND 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 ND 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 ND was adopted shows any of the following:

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

- a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or ND or negative declaration;
- b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or ND;
- 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 or ND 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 15162 (a); see also Pub. Resources Code, Section 21166).

This addendum, checklist, and attached documents constitute substantial evidence supporting the conclusion that preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR or ND is not required prior to approval of the project by the City, and provides the required documentation under CEQA.

This addendum reviews and considers the conclusions of the certified November 2003 EIR and will be used to analyze impacts to the proposed project. The 2003 EIR analyzes changes to the project site that is the baseline for this environmental analysis and incorporates all pertinent conclusions and mitigation measures from the 2003 EIR; therefore, this Addendum simply cites the EIR for ease of reference.

### **1.4 FINDINGS**

There are no substantial changes proposed by the project or in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the 2003 EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. The project is consistent with the 2003 EIR, and would involve only minor changes.

### **1.5 CONCLUSIONS**

The Antioch Planning Commission or Antioch City Council may approve the project based on this Addendum. The impacts of the proposed project remain within the impacts previously analyzed in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164).

The current proposed project does not require any major revisions to the 2003 EIR. Minor revisions are proposed to confirm that no new significant information or changes in circumstances surrounding the project have occurred since the certification of the 2003 EIR. Therefore, the previous CEQA analyses completed for the General Plan remain adequate. The applicable mitigation measures from the 2003 EIR will be imposed on the proposed project as described in this Addendum, unless modified, accomplished or otherwise no longer applicable or warranted, as noted above.

**1.6 MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM**

As required by Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 (a)(1), a mitigation monitoring and reporting program has been prepared for the project to monitor the implementation of the mitigation measures that have been adopted for the project. Any long-term monitoring of mitigation measures imposed on the overall development will be implemented through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## 2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

---

1. **Project title:** Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Update
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Antioch  
Community Development Department  
200 "H" Street  
P.O. Box 5007  
Antioch, CA 94531
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Forrest Ebbs, AICP  
Community Development Director  
(925) 779-7038
4. **Project location:** City of Antioch, Contra Costa County, CA
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** City of Antioch  
Community Development Department  
200 "H" Street  
P.O. Box 5007  
Antioch, CA 94531
6. **General Plan designation:** Various
7. **Zoning:** Various
8. **Project description:** The project is an update to the City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element. The project would revise goals, policies, and objectives for the Land Use Element, update the Land Use Map to reflect these changes, and revise land use intensities and distribution.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** Antioch is located in eastern Contra Costa County, approximately 40 miles northeast of Oakland. Adjacent cities include Pittsburg to the west and Oakley and Brentwood to the east and southeast, respectively. The City and the General Plan study area are bordered by the San Joaquin River to the north and by unincorporated Contra Costa County to the south.

## **2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

### **3.1 PROJECT LOCATION**

The City of Antioch is located in eastern Contra Costa County, approximately 40 miles northeast of Oakland. Adjacent cities include Pittsburg to the west and Oakley and Brentwood to the east and southeast, respectively. The city and the General Plan study area are bordered by the San Joaquin River to the north and by unincorporated Contra Costa County to the south (**Figure 3-1, Project Location Map**).

### **3.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

The City of Antioch (City) prepared a General Plan in 2003, adopting the General Plan on November 24, 2003. As part of the General Plan process, the City prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) in July 2003 to assess the physical environmental impacts of the General Plan, including its policies and implementing programs. The Final EIR (FEIR) was certified by the City Council on November 24, 2003 (City Council Resolution No. 2003/134).

The Land Use Element of the General Plan provides a blueprint for the physical development of the community by designating lands for different types of uses and prescribing general standards for their development. Over time, changes have occurred throughout the city and in the focus areas or as the City's planning vision for these areas has evolved.

The Land Use Element describes where various land uses are best located and how much of each use should be provided. The General Plan identifies opportunities and removes barriers, but it does not actually cause development to happen. The General Plan recognizes that, ultimately, growth and development depend on the initiative of individual developers. Whether developers seize the initiative and move forward with projects depends on the economic benefit they expect to derive from such development. In deciding whether to pursue a development project on a particular site, developers evaluate a series of factors to determine whether the project will be economically feasible and should be pursued. If projects are not economically feasible, development will not happen, regardless of the directives of the General Plan and the desires of the community. Thus, the development pattern that evolves is the joint outcome of the development framework established by the General Plan and the private sector conditions that shape the developers' assessment of feasibility.

#### **CONTRA COSTA COUNTY 65/35 LAND PRESERVATION PLAN (URBAN LIMIT LINE)**

In 1990, the voters of Contra Costa County approved Measure C-1990. This measure states that urban development is to be limited to no more than 35 percent of the land in the county. At least 65 percent of all land in the county is to be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks, and other non-urban uses. To ensure the enforcement of the "65/35" standard, the County has established an Urban Limit Line (ULL), which is incorporated into the Contra Costa County General Plan Open Space and Conservation elements. The criteria set by the County for determining lands that should be located outside the ULL includes:

- Prime agricultural lands (US Soil Conservation Service Class I and Class II)
- Open space, parks, and other recreation areas
- Lands with slopes in excess of 25 percent
- Wetland areas



### **3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

Figure 3.0-1 Project Location Map

- Other areas not appropriate for urban growth because of physical unsuitability for development

Although the direct land use effects of the Urban Limit Line are limited to unincorporated areas of the county, the Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) has consented to support the County's 65/35 preservation standard, Urban Limit Line, and growth management standards in the review of proposed city spheres of influence and annexations. Thus, LAFCO has stated that it would not approve the annexation of lands outside of the ULL to a city. Measure 1990-C states that the County is to review the location of the ULL every five years. The current voter-approved urban limit line will expire in 2020.

### **GENERAL PLAN STUDY AREA**

The Antioch General Plan study area encompasses the entirety of the city and the City's sphere of influence, as well as additional lands to the south of Antioch that, in the City's opinion, bear a relationship to its long-term planning. State law permits the inclusion of such lands in a community's general plan. However, the Antioch General Plan asserts land use control only over lands actually within the city's corporate limits. Until such time as lands currently outside of Antioch may be incorporated into the city, the Contra Costa County General Plan will remain the lead land use planning document for existing unincorporated territory.

### **3.3 EXISTING LAND USES**

The City of Antioch is a predominantly residential community. Throughout much of the General Plan study area, Antioch's land use pattern is well established. With the exception of the northeastern and waterfront portions of the city, residential uses, particularly single-family detached residential uses, are the most prominent land use in Antioch. Commercial uses are distributed throughout the city along major thoroughfares and in higher concentrations on Somersville Road near the Somersville Towne Center mall, in downtown Antioch, and along the Lone Tree Way, 18th Street, and A Street corridors. The northeast corner of Antioch is dominated by active and inactive industrial lands that reflect the city's industrial roots.

### **3.4 PROJECT COMPONENTS**

The project is an update to the City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element. Since the General Plan was adopted in 2003, many changes have occurred over time in response to development applications, planning actions by other jurisdictions and agencies, and planning actions by the City. The project would revise goals, policies, and objectives for the Land Use Element, update the Land Use Map to reflect these changes, and revise land use intensities and distribution. The proposed Land Use Element is shown in **Appendix A. Figure 3.0-2, Existing Land Use Map**, shows land uses in the city at this time. The proposed Land Use Map is shown in **Figure 3.0-3, Proposed 2017 Land Use Element Map**.

The proposed Land Use Element changes would incorporate the following changes that either were approved previously by the City, are in the process of approval, or are proposed under the Land Use Element update:

- **Resolution No. 2005/130.** This resolution was adopted by the Antioch City Council approving revisions to the General Plan Land Use Map to comply with land uses and amendments to the General Plan text on November 11, 2005.



Figure 3.0-2 Existing Land Use Map

### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

Figure 3-.03, Proposed 2017 Land Use Element Map

- **Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area.** Policies for the Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area would be updated to reflect the pending annexation of the Tuscany Meadows area into the city of Pittsburg. This change would include revisions to the Land Use Map and a name change to Western Antioch Commercial Focus Area to better reflect the broader area, including Auto Center Drive to the north. Land Use Element text would also be modified to encourage redevelopment of the mall and auto corridor.
- **Draft Downtown Specific Plan.** The Draft Downtown Specific Plan was presented to the City Council on August 23, 2016. At that time, the City Council discussed some minor mapping changes in the draft plan. The Draft Downtown Specific Plan was revised and presented to the Planning Commission on September 21, 2016. An Addendum to the Antioch General Plan Update EIR was prepared for the Downtown Specific Plan and released to the public on February 14, 2017. The City is planning to take action on the Downtown Specific Plan in fall 2017. The project would eliminate text references to the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront Focus Area and incorporate the Downtown Specific Plan boundaries into the Land Use Map.
- **Roddy Ranch.** In 2014, the East Bay Regional Park District acquired 1,885 acres of Roddy Ranch, including the majority of the area identified for development through the approval of Measure K. This land is now in permanent reserve as open space. The golf course subsequently closed for operation in 2016. The future of Roddy Ranch is uncertain, as the development enabled by voter-approved Measure K is no longer likely achievable because of the area's ownership and the associated restrictions. The only remaining development potential for Roddy Ranch centers on the golf course and immediately adjacent areas that include the parking lots, clubhouse, and support services. Approximately 271 acres remain outside of the East Bay Regional Park District property. The project would update Land Use Element text to better reflect the area's status. However, the voter-approved development projections must remain as they are beyond the control of the City Council.
- **Hillcrest Specific Plan.** The City of Antioch adopted the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan in 2009. The plan is incorporated by reference in the General Plan and represents the entirety of the planning policies for this area.
- **Housing Element.** The project would update the Land Use Element text and map in response to the 2015–2023 Housing Element update.
- **Sand Creek Focus Area.** The City is currently preparing an amendment of the Antioch General Plan for the Sand Creek Focus Area Map to reflect recent development in the Sand Creek Focus Area and current expectations for future development. An Addendum to the Antioch General Plan Update EIR was prepared for the Sand Creek Focus Area and released to the public in June 2017. The City is planning to act on the Sand Creek Focus Area in fall 2017. Such an action, if taken, would be wholly apart from the project and would evaluate the potential impacts separately. As such, the project includes no changes to the 2003 text and map, as amended by prior City Council actions. The project would incorporate the Promenade-Vineyards at Sand Creek and Aviano project-specific amendments into the Land Use Element text and map.
- **Open Space Areas.** The project would update the Land Use Map to show new parks and open space areas (that would no longer be available for proposed development). These areas include:

### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

- The Dow properties along the western edge of the waterfront area are currently included in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront designation but would not be included in the proposed Downtown Specific Plan area. This designation would replace the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront designation with appropriate open space designations.
- The ball fields along 10<sup>th</sup> Street would be designated as open space.
- City-owned parcels along the waterfront in the Rogers Point Area would be designated open space, as suggested by past policies. This area is beyond the boundaries of the Downtown Specific Plan study area.
- The 2003 General Plan Land Use Map incorrectly identified the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge as part of the Eastern Waterfront Employment Area. All Refuge parcels would be correctly designated as open space.
- The former Sierra Vista subdivision would be designated as open space to reflect its acquisition by the East Bay Regional Park District.
- The Black Diamond Estates subdivision is complete. Parcels given to the City would be designated as open space.
- **Miscellaneous Land Use Revisions.** The project would include minor land use designation revisions, corrections, and updates including:
  - Concurrent with the adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, the City designated three parcels, totaling approximately 15 acres, at the southwest corner of the intersection of SR 160 and East 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Business Park to High Density Residential, leaving the adjacent 15-acre parcel (APN 051-200-025) to retain its Business Park designation. As the surrounding area is now entirely residential, development of the remaining 15-acre Business Park parcel would be constrained by potential industrial or commercial impacts on the immediately-adjacent properties. As such, the project would designate this remaining 15-acre parcel as High Density Residential to complement the adjacent designations.
  - Updates to Land Use Element text to encourage consideration of multi-family residential uses in commercial designations under very specific circumstances and when traffic impacts are avoided.
  - The Dow properties south of the railroad tracks would be designated as Business Park, as they are no longer part of the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront Focus Area.
  - Small commercial properties at Auto Center Drive/10<sup>th</sup> Street would be designated as Community Commercial.
  - Larger commercial properties at Auto Center Drive/6<sup>th</sup> Street would be moved from the Somersville Road Corridor Focus Area to the Downtown Specific Plan Focus Area.
  - The City-owned corporation yard near the Fulton Shipyard would be designated as Eastern Waterfront Employment Area with a sub-designation of Industrial.

- o The Office Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) land use category would be eliminated as it previously only existed within the current Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan Focus Area.

The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of commercial land uses. There would also be reductions in single-family residential units in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront, Somersville Road Corridor, and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units. This reduction would occur in the Estate Residential and Low Density Residential designations and in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. There would be a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units in the High Density Residential designation and the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

Table 3.0-1 shows the buildout under the 2003 element and the proposed 2017 Land Use Element for residential (single-family and multi-family) land uses.

**TABLE 3.0-1  
PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN RESIDENTIAL BUILDOUT CHANGE**

Land Uses/Focus Area	Single-Family Residential (DU)			Multi-Family (DU)		
	2003	2017	Change	2003	2017	Change
<b>Residential</b>						
Estate Residential	2,787	915	(1,872)	—	—	—
Low Density Residential	5,049	4,944	(105)	—	—	—
Medium Low Density Residential	22,333	22,333	—	—	—	—
Medium Density Residential	831	831	—	1,247	1,247	—
High Density Residential	—	—	—	6,509	4,817	(1,692)
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31,000</b>	<b>29,023</b>	<b>(1,977)</b>	<b>7,756</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>(1,692)</b>
<b>Commercial</b>						
Convenience Commercial	—	—	—	—	—	—
Neighborhood Community Commercial	—	—	—	—	—	—
Office	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>
<b>Industrial</b>						
Business Park	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Special</b>						
Mixed Use	—	—	—	279	279	—
Public Institutional	—	—	—	—	—	—
Open Space	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>—</b>
<b>Focus Areas</b>						



### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Land Uses/Focus Area	Single-Family Residential (DU)			Multi-Family (DU)		
	2003	2017	Change	2003	2017	Change
"A" Street Interchange	124	124	—	—	—	—
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	1,100	1,100	—	250	250	—
Eastern Employment Areas	12	12	—	248	248	—
Ginochio Property	400	400	—	—	—	—
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	1,135	1,065	(70)	1,385	1,221	(164)
Roddy Ranch	600	600	—	100	100	—
Hillcrest Station Area	—	—	—	2,500	2,500	—
Sand Creek	3,537	3,537	—	433	433	—
Somersville Road Corridor	1,926	—	(1,926)	358	358	—
Western Gateway	—	—	—	1,639	460	(1,179)
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8,834</b>	<b>6,838</b>	<b>(1,996)</b>	<b>6,913</b>	<b>5,570</b>	<b>(1,343)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39,834</b>	<b>35,862</b>	<b>(3,972)</b>	<b>14,947</b>	<b>11,912</b>	<b>(3,035)</b>
Percentage Change			(9.9)			(20.3)

Source: Antioch 2017

Totals have been rounded.

The project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in commercial, office, mixed-use, and in all Focus Areas other than the Ginochio Property. In some cases, the project would increase square footage in a land use designation or Focus Area, and in other cases there would be a reduction. Overall, square footage of commercial and office uses would be reduced by 14.2 percent.

For business park and industrial uses, the project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in business park, public institutional, and the Eastern Employment Areas, Ginochio Property, and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. In some cases, the project would increase square footage in a land use designation or Focus Area, and in other cases there would be a reduction. Overall, square footage of business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent. **Table 3.0-2** shows the buildout under the 2003 element and the proposed 2017 Land Use Element for commercial/office and business park/industrial uses.

**TABLE 3.0-2**  
**PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN COMMERCIAL/OFFICE AND BUSINESS PARK/INDUSTRIAL BUILDOUT CHANGE**

Land Uses	Commercial/Office (sq. ft.)			Business Park/Industrial (sq. ft.)		
	2003	2017	Change	2003	2017	Change
<b>Residential</b>						
Estate Residential	—	—	—	—	—	—
Low Density Residential	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medium Low Density Residential	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medium Density	—	—	—	—	—	—

### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Land Uses	Commercial/Office (sq. ft.)			Business Park/Industrial (sq. ft.)		
	2003	2017	Change	2003	2017	Change
Residential						
High Density Residential	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>
<b>Commercial</b>						
Convenience Commercial	281,788	341,449	59,661	—	—	—
Neighborhood Community Commercial	4,563,853	4,563,853	0	—	—	—
Office	7,000,320	7,059,981	59,661	—	—	—
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>11,845,961</b>	<b>11,965,283</b>	<b>119,322</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>
<b>Industrial</b>						
Business Park	—	—	—	4,687,009	8,647,651	3,960,641
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4,687,009</b>	<b>8,647,651</b>	<b>3,960,641</b>
<b>Special</b>						
Mixed Use	606,885	606,885	0	—	—	—
Public Institutional	—	—	—	5,968,350	5,968,350	—
Open Space	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>606,885</b>	<b>606,885</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,968,350</b>	<b>5,968,350</b>	<b>—</b>
<b>Focus Areas<sup>1</sup></b>						
"A" Street Interchange	2,121,125	2,110,165	(10,960)	—	—	—
East Lone Tree Specific Plan	1,135,000	1,135,000	—	2,152,300	2,152,300	—
Eastern Employment Areas	25,000	268,051	243,051	26,407,539	16,486,808	(9,920,730)
Ginochio Property <sup>1</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rivertown/Urban Waterfront	1,712,175	3,927,420	2,215,245	5,688,163	82,019	(5,606,143)
Roddy Ranch	225,000	225,000	—	—	—	—
Hillcrest Station Area	2,500,000	2,500,000	—	—	—	—
Sand Creek	1,240,000	1,240,000	—	—	—	—
Somersville Road Corridor	17,335,501	9,224,280	(8,111,221)	8,390,227	—	(8,390,227)
Western Gateway	215,216	215,216	0	—	—	—
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>26,509,017</b>	<b>20,845,132</b>	<b>(5,663,885)</b>	<b>42,638,229</b>	<b>18,721,127</b>	<b>(23,917,101 )</b>

### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Land Uses	Commercial/Office (sq. ft.)			Business Park/Industrial (sq. ft.)		
	2003	2017	Change	2003	2017	Change
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38,961,863</b>	<b>33,417,298</b>	<b>(5,544,565)</b>	<b>53,293,588</b>	<b>33,337,128</b>	<b>(19,956,460 )</b>
Percentage Change			(14.2)			(37.4)

Source: Antioch 2017

Totals have been rounded.

<sup>1</sup> Figures indicated represent the maximum permitted development intensity. The actual yield of future development is not guaranteed by the General Plan, but is dependent upon appropriate responses to General Plan policies. The ultimate development yield may be less than the maximums stated in this table.

#### 2003 GENERAL PLAN EIR

The certified EIR (including the DEIR, the FEIR, and subsequent addendums and amendments) assesses the environmental impacts of the General Plan development projections through 2020 (cumulative). The certified EIR serves as a program-level environmental document for subsequent City actions that are consistent with the General Plan. Further, the certified EIR was prepared and determined to be legally sufficient to serve as a project-level environmental document for subsequent actions such as rezonings, prezonings, annexations, and revisions to the Antioch Municipal Code and regulations, as deemed necessary or recommended to implement provisions of the General Plan.

Potential environmental impacts and policies/mitigation measures were identified in the EIR for aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geologic and seismic hazards, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, utilities, and transportation and traffic. For each potential impact, policies/mitigation measures were recommended to reduce the impact's level of significance. With the exception of air quality and transportation and traffic, these policies/mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Impacts related to air quality and transportation and traffic were considered significant and unavoidable adverse impacts that would result from implementation of the 2003 General Plan update. Therefore, the City adopted a statement of overriding considerations, which balanced the merits of approving the plan with the significant and unavoidable environmental effects identified in the General Plan EIR, which are:

- The rate of increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is higher than the rate of increase in population in Contra Costa County (1.5 percent per year) and in the Bay Area (1 percent per year). The rates of population increase for the county and the region are averages of the cities in each area. Cities such as Antioch would be expected to be higher in VMT than the average because of the city's proximity to employment centers and because the vacant land in the city allows for expansion.
- Generation of nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions that would exceed the project-level operations threshold established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).
- Stationary and mobile source air pollutant emissions associated with land uses in the city. Although some of the future pollutant emissions will occur as a result of previously approved development projects, pollutant emissions will also occur as a result of

additional development allowed by the General Plan beyond that which currently exists or is approved.

- Increases in traffic on area freeways and roadways. Certain roadways outside of Antioch will operate at unacceptable levels of service.

### 3.5 PROJECT APPROVALS

As the lead agency, the City of Antioch is the authority for project approval or denial. The proposed project would require that the City approve the Addendum, as supported by the Initial Study, and adopt the revised General Plan Land Use Element.

### **3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## **4.1 CEQA CHECKLIST**

The purpose of the checklist is to evaluate the categories in terms of any changed condition (e.g., changed circumstances, project changes, or new information of substantial importance) that may result in a changed environmental result (e.g., a new significant impact or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162).

The questions posed in the checklist come from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. A “no” answer does not necessarily mean that there are no potential impacts relative to the environmental category, but that there is no change in the condition or status of the impact since it was analyzed and addressed (with mitigation measures, if required) in the 2003 General Plan EIR. These environmental categories might be answered with a “no” in the checklist, since the proposed project does not introduce changes that would result in a modification to the conclusion of the previously approved CEQA document.

## **4.2 EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST EVALUATION CATEGORIES**

### **(1) 2003 GENERAL PLAN IMPACT COMPARISON**

This column indicates whether the impacts for the proposed project remain the same as found in the 2003 EIR.

### **(2) DO THE PROPOSED CHANGES INVOLVE NEW OR MORE SEVERE IMPACTS?**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the project would result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the 2003 EIR, or whether the changes would result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

### **(3) NEW CIRCUMSTANCES INVOLVING NEW OR MORE SEVERE IMPACTS?**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates whether there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require major revisions to the 2003 EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

### **(4) NEW INFORMATION REQUIRING NEW ANALYSIS OR VERIFICATION?**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D), this column indicates whether 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 2003 EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

- A) The project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the 2003 EIR;
- B) Significant effects previously examined would be substantially more severe than shown in the 2003 EIR;

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

- 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 2003 EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effect of the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

If the additional analysis completed as part of this environmental review were to find that:

- The conclusions of the 2003 EIR remain the same, and
- No new significant impacts are identified, or
- Identified impacts are not found to be substantially more severe, or
- Additional mitigation is not necessary.

Then answer in the checklist will be “no” and no additional environmental documentation would be required.

<b>Table 1-1</b> <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
<b>Aesthetics</b>		
Impact 4.1.1. Affected Views to Scenic Vistas and Scenic Resources. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by GP would increase the development of urban uses, causing a loss of open space and change in aesthetic character. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 5.4.2 and 5.4.14	No change. Future development under the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, as well as the new policies included in the proposed GPA, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.1.2. Light and Glare. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by GP would increase light and glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views of Antioch. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Mitigation Measures 4.1.2A, 4.1.2B, 4.1.2C, and 4.1.2D require the City to modify the proposed General Plan to incorporate policies to limit sources of lighting to the minimum required for safety and provide screening for commercial and industrial lighting adjacent to residential land use designations.	No change. Future development under the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, as well as the proposed, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Air Quality</b>		
Local Carbon Monoxide Hot Spot. The GP EIR determined that future ambient CO concentrations, with implementation of the proposed General Plan, would not violate either the State or Federal CO standards. Impact considered less than significant.	Mitigation not required.	No change. Given the intensity and type of development which could occur under buildout of the General Plan Land Use Element Update, as well as required compliance with existing air quality regulations, air quality impacts of future development would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
Impact 4.2.1. Construction Impacts. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by GP would result in construction-related impacts on air quality. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 10.5.2.a	No change. Given the intensity and type of development which could occur under buildout of the General Plan Land Use Element Update, as well as required compliance with existing air quality regulations, air quality impacts of future development would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.2.2. Regional Emissions Associated with Vehicular Trips. Development would result in more daily vehicular trips within the Planning Area. Emission factors for the existing (2003) and future build out year (2030) were determined. Future emissions (2030) would be lower when compared to their corresponding existing emissions (2003), except PM 10. NOx emissions would exceed the project level operations threshold established by the BAAQMD. Impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.	Policies: 10.5.2.b and 10.5.2.c.	No change. Given the intensity and type of development which could occur under buildout of the General Plan Land Use Element Update, as well as required compliance with existing air quality regulations, air quality impacts of future development would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.2.3. Consistency With Clean Air Plan Population and VMT Assumptions. The GP EIR determined that the rate of increase in VMT is higher than the rate of increase in population in Contra Costa County (1.5% per year) and in the Bay Area (1% per year). The rates of population increases for the County and region are averages of the cities within each area. Cities such as Antioch would be expected to be higher than the average, due to the proximity of the City to employment centers and that the vacant land within the City allows for expansion. Impacts are	Policies: 10.5.2.b and 10.5.2.c.	No change. Given the intensity and type of development which could occur under buildout of the General Plan Land Use Element Update, as well as required compliance with existing air quality regulations, air quality impacts of future development would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

**Table 1-1**  
**Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
considered significant and unavoidable.		
Impact 4.2.4. Stationary Source Emissions. The proposed General Plan would potentially result in increased stationary sources emissions from nonresidential development, new industries having the potential for emitting toxic air contaminants, and woodburning stoves and fire places. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 10.5.2.d, 10.5.2.e, and 10.5.2.f.	No change. Given the intensity and type of development which could occur under buildout of the General Plan Land Use Element Update, as well as required compliance with existing air quality regulations, air quality impacts of future development would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Biological Resources</b>		
Impacts 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. Sensitive Species and Sensitive Natural Communities. The GP EIR determined that implementation of the proposed GP may result in impacts to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, as well as riparian, wetland or other sensitive natural communities. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 10.4.2.	No change. Future development proposed under the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impacts 4.3.3 and 4.3.4. Impacts to Migratory Wildlife Corridors. The GP EIR determined that implementation of the proposed General Plan could interfere with the movement of wildlife species or with migratory wildlife corridors. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 10.4.2 and 10.3.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would not create changes to wildlife corridors. As such, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
Impact 4.4.1. Adverse Change in the Significance of an Historical Resource. The GP EIR determined that development allowed by implementation of the proposed General Plan could cause the destruction of or loss of an historical resource. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 5.4.6, 5.4.11, and 10.7.2.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code and State guidelines related to protection of cultural resources. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, as well as the new policies included in the proposed GPA, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.4.2. Destruction of a Known Archaeological Resource. The GP EIR determined that development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands and could cause the destruction of known archaeological resources. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 10.7.2a and b Mitigation Measure 4.4.2A requires the City to modify the proposed General Plan to incorporate a policy with a provision in the event that avoidance and/or preservation in the location of any cultural resources is not possible.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code and State guidelines related to protection of cultural resources. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulation, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.4.3. Destruction of a Unique Paleontological Resource or Site. The GP EIR determined that development associated with the proposed General Plan would require disturbance of vacant lands and could cause the destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 10.7.2a and b Mitigation Measure 4.4.3A requires the City to modify the proposed General Plan to incorporate a policy requiring the presence of a paleontologist during site grading if the site may contain paleontological resources.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code and State guidelines related to protection of cultural resources. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in

**Table 1-1**  
**Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

General Plan EIR Impact	General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure	Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR
		the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Geology and Soils</b>		
Impact 4.5.1. Ground Shaking. The GP EIR determined that new development would likely be subject to some level of seismic ground shaking. Considered significant pre mitigation, but less than after mitigation. Impact 4.5.5. Unstable Geologic Conditions. The GP EIR determined that development in certain areas may become unstable and potentially result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 11.3.2 and 11.8.2. Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A and 4.5.1B require the City to modify the proposed General Plan to incorporate a policy requiring the preparation of a site-specific ground shaking assessment for any proposed development in the city.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code and the most recent version of the California Building Code (CBC). With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.5.2. Liquefaction. The GP EIR determined that future proposed General Plan development within Antioch would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in or near areas susceptible to liquefaction. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 11.3.2-i and k. Mitigation Measure 4.5.2A requires the City to modify the proposed General Plan to incorporate a policy regarding liquefaction hazards.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code, as well as the most recent version of the CBC. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.5.3. Landslides, Rockfalls, and Expansive Soils. The GP EIR found that future proposed General Plan development within the City would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to landslides, rockfalls, or expansive soils. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than	Policies: 5.4.14-a and b; 11.3.2-a, g, h, i, and j.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code, as well as the most recent version of the CBC. With adherence to existing guidelines and

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
significant after mitigation.		regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.5.4. Soil Erosion/Loss of Topsoil. The GP EIR determined that areas exposed during future proposed General Plan development activities would be prone to erosion and/or the loss of topsoil. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 8.7.2 and 10.6.2.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code, as well as the most recent version of the CBC. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.5.5 Unstable Geologic Conditions. Implementation of the proposed General Plan could facilitate new development in areas that may become unstable and potentially result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Impacts to this issue are potentially significant.	Policies 11.3.2-a, l, j, and k.  Mitigation Measures 4.5.1A and 4.5.1B	Less than Significant.
Impact 4.5.6. Expansive Soils. The GP EIR determined that future development would increase the potential for the placement of structures and facilities in areas susceptible to damage resulting from expansive soils. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 11.3.2-a and k.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code, as well as the most recent version of the CBC. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

**Table 1-1**  
**Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

General Plan EIR Impact	General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure	Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>		
Impact 4.6.1. Hazardous Materials Use, Generation and Transport. The GP EIR determined that buildout of the proposed General Plan may result in increased risk of upset associated with the routine use, generation, and transportation of hazardous materials, which may potentially pose a health or safety hazard. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.7.2.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code and various other federal and State guidelines related to handling of hazardous materials. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.6.2. Impair an Emergency Response Plan. The GP EIR determined that build out of the proposed General Plan may impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.8.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update does not include land use or policy changes that would interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.6.3. Wildland Fire Hazards. The GP EIR determined that implementation of the proposed General Plan may expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than	Policy: 8.10.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update does not include land use or policy changes that would increase the risk of wildland fire hazards within the City. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
significant after mitigation.		municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.6.4. Mine Hazards. The GP EIR determined that collapse of historic coal mine tunnels could result in subsidence of lands located above the mines, potentially causing damage to foundations or other improvements. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.3.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update does not include land use or policy changes that would increase mine-related hazards within the City. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
Impacts to Groundwater Supplies. The GP EIR determined that impacts to ground water supplies are less than significant as no municipal water is pumped from groundwater. Impact considered less than significant.	Policies: 3.5.9.2, 3.7.2, 8.7.2, 10.3.2, 10.6.2, and 11.8.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development of the City, and, thus, would decrease demand for ground water supplies. In addition, future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impacts to Water Quality. The GP EIR determined that impacts associated with new development	Policies: 3.5.9.2, 3.7.2, 8.7.2, 10.3.2, 10.6.2,	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be

**Table 1-1  
Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
can include erosion and sedimentation associated with groundbreaking and clearing activities. Additionally, stormwater runoff from urban areas contains a variety of pollutants that may reduce the quality of groundwater resources when introduced into groundwater aquifers. Impact considered less than significant.	and 11.8.2.	subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan related to water quality, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. Furthermore, the General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the intensity of construction activity that would occur under buildout of the City. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Risk of Seiche, Tsunami or Mudflows. The GP EIR determined that due to this geographic location, implementation of the proposed GP would not expose people or property to flooding associated with seiches or tsunamis. Additionally, the hillside to the south is generally stable and is not prone to mudflows. Impact considered less than significant.	Policies: 3.5.9.2, 3.7.2, 8.7.2, 10.3.2, 10.6.2, and 11.8.2.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Risk of Dam Failure. Portions of the City of Antioch are located below the Contra Loma Reservoir and the overall safety classification of the dam is registered as satisfactory. Impact considered less than significant.	Policies: 3.5.9.2, 3.7.2, 8.7.2, 10.3.2, 10.6.2, and 11.8.2.	No change. Although the City is located within the dam inundation zone for the Contra Loma Reservoir, General Plan policies would reduce impacts. This impact would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.7.1. Increased Stormwater Runoff. The GP EIR determined that future development would likely result in a net increase in impervious surfaces that would reduce the amount of rainfall that can infiltrate into the subsurface. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than	Policy: 11.4.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update decrease future development intensity within the City, and the proposed land use and policy changes would result in an overall decrease in total impervious area from what was previously considered in the 2003 General Plan



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
significant after mitigation.		EIR. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan related to stormwater, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.7.2. Flood Hazards. The GP EIR determined that an increase in development within the City has the potential to increase the risk of flooding. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 3.5.6.2.	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.7.3. Alteration of the San Joaquin River. The GP EIR determined that revitalization and development of Rodgers Point may substantially alter a portion of the San Joaquin River. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	The City shall modify the proposed General Plan to incorporate a policy with the following provision: Prior to or concurrent with approvals of any development applications, at Rodgers Point a Master Plan for the area shall be prepared and approved by the City. The Master Plan shall provide detailed guidance for environmental review, project-related land use, provision and financing of required public services and facilities, open space preservation, community design, recreational amenities, and community	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would not result in alterations to the San Joaquin River, and impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

Table 1-1 Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR		
General Plan EIR Impact	General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure	Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR
	improvements.	
Land Use		
Physically Divide an Established Community. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by the GP will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of any established neighborhood. Impact considered less than significant.	Mitigation not required.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would not substantially alter the development trends which were previously anticipated for the area in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.8.1. Changes in the Pattern of Land Use. The GP EIR determined that changes in the pattern of land uses would result in the development of structures or facilities within areas that are currently undeveloped. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 4.3.2, 4.4.4.2, and 5.4.12.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would not substantially alter the development trends which were previously anticipated for the area in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.8.2. Development Outside Urban Limit Line. The GP EIR determined that the proposed urban development within areas that are currently outside of the County's Urban Limit Line might not be consistent with the provisions of the Contra Costa County 65/35 Land Preservation Plan. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 4.3.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would enable future development to occur outside the City's established Urban Limit Line; however, development would occur only after the expansion of the Urban Limit Line. Impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.8.3. Consistency with ABAG Growth Projection. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by the GP would	Policies: 3.8.2, 4.4.4.2, and 4.4.6.5.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease total development in the City and the proposed land use and policy

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
generate employment in excess of that which is projected by ABAG. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.		changes would not substantially increase the intensity of development previously considered in the 2003 General Plan, and impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Noise</b>		
Impact 4.9.1. Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts. The GP EIR determined that construction activities facilitated by the GP would result in potentially significant noise impacts. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.6.2. Mitigation Measures 4.9.1A and 4.9.1B would require compliance with the City's noise ordinance construction hours.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the intensity of construction activity which could occur under buildout of the General Plan. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.9.2. Long-Term Vehicular Noise Impacts. The GP EIR determined that long-term vehicular noise than could affect sensitive land uses along the roads, particularly residential uses along and adjacent to major transit corridors. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.6.2	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease volumes of traffic occurring within the City under buildout conditions. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

**Table 1-1  
Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
Impact 4.9.3. Long-Term Stationary Noise Impacts. The GP EIR determined that new development associated with implementation of GP could expose existing and new uses to stationary noise sources. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.6.2	No change. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.9.4. Long-Term Railroad Noise Impacts. The GP EIR determined that new proposed sensitive land uses along and adjacent to the railroads could be affected by noise levels from railroad operations. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 11.6.2	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease development in areas that would be adjacent to railroad lines. Impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Population and Housing</b>		
Impact 4.10.1. Population and Housing Projections are exceeded. The GP EIR determined that implementation of the proposed Housing Element will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, and associated infrastructure. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 3.6.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Public Services</b>		
Impact 4.11.1. Police Protection. The GP EIR determined that increases in population and employment anticipated with the General Plan	Policies: 3.5.3, 3.5.3.1, 3.5.3.2, and 8.11.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City. Future development within the

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
would increase the need for police protection and police services. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.		City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan related to police protection services, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.11.2. Fire Protection. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by the GP will result in a substantial increase in population and structures, and will require additional on-duty firefighters. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 3.5.2.1, 3.5.2.2, and 8.10.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City. Future development from the General Plan Land Use Element Update would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan related to fire protection services, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.11.3. Schools. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by the GP will result in an increased student population throughout the City. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 3.5.8.1, 3.5.8.2, and 8.8.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City and would not increase future demand for schools. Impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.11.4. Parks and Recreation. The GP EIR determined that the build out within the City of Antioch will result in a substantial increase in population, potentially increasing the use of existing parks and recreation facilities. These impacts will require the expansion of existing	Policies: 8.4.2 and 10.6.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City and would not increase future demand for parks. Future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General

**Table 1-1  
Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
facilities and recreation programs or the construction of new parks and recreational facilities. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.		Plan related to the provision of parks, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
<b>Utilities</b>		
Impact 4.12.1. Water Supply. The GP EIR determined that the population increases projected for the City will increase the demand for water beyond that which currently exists. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 8.4.2 and 10.6.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City and would not substantially increase demand for water supplies beyond what has been previously considered for the area. In addition, future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.12.2. Water Quality. The GP EIR determined that development facilitated by the GP will result in reliance on a higher percentage of lower quality water from the San Joaquin River and may increase the level of pollutants that occur in water reserves. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 10.6.2.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the total development yield of the City and would not substantially increase demand for ground water supplies beyond what has been previously considered for the area. In addition, future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<p align="center"><b>Table 1-1</b>  <b>Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR</b></p>		
<b>General Plan EIR Impact</b>	<b>General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR</b>
		the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.12.3. Wastewater. The GP EIR determined that increases in population and housing, (in addition to increases of commercial, and industrial land uses,) would necessitate increased wastewater treatment capacity. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 8.5.2, 3.5.5.1, 3.5.5.2, 3.5.9.2, and 3.6.3.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the intensity of development within the City and future development would not generate more wastewater than what was previously considered in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulation impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.12.4. Gas Services. The GP EIR determined that build out of the City will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, potentially increasing the use of and need for natural gas. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policies: 3.6.2, and 9.4.1. Mitigation Measures 4.12.4A and 4.12.4B.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the intensity of development within the City and future development would not increase demand for gas services beyond levels previously considered in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.12.5. Electric Services. The GP EIR determined that build out of the City will result in a substantial increase in population and residential and non-residential structures, potentially increasing the use of and need for electricity. Considered significant before	Mitigation Measures 4.12.4A and 4.12.4B.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease the intensity of development within the City and future development would not increase demand for electricity beyond levels previously considered in the 2003 General Plan EIR. With adherence to

**Table 1-1  
Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR**

General Plan EIR Impact	General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure	Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR
mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.		existing guidelines and regulations related to energy conservation impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Impact 4.12.6. Solid Waste Services. The GP EIR determined that increases in population and employment could increase the need for solid waste disposal, requiring additional landfill capacity and related support facilities. Considered significant before mitigation, but less than significant after mitigation.	Policy: 8.6.2. Mitigation Measures 4.12.6A, 4.12.6B, and 4.12.6C.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would not increase the intensity of development within the City and future development would not increase generation of solid waste beyond levels previously considered in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan related to solid waste, as well as existing regulations within the City's municipal code. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
Transportation/Traffic		
Impact 4.16.1. Potential to Degrade Roadway Levels of Service. The GP EIR determined that future growth will increase area-wide traffic volumes with the potential to degrade roadway performance below applicable performance standards. Impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.	Policies: 3.4.4, 3.4.5, and 7.3.2 Mitigation Measure. There are no feasible mitigation measures that the City could adopt to reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level.	No change. The General Plan Land Use Element Update would decrease potential land use development and would decrease area-wide traffic volumes. Future development within the City would be subject to the applicable policies and measures included in the adopted General Plan related to circulation systems, as well as existing federal, State, and local guidelines related to transportation systems. With adherence to existing guidelines and regulations, impacts would be less than or equal to impacts previously



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

Table 1-1 Consistency of City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Addendum with General Plan EIR		
General Plan EIR Impact	General Plan EIR Policies/Mitigation Measure	Relationship of Proposed Project to General Plan EIR
		identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

This page intentionally left blank

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on a scenic vista.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on a scenic vista.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of scenic vistas.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on State Scenic Highways.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on State Scenic Highways.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of State Scenic Highways.
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on visual character.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on visual character.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of visual character.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on light and glare	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on light and glare	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of light and glare.

## EXISTING SETTING

The City of Antioch extends in a roughly square pattern from Pittsburg on the west to the Antioch Bridge on the east, and from the foothills of Mt. Diablo on the south to the San Joaquin River on the north. The City is bisected by State Route 4 (SR 4), an east-west-oriented four-lane freeway. The Southern Pacific Railroad line runs east-west just north of SR 4; the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad line runs east-west along the San Joaquin River waterfront. The Contra Costa Canal is located south of SR 4, and traverses the Planning Area in an east-west direction.

The City's form and visual character has developed over a period defined by post-war expansion as well as a natural progression of economic development in the San Francisco Bay Area. Antioch's commercial and residential character is physically divided by the State highway infrastructure.

### **Scenic Views**

Views of Mt. Diablo, the ridgelines, and the San Joaquin River are important resources for the City of Antioch. Public view along Somersville Road on the A Street Connection include either the hills or the San Joaquin River. Other major streets providing north and south views include Contra Loma Boulevard, Lone Tree Way, Hillcrest Avenue, and SR 160. Streets providing east and west views include James Donlon Boulevard, Lone Tree Way, Putnam Street, SR 4, Oakley Road, and Empire Mine Road. Major ridgelines associated with the foothills of Mt. Diablo occur along the entire southwest boundary of the Planning Area. Most of the open lands in the southwest area of the City are located within either Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve or Contra Loma Regional Park.

The City's General Plan Community Image and Design Element aims to maintain views of the San Joaquin River and its shoreline, Mt. Diablo and its foothills, and scenic resources within the City's view shed.

### **DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a) Scenic vistas within the City of Antioch include views of the San Joaquin River, moderate to steep hills (including Mount Diablo), broad valleys, narrow canyons, and lakes. The project would revise goals, policies, and objectives for the Land Use Element, update the Land Use Map to reflect these changes, and revise land use intensities and distribution. The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. The project does not propose any land use designations that would increase height of allowed development along a scenic vista or buildings on ridgelines in new areas. The project would update the Land Use Map to show new parks and open space areas (that would no longer be available for proposed development) and would not reduce open space areas. As such, the proposed project would not alter any conclusions set forth in the EIR and project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- b) According to the California Scenic Highway Program, SR 4 and SR 160 are not designated scenic highways within the City of Antioch, nor are they considered eligible to be officially designated. There would be no potential for the project to substantially damage scenic resources or a scenic highway and project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- c) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. Under the proposed project, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units in the Estate Residential and Low Density Residential designations and in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. There would be a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units in the High Density Residential designation and the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

For business park and industrial uses, the project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in business park, public institutional, and the Eastern Employment Areas, Ginochio Property, and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. In some cases, the project would increase square footage in a land use designation or Focus Area, and in other cases there would be a reduction. Overall, square footage of business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent citywide.

These land use changes refine the 2003 Land Use Element and would not increase development intensities or change the type of development in the City. The General Plan includes general design and hillside design policies. Future development would be required to be consistent with General Plan policies (specifically Policies: 5.4.2 and 5.4.14) and zoning related to community design, density, setbacks, and bulk. Therefore, impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- d) The City is developed with streetlighting and land uses that generate ambient light and glare. The project would revise land use designations that would result in development with the potential to increase light and glare. However, overall, the project would result in reductions in housing units in the single-family residential and multi-family residential land designations, and a reduction of square footage in nonresidential uses in commercial, office, mixed-use designations, and in all Focus Areas other than the Ginochio Property. Overall development would be reduced in the City, which would ultimately reduce potential ambient light and glare.

Similar as analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR, new development created by the project would be required to be consistent with the City Municipal Code standards for lighting. Additionally, future development would be subject to existing General Plan policies regarding light and glare, including Policy 5.4.2(o), which states that lighting must not result in nuisance levels or light or glare on adjacent properties. Therefore, impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe aesthetic impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on Important Farmland.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on Important Farmland.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of Important Farmland.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on forest land or timberland.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on forest land or timberland.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of forest land or timberland.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on forest land or the conversion of forest land.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on forest land or the conversion of forest land.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of forest land or the conversion of forest land.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on surrounding agricultural uses.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on surrounding agricultural uses.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of surrounding agricultural uses.

### EXISTING SETTING

Agricultural uses of land in the City of Antioch include hayfields, vineyards, almond orchards, and walnut orchards. Most of the agricultural lands are found along the eastern edge of the City<sup>1</sup>, but they can also be found scattered among the more urban areas. As shown in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) Map for Contra Costa County, the City is classified as Urban and Built up Land, occupied by structures with building density of at least 1 unit per 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. There are no Prime Farmland of Local or Statewide Importance within the project area<sup>2</sup>. The City is a combination of primarily commercial and light industrial purposes, is not currently used for any type of agricultural or forestry use, and is not zoned for agricultural or forestry use. The project area is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. The project area does not meet the definition of forestland provided in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) due to its location in an intensely developed area, which would preclude the management of any forest resources.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) The project area does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland

<sup>1</sup> LSA 2003. Figure 4.3.1, City of Antioch General Plan Update, Biological Resources. July 24, 2003.

<sup>2</sup> DOC 2014. Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2014. Updated January 2017.

Mapping Program of the California Resources Agency. As such, the project would not convert Important Farmland to non-agricultural use. Project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- b) There are no Williamson Act Contracts in the project area and the City is not zoned for agricultural use, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104[g]). As such, project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- c) The project area is not zoned as forest land or timberland and would not rezone any forest land or timberland. As such, the project would not convert forest land or timberland to non-agricultural use. Project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- d) As stated above in c), the project area is not zoned as forest land or timberland and would not rezone any forest land or timberland. There are no lands adjacent to the City that are zoned as forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project would not have any potential to convert forest land to a non-forest use or result in the loss of forest land. Project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- e) The project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, or land under a Williamson Act Contract. The project area is not zoned as forest land or timberland and would not rezone any forest land or timberland. The City is surrounded by the County Urban Limit Line (ULL), which is incorporated into the Contra Costa County General Plan Open Space and Conservation elements, and which limits urban development in the adjacent County areas. Therefore, the project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of forest land to non-forest use. As such, the proposed project would not alter the conclusions of the EIR and impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

## CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on an applicable air quality plan.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on an applicable air quality plan.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of an applicable air quality plan.
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with violation of an air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with violation of an air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of violations of air quality standards.
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on sensitive receptors.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on sensitive receptors.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of sensitive receptors.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Yes	No. The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with objectionable odors.	No. There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with objectionable odors.	No. No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of objectionable odors.

## EXISTING SETTING

The City is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The SFBAAB area is currently designated as a nonattainment area for the State and federal ozone, State and federal fine particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and State respirable particulate matter 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) ambient air quality standards (AAQS). The SFBAAB is designated attainment or unclassified for all other AAQS. Although the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) issued a final rule determining that the Bay Area attained the 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> federal AAQS, the Bay Area must continue to be designated as nonattainment for the federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> AAQS until the USEPA approves the redesignation. Therefore, the SFBAAB remains in nonattainment for 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

The BAAQMD is responsible for planning, implementing, and enforcing air quality standards within the Bay Area Air Basin including the City of Antioch. The BAAQMD prepares ozone attainment plans for the national ozone standard and clean air plans for the California standard, both in coordination with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG).

With respect to applicable air quality plans, the BAAQMD prepared the 2017 Clean Air Plan—titled Spare the Air, Cool the Climate—to address nonattainment of the national 1-hour ozone standard in the air basin. The Clean Air Plan defines a control strategy that the BAAQMD and its partners will implement to (1) reduce emissions and decrease ambient concentrations of harmful pollutants; (2) safeguard public health by reducing exposure to air pollutants that pose the greatest health risk, with an emphasis on protecting the communities most heavily impacted by air pollution; and (3) reduce greenhouse gas emissions to protect the climate. It is important to note that in addition to updating the previously prepared ozone plan, the newly adopted Clean Air Plan also serves as a multipollutant plan to protect public health and the climate. In its dual role as an update to the state ozone plan and a multipollutant plan, the 2017 Clean Air Plan addresses four categories of pollutants (BAAQMD 2017)

- Ground-level ozone and its key precursors, ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>
- Particulate matter: primary PM<sub>2.5</sub>, as well as precursors to secondary PM<sub>2.5</sub>
- Air toxics
- Greenhouse gases

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

The Clean Air Plan includes local guidance for the State Implementation Plan, which establishes the framework for air quality basins to achieve attainment of the state and federal ambient air quality standards.

The 2003 General Plan EIR analyzed air quality impacts for the entirety of the City of Antioch, and determined that impacts for implementation of an air quality plan and to existing air quality violations would be significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of mitigation.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-c) The Bay Area 2010 CAP was based on land use and growth projections consistent with those used in the City of Antioch 2003 General Plan. Therefore, the City's General Plan is consistent with the CAP since it supports the primary goals, includes control measures, and does not conflict with or disrupt implementation of control measures. Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units and a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units. Overall, square footage of commercial and office uses would be reduced by 14.2 percent and business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent.

Construction emissions are generated by machinery during construction of land uses. The reduction in housing units and square footage of land uses would result in reduction in construction emissions in the City. Therefore, construction emissions would be reduced from what was analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Additionally, General Plan Policy 10.5.2.a would require land use developers to implement BAAQMD dust abatement measures.

Additionally, the reduction in housing units and square footage would result in reduction in operational emissions generated by vehicle trips in the City. Operational emissions are analyzed based on the number of vehicle trips, which is calculated from the project's housing units and square footage of commercial, office, business parks, and industrial uses.

Based on trip generation rates provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 2012 *Trip Generation Manual*, average daily trips were calculated for previously considered and proposed projects. As described in Traffic and Transportation, average daily vehicle trips would be reduced by 367,411 trips (23.4 percent). Trips during the a.m. peak hour would be reduced by 41,116 trips (23.8 percent), and vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour would be reduced by 39,260 trips (23.8 percent).

Therefore, the proposed project would result in fewer average daily trips than under the previously considered project, and would generate fewer emissions. The proposed project would not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled that would conflict with Bay Area Quality Management District (BAAQMD) regional air quality planning efforts. Implementation of the Air Quality Policies 10.5.2.b and 10.5.2.c and included in the Resource Management section of the proposed General Plan, would reduce emissions from vehicle travel, but are not expected to reduce them to below the population growth rate in the region. Although, this impact would be less than the impact found in the General Plan EIR, it would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

- d) Sensitive receptors include children, senior citizens, acutely or chronically ill people and/or facilities where these more sensitive population groups reside or spend time (i.e., schools, retirement homes, hospitals). These types of uses are scattered throughout the

City. Development under the project would be scattered throughout the City depending on specific development proposals. The amount of development, including industrial development, would be reduced under the Land Use Element Update from the 2003 General Plan. Therefore, the risk of exposing sensitive receptors would be less than found in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Development projects would be subject to General Plan Policies 10.5.2 d-f, which require review of stationary sources of air emissions. Similar to land uses developed under the 2003 General Plan, any new projects proposed would be subject to undergo site specific review, including a Health Risk Assessment (if the uses and location require it). Therefore, project impacts would be less than, or similar, as analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- e) The proposed project would develop residential, commercial, business park, and industrial uses. The project does not propose any specific development. Although commercial or industrial uses could be considered sources of objectionable odors, specific development proposals would be subject to review, including for the potential to generate objectionable odors prior to any project approval. Development projects would be subject to General Plan Policies 10.5.2 d-f, which require review of stationary sources of air emissions that could create objectionable odors. Additionally, the project would result in a reduction in land designated for housing, commercial, business park, and industrial uses. Therefore, project impacts would be less than, or similar, as analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

Although, impacts would be less than the impact found in the 2003 General Plan EIR, they would likely remain significant and unavoidable. The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on special status species.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on special status species.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of special status species.
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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on riparian habitat.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on riparian habitat.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of riparian habitat.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on Section 404 wetlands.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on Section 404 wetlands.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of Section 404 wetlands.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on fish or wildlife movement.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on fish or wildlife movement.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of fish or wildlife movement.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on local biological policies or ordinances.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on fish or local biological policies or ordinances.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of local biological policies or ordinances.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

## EXISTING SETTING

Although the City is largely urbanized, portions of remaining undeveloped lands contain vegetation and habitat types that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) considers rare and therefore candidates for consideration in the California Natural Diversity Database, including native grasslands, vernal pools, seasonal wetlands, and riparian woodlands. Antioch's General Plan Open Space policies are designed to maintain, preserve, and acquire open space and associated resources by providing recreational parks, trails, and the preservation of natural, scenic and other open space resources. Further, the City is adopting the Sand Creek Resource Management Plan, which addresses the relationship between existing preserved lands in regional proximity to natural resources and habitats. The plan is designed to work in concert with the General Plan that will be used to consider and approve development proposals to ensure maximum benefit to comprehensive multi-parcel planning.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Sand Creek Resource Management Plan: Framework for Resource Management Plan for Sand Creek Focus Area. Prepared by Live Oak Associates, Inc. Prepared for Morrison and Foerster. July 11, 2003.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-c) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of commercial land uses. Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units. There would be a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units in the High Density Residential designation and the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

The project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in commercial, office, mixed-use, and in all Focus Areas other than the Ginochio Property. Overall, square footage of commercial and office uses would be reduced by 14.2 percent and square footage of business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent.

The project would update the Land Use Map to show new parks and open space areas (that would no longer be available for proposed development) and would not reduce open space areas. Future development would be required to adhere to all applicable General Plan policies and programs related to the protection of wildlife movement corridors. For example, General Plan Policy 10.4.2 calls for the preservation of existing wetlands and riparian resources along the San Joaquin River and other natural streams within the City of Antioch. General Plan policy 10.3.2 requires that proposed development projects containing significant natural resources (e.g. sensitive habitats, habitat linkages, steep slopes, cultural resources, wildland fire hazards, etc.) prepare Resource Management Plans to provide a long-term plan for conservation and management of natural communities. Therefore, development in the City would be reduced and the potential for impacts to sensitive species, habitats, riparian habitat, or wetlands would be reduced. As such, the proposed project would not alter any conclusions set forth in the EIR and project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- d) The project would result in a reduction in proposed development. Future development would be required to adhere to all applicable General Plan policies and programs related to the protection of wildlife movement corridors. For example, General Plan Policy 10.4.2 calls for the preservation of existing wetlands and riparian resources along the San Joaquin River and other natural streams within the City of Antioch that could serve as migration corridors. General Plan policy 10.3.2 requires that proposed development projects containing significant natural resources (e.g. sensitive habitats, habitat linkages, steep slopes, cultural resources, wildland fire hazards, etc.) prepare Resource Management Plans to provide a long-term plan for conservation and management of natural communities.

Therefore, development in the City would be reduced and the potential for impacts to wildlife corridors would be reduced. As such, the proposed project would not alter any conclusions set forth in the EIR and project impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- e) The project does not include any specific proposal for developments at this time, and, as such, would not directly conflict with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance (Title 9, Chapter 5, Article 12 of the Antioch Municipal Code). Any future development project would be required to demonstrate consistency with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance.

Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance would be less than or similar to impacts previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- f) The City of Antioch is not within the boundaries of the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP). Therefore, impacts to conflict with a HCP/NCCP would be similar to as found in the 2003 General Plan EIR and no impacts would occur.

## CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on historic resources.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on historic resources.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of historic resources.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on archaeological resources.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on archaeological resources.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of archaeological resources.
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on paleontological resources.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on paleontological resources.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of paleontological resources.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on burial sites.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on burial sites.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of burial sites.

### EXISTING SETTING

Antioch is home to a variety of historical resources, ranging from landmark commercial buildings, to Victorian, Craftsman, and Modern-style homes, to churches, schools, and civic buildings. The City and environs also contain historical archaeological deposits associated with homes, farms, ranch sites, and industrial activities. Twenty historical archaeological sites are recorded within the study area. The Antioch waterfront is a distinctive resource both on- and offshore.

Fifty-six of Antioch's historical buildings and four monuments and vanished sites are listed on national, state, and local registers of historic properties and landmarks. The Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File (HPD), maintained by the state Office of Historic Preservation, is a master list of all resources that have been evaluated for potential eligibility for State and national registers of historic places.

The City of Antioch Community Development Department maintains a map of known cultural resources sites within the City (City of Antioch 1992); however, to deter vandalism, artifact hunting, and other activities with the potential to damage such resources, the locations of known cultural resources are kept confidential. The legal authority to restrict cultural resource location information is in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended Section 304, and California Government Code 6254.1.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. Furthermore, while the proposed project would allow for future development to occur, the project does not include a specific proposal for development at this time. In addition, future development would be subject to existing General Plan policies and programs that protect historical resources, including Policies 5.4.6, 5.4.11, and 10.7.2 a and b, which requires surveys for projects with the potential to impact historical resources. If historical resources found to be present, mitigation would be required prior to initiation of construction activities in accordance with applicable CEQA guidelines and provisions of the California Public Resources Code. Therefore, impacts related to historical resources would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- b-d) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of commercial land uses. Additionally, the project would update the Land Use Map to show new parks and open space areas that would no longer be available for proposed development. Future projects in the City would be subject to General Plan Policies 5.4.6, 5.4.11, and 10.7.2 a and b and environmental review under CEQA, which would provide for analysis of impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources, as well as human remains.

In accordance with AB 52 (PRC Section 21084.2) lead agencies are required to consult with Native American tribes that have requested notification of projects that could have an impact to a Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) including a site feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object, of cultural value to the tribe and is listed on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or a local register.

Therefore, the City would be required to initiate consultation with a tribe with traditional and/or cultural affiliations within the City. Should the tribe respond requesting formal consultation, the City would work with the tribe or representative thereof to determine the level of environmental review warranted, identify impacts, and recommend avoidance or mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Future projects would adhere to all applicable General Plan policies and programs related to the protection of archaeological and paleontological resources, including General Plan Policy 10.7.2 a and b, which requires surveys for projects having the potential to impact archaeological or paleontological resources.

If human remains were discovered in the course of any earthmoving activities resulting from a project, project activities would be subject to State law regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains including Health and Safety Code Section (b) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

## **CONCLUSION**

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<b>Yes</b>	No. The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on an earthquake fault.	No. There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on an earthquake fault.	No. No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of an earthquake fault.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on strong seismic ground shaking.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on strong seismic ground shaking.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of strong seismic ground shaking.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR</b>	<b>Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</b>
iv) Landslides?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on landslides.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on landslides.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of landslides.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on soil erosion.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on soil erosion.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of soil erosion.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on unstable geologic units or soils.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on unstable geologic units or soils.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of unstable geologic units or soils.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on expansive soils.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on expansive soils.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of expansive soils.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on septic systems.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on septic systems.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of septic systems.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

### EXISTING SETTING

The City of Antioch geology is defined by Lowland and Upland areas. The Lowland Area of Antioch is underlain by alluvium that is younger than 2 million years old, and consists mainly of unconsolidated floodplain deposits with sand, silt, gravel, and clay irregularly interstratified. The Upland Area of the City consists primarily of tilted sedimentary rocks that range in age from Upper Cretaceous (65 million years old) to Holocene (11,000 years old)<sup>4</sup>. Antioch is an historic coal mining town. The Black Diamond Mines Regional Park is located in the southwestern portion of the City. By 1890, more than 80 percent of the total reserves for this region had been depleted<sup>5</sup>.

Historically active faults in Contra Costa County include the Concord-Green Valley, Hayward, Calaveras, and Marsh Creek-Greenville faults. The largest regional fault, the San Andreas Fault, is located approximately 45 miles west of the City of Antioch. The nearest active faults are the Concord-Green Valley and Marsh Creek-Greenville-Clayton faults, located approximately 10 miles and 4 miles, respectively, from the City.

In 1996 the City of Antioch approved an Emergency Response Plan that addresses response to disasters, including, but not limited to, earthquakes, floods, and fires. Additional policies and regulations are discussed below in Discussion of Impacts.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a i-iv) As stated above, the nearest active faults are the Concord-Green Valley and Marsh Creek-Greenville faults, located approximately 10 miles and 4 miles, respectively, from the City. Although no active or potentially active faults lie under the City, the proximity to active faults may lead to strong ground-shaking experienced in the City in a seismic event. Development would be reduced as compared to the 2003 General Plan, which would reduce the potential number of structures and people that would be exposed to seismic hazards. Additionally, any new development would be subject to compliance with applicable California Building Standards Code (CBC), including CBC Title 21 and 24 (adopted 2017), which provides parameters for the design and construction of buildings in California. Additionally, General Plan Policy 11.3.2 requires preparation of geologic and soils reports for proposed development sites, evaluations of potential slope stability for development proposed within hillside areas, and requires specialized soils reports in areas with potential soil stability issues (including expansion, settlement, or subsidence). which requires compliance with the most recent CBC, would reduce the potential for exposure of persons and property to harm from ground shaking. The City's Emergency Response Plan was updated to comply with General Plan Policy 11.8.2. Therefore, impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse impacts involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides, as would be would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- b) The project would reduce overall development in the City and these land use changes would reduce the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil associated with future

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Geologic Survey, 1994. Preliminary Geologic Map Emphasizing Formations in Contra Costa County, California.

<sup>5</sup> Wagstaff & Associates, 1997. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Southeast Area Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation.

development in the City. All future development would be subject to existing federal, State, and local regulations related to erosion, including Policy 10.3.2 i-k, in the City's General Plan, which requires implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and sedimentation associated with construction activities. As such, impacts related to substantial erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- c-d) Future development within the City would be subject to existing policies in the City's General Plan related to geologic and seismic hazards. Specifically, Policy 11.3.2 requires preparation of geologic and soils reports for proposed development sites. In addition, Policy 11.3.2 i-k requires evaluations of potential slope stability for development proposed within hillside areas, and requires specialized soils reports in areas with potential soil stability issues (including expansion, settlement, or subsidence). The project would reduce overall development in the City, which would reduce the potential for development on an unstable geologic unit or expansive soils associated with future development in the City. General Plan Policies 5.4.14 a and b specify hillside development policies. Therefore, future development would be subject to the same or reduced risk of exposure as previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Therefore, impacts related to unstable geologic units and expansive soils, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- e) Development in the City is served by sewers and wastewater is treated by Delta Diablo Sanitation District, which provides wastewater/sewer service to the City. Any new development as a result of the proposed project would be served with sanitary sewer service provided by the City. The project would not use a septic or alternative wastewater disposal system. As such, the proposed project would not alter any conclusions set forth in the EIR as they pertain to septic or alternative wastewater disposal systems and impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

## CONCLUSIONS

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<b>Not previously analyzed</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of the generation of greenhouse gas emissions.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<b>Not previously analyzed</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with the conflict of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with the conflict of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of the conflict of an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

### EXISTING SETTING

GHG emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to significant adverse environmental impacts. While no single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature, the combination of GHG emissions from past, present, and future projects contributes substantially to the phenomenon of global climate change and its associated environmental impacts, and, as such are addressed only as a cumulative impact. In developing thresholds of significance for GHG emissions, the BAAQMD considers the emission levels for which a project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. If a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse GHG emissions impacts.

The General Plan EIR was certified in 2003 and does not evaluate the effects of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission generation. At the time of approval of the EIR, the issue of contribution of GHG emissions to climate change was a prominent issue of concern. On March 18, 2010, amendments to the CEQA Guidelines took effect which set forth requirements for the analysis of GHG emissions under CEQA. Since the General Plan EIR was approved at that time, the determination of whether GHG emissions and climate change needs to be analyzed for the

General Plan Land Use Element Update is governed by the law on supplemental or subsequent EIRs (Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163). GHG emissions and climate change are not required to be analyzed under those standards unless it constitutes “new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time” the General Plan EIR was approved (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)).

The issue of GHG emissions and climate change impacts is not new information that was not known or could not have been known at the time of the approval of the EIR. The issue of climate change and GHG emissions was widely known prior to the EIR approval. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was established in 1992. The regulation of GHG emissions to reduce climate change impacts was extensively debated and analyzed throughout the early 1990s. The studies and analyses of this issue resulted in the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997.

Consistent with the statutory language, the courts have repeatedly held that new information that “was known” or “could have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence” at the time of the EIR certification does not trigger the supplemental EIR standard (*Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego* (2011) 196 Cal.App.4th 515, 532 (“CREED II”); *ALARM*, supra, 12 Cal.App.4th at 1800–1803.) In particular, the courts have held that information on GHG emissions could have been known as early as 1994 and therefore do not trigger the new information standard under Section 21166 for EIRs certified after that date (*CREED II*, supra, 196 Cal.App.4th at 530–532 [Impact from GHGs not new information for EIR certified in 1994.]). Since the EIR was approved in 2003, CREED II is dispositive and establishes that no review of this environmental issue is required for this project (see also *Concerned Dublin Citizens v. City of Dublin* (2013) 214 Cal. App. 4th 1301—the potential effects of GHG emissions were known and could have been addressed in conjunction with the approval of the EIR in 2003.)

Therefore, per the CREED II court decision, although this previous environmental document did not include a GHG analysis, a supplemental environmental analysis of GHG impacts cannot be required absent new information on that front. Information on the effect of GHG emissions on climate was known long before the City approved the EIR. Thus, the effect of GHG emissions on climate could have been raised in 2003 when the City considered the EIR. A challenge to an EIR must be brought within 30 days of the lead agency's notice of approval (Pub. Resources Code, Section 21167(b)). Under Public Resources Code section 21166(c), an agency may not require a supplemental environmental review unless new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was approved, becomes available. After a project has been subjected to environmental review, the statutory presumption flips in favor of the project proponent and against further review (*Moss v. County of Humboldt* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 1041, 1049-1050). “[S]ection 21166 comes into play precisely because in-depth review has already occurred [and] the time for challenging the sufficiency of the original EIR has long since expired. . . .” (*Id.*, 1050). There is no competent evidence of new information of severe impact, and thus the City may rely on an addendum. Accordingly, the City finds that GHG impacts and climate change are not “new information” under Public Resources Code Section 21166.

Therefore, the impact of GHG emissions on climate change was known at the time of adoption of the EIR in 2003 and therefore, under CEQA standards, it is not new information that requires analysis in an addendum. No supplemental environmental analysis of the project's impacts on this issue is required under CEQA. Nonetheless, for purposes of full disclosure, a qualitative discussion of GHG for the proposed project has been provided.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-b) Future development under the General Plan would generate GHG emissions over the short term from construction activities, consisting primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust. There would also be long-term regional emissions associated with new vehicular trips and indirect source emissions, such as electricity usage for lighting.

The City of Antioch's baseline GHG emissions inventory was completed for the year 2005. On June 23, 2009, City Council unanimously approved Resolution 2009/57 adopting GHG reduction targets to reduce overall carbon emissions by 25 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050. The City adopted a Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) on May 24, 2011. The CCAP organizes GHG emissions reductions strategies under three broad areas: Land Use and Transportation; Green Building and Energy; and Education and Behavior Change. The CCAP includes strategies focused on green building, renewable energy, transportation and land use, education, and waste management. The City recently completed its first re-inventory of GHG emissions for 2010 and 2015 (approved by the City Council in September 2016).

Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units and a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units. Overall, square footage of commercial and office uses would be reduced by 14.2 percent and business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent. This reduction in housing units and square footage would result in a corresponding reduction in GHG emissions generated by vehicles and land uses in the City.

Operational GHG emissions are analyzed based on the number of vehicle trips generated by land uses in the City; i.e., the number of residential units; and square footage of commercial, office, business parks, and industrial uses. As described in Traffic and Transportation, average daily vehicle trips would be reduced by 367,411 trips (23.4 percent). Trips during the a.m. peak hour would be reduced by 41,116 trips (23.8 percent), and vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour would be reduced by 39,260 trips (23.8 percent). Therefore, GHG emissions generated by vehicular trips would likewise be reduced. Additionally, the reduction in housing units and square footage would result in reduction in GHG emissions in the City.

Therefore, the project's impacts related to generation of GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and/or conflicting with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, would be less than or similar to impacts that would be anticipated to occur under buildout of the existing General Plan.

### CONCLUSION

The impact of GHG emissions was not analyzed in the EIR. Based on the analysis above, implementation of the proposed project would not result in GHG-related impacts.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR</b>	<b>Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</b>
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.
e) Be located within two miles of a public airport or private use airport and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on airports.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on airports.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of airports.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on private airstrips.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on private airstrips.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of private airstrips.
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on emergency evacuation or response.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on emergency evacuation or response.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of emergency evacuation or response.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
h) Be located in an area designated as having a high, extreme, or severe fire hazard, or otherwise expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on wildland fires.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on wildland fires.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of wildland fires.

## EXISTING SETTING

Like most urban areas, the City of Antioch and its residents are potentially exposed to a number of hazardous materials risks from businesses, industrial facilities and private residences.

Although incidents can happen almost anywhere, certain areas of Antioch are at higher risk for inadvertent release of hazardous materials. Locations near roadways that are frequently used for transporting hazardous materials (e.g., SR-4) and locations near industrial facilities that use, store, or dispose of these materials have an increased potential for a release incident, as do locations along the freight railways.

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control identifies two (2) sites within Antioch where surface and/or sub-surface contamination has occurred due to the release of hazardous materials or wastes. Those sites include the GBF/Pittsburg Dumps, located at the intersection of Somersville Road and James Donlon Boulevard, and the former Hickmott Cannery site at the intersection of 6<sup>th</sup> and "A" Streets.<sup>6</sup>

Antioch also has a long history of agricultural activities that produced hazardous byproducts. These activities include storage and periodic application of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers, as well as the storage and use of toxic fuels and solvents. The infiltration of these substances may leach into local groundwater supplies, presenting an elevated risk of groundwater contamination. In addition, nearly all Antioch residents have some type of hazardous material in their homes. Examples include motor oil, paints, cleaners, aerosols, and pesticides.

<sup>6</sup> City of Antioch General Plan Draft EIR. July 2003.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

The Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD) disposes of hazardous materials within the City of Antioch. The DDSD operates the Delta Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility (DHHWCF). The DHHWCF collects hazardous substances and pollutants such as used oil and filters, anti-freeze, latex and oil-based paints, household batteries, fluorescent and high intensity lamps, cosmetics, pesticides, pool chemicals, and household cleaners for safe disposal at the facility. All hazardous waste must be discharged at a Class I landfill under the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

The nearest airport to the project area is the Funny Farm Airport, a private airport located in Brentwood approximately 5 miles to the southeast of the City border. There are no public airports within 2 miles of the project area.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-b) Future development within the City would potentially involve demolition, grading, construction activities, and material delivery, which could result in the temporary handling and transport of hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, and insulation. Development would also result in excavation and grading activities that could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

However, all future development would be required to comply with applicable California Health and Safety Codes and local City ordinances regulating the handling, storage, and transportation of hazardous and toxic materials, including the City's Grading and Drainage Ordinance and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Additionally, existing and new development is required to adhere to best management practices (BMPs) and comply with applicable policies in the City's General Plan. Specifically, Policy 11.7.2 requires use permits for all operations involving handling of hazardous materials. In addition, all future projects would be subject to BAAQMD regulations, including regulations related to the identification, handling, and disposal of recognized asbestos-containing materials and existing federal, State, and local regulations governing hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts related to creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- c) Schools are located throughout Antioch. Although development could be located within 0.25 miles of a school, all future development would be evaluated for the potential to emit hazardous materials that would affect a school. The project proposes land use changes that would result an overall decrease in development as allowed under the 2003 General Plan. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project related to emission of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- d) The City contains some sites included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. These sites are dispersed throughout the City and development could be proposed on a site that is listed. However, General Plan Policy 11.7.2.o requires source reduction, facilities siting and management, and clean-up of sites. Additionally, development in the City is subject to review to determine if the site is located on the list and if so, the City would be required to oversee investigation and

remediation of hazardous materials on a site. The project proposes a reduced amount of development, which would further reduce the risk of development on a listed site. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and impacts related to such would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- e, f) The project area is approximately 5 miles from the Funny Farm Airport, a private airport. There are no public airports within 2 miles of the project area. As such, the project site not within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip and, therefore, would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site. As such, similar to the EIR, no impacts would occur.
- g) The project would not amend or change the City's Emergency Plan that addresses response to disasters, including, but not limited to, earthquakes, floods, fires, hazardous spills or leaks, major industrial accidents, major transportation accidents, major storms, airplane crashes, environmental response, civil unrest, and national security emergencies.

However, emergency response or emergency evacuation can be hindered by traffic in the City. The project proposes land use changes that would result an overall reduction in vehicular trips and congestion than under the 2003 General Plan. Additionally, General Plan Policy 11.8.2 requires that the City maintain an updated Emergency Response Plan. Therefore, the project would not increase congestion in a manner that would impact the City's Emergency Plan. Therefore, impacts related to emergency plans would be less than or similar to impacts previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- h) The City is adjacent to open space areas that could be subject to wildland fires. New development within rural and hilly terrain areas could expose persons to hazardous conditions associated with wildland fires. Additionally, there is the potential for an increase in the occurrence of fire in these areas due to increasing population and the fact that a majority of wildland fires are caused by human carelessness.

The project would result in a decrease in development citywide, including in areas adjacent to open space, such as the Roddy Ranch Focus Area or in areas that were proposed for development and have now become permanent open space. This decrease in development would reduce the risk of wildland fires. Additionally, General Plan Policy 8.10.2, Fire Protection Policies, requires the City to provide the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) with information pertaining to development proposals and projected levels of growth within the City in order to allow the CCCFPD to maintain appropriate long-term master plans and refine the delivery of service and facilities to maintain performance standards. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project related to exposure of people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

## CONCLUSIONS

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

---

supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on groundwater.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on groundwater.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of groundwater.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on erosion.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on erosion.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of erosion.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on flooding.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on flooding.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of flooding.
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on runoff.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on runoff.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of runoff.
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on water quality.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on water quality.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of water quality.
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on 100-year flood hazard areas.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on 100-year flood hazard areas.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of 100-year flood hazard areas.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on 100-year flood hazard areas.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on 100-year flood hazard areas.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of 100-year flood hazard areas.
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on dam or levee failure.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on dam or levee failure.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of dam or levee failure inundation zone.
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

## EXISTING SETTING

The principal waterways within the City of Antioch include the San Joaquin River, East Antioch Creek, West Antioch Creek, Markley Creek, Sand Creek, Marsh Creek, and Deer Creek. Parts of the City's naturally occurring floodplains are paved, and stretches of creek channels have been covered by culverts. Most flooding within the City of Antioch is caused by heavy rainfall, high tides from the San Joaquin River, and subsequent runoff volumes that cannot be adequately conveyed by the existing storm drainage system and surface water.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps, panel numbers 06013C0335F and 06013C0330F, the City is primarily located within Zone X. Parts of the City are located within a 100-year flood zone. These areas include the City's waterfront bordering the San Joaquin River, western area of the City encompassing Somersville Road,

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

Buchanan Road, and Putnam Street, the areas bounded by 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to the north, near SR 4 to the South, A Street to the east, and L Street to the West.

In addition to naturally occurring creeks, other waterways also occur within the City. The Contra Costa Canal, owned by the Bureau of Reclamation, is a channelized potable water conveyance canal. A spillway, the Los Medanos Wasteway, leads from the Contra Costa Canal near the western edge of the Planning Area and flows north to the San Joaquin River. The East Bay Municipal Utility District Aqueduct is a water transmission facility that runs from the Central Valley to the East Bay region. The lines are located south of SR 4 and are aboveground for roughly 350 feet north of Buchanan Road and west of Somersville Road.

The Antioch Municipal Reservoir is also a key component of the City's water system. The Reservoir provides a means of equalizing demand and ensuring the reliability of the supply from the Contra Costa Canal. It also provides some flood protection in the West Antioch Creek watershed, although it is not situated on the main stem of the Creek.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) Water quality can be affected by both the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff containing urban pollutants generated by residential, commercial, and industrial land use. These pollutants typically include sediment, oil and grease, heavy metals, pesticides, treatment plant discharges, and debris. Additionally, development may involve ground disturbing activities that have the potential to impact water quality if not properly controlled. However, the project would be subject to General Plan Policy 10.6.2, which protects water resources. Additionally, the project proposes a reduction in development, which would reduce the potential for polluted runoff, which could impact water quality standards. Therefore, impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and/or degradation of water quality, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- b) Although the City of Antioch currently does not rely on groundwater for water supplies, development under the project would create impervious surfaces that would reduce the potential for ground water recharge. Policy 10.6.2(c) in the City's General Plan, calls for protection to groundwater recharge areas. Additionally, the project would reduce the amount of development as compared to the 2003 General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts associated with substantial depletion of groundwater supplies, or substantial interference with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- c-d) Development under the project has the potential to alter the existing development pattern and create flooding or erosion. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) regulates stormwater discharges associated with construction activities where clearing, grading, or excavation results in a land disturbance of one or more acres. The City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requires applicants to show proof of coverage under the State's General Construction Permit prior to receipt of any construction permits. Therefore, all future projects disturbing one or more acres of land within the City would be subject to the requirements of the State's General Construction Permit. Furthermore, future development and/or redevelopment projects that create or alter 10,000 or more square feet of impervious area would be required to contain and treat all stormwater runoff per the County C.3 Stormwater Standards, which

have been adopted by the City of Antioch. Future projects would also be subject to applicable General Plan policies and programs related to water quality and waste discharge standards including Policy 8.7.2, which requires drainage within urban areas to be designed to prevent runoff from landscaped areas and impervious surfaces from carrying pesticides, fertilizers, and urban and other contaminants into natural streams and General Plan Policy 10.6.2, which protects water resources.

Overall, the project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and the square footage of commercial, business park, and industrial land uses. This would result in a reduction in development with the potential to alter the existing development pattern and create flooding or erosion. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site, 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 beyond what has been previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be project would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- e-f) The project would result in development, which would create impervious surfaces and could result in polluted runoff. However, future development would be subject to existing NPDES regulations and C.3 Standards, as well as policies and programs in the General Plan related to drainage and surface runoff. C.3 requirements include appropriate site design measures, source controls, and hydraulically-sized stormwater treatment measures to ensure that the rate or amount of runoff associated with the project site would be equal to or less than existing levels. In addition, future projects would be subject to Title 6, Chapter 9, in the City's Municipal Code, which requires projects to provide for appropriate detention and treatment of stormwater runoff. Future projects would also be subject to applicable General Plan policies and programs related to water quality and waste discharge standards including Policy 8.7.2, which requires drainage within urban areas to be designed to prevent runoff from landscaped areas and impervious surfaces from carrying pesticides, fertilizers, and urban and other contaminants into natural streams and General Plan Policy 10.6.2, which protects water resources.

The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site, 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 beyond what has been previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be project would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- g-h) According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps, panel numbers 06013C0335F and 06013C0330F, the City is primarily located within Zone X. Parts of the City are located within a 100-year flood zone. These areas include the City's waterfront bordering the San Joaquin River, western area of the City encompassing Somersville Road, Buchanan Road, and Putnam Street, the areas bounded by 2nd Street to the north, near SR 4 to the South, A Street to the east, and L Street to the West. Development, including residential development, could occur in areas of 100-year flood zones. However, the project would be subject to General Plan Policy 11.4.2 which specifies where and how development can occur relative to flood

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

areas. Additionally, the project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial, business park, and industrial land use designations. Therefore, the project's impacts associated with placing housing in a 100-year flood zone or development in areas where flood flows would be redirected, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- i) The City of Antioch is located below the Contra Loma Reservoir. The Bureau of Reclamation Division of Dam Safety conducted a safety analysis of the Contra Loma Reservoir in 1983 and determined that "safe performance of the dam can be expected under all anticipated loading conditions, including the MCE (maximum credible earthquake) and PMF (probable maximum flood) events." Therefore, the overall safety classification of the dam is registered as satisfactory. The General Plan EIR found that General Plan Policy 11.8.2-f would require regular review and clarification of emergency evacuation plans in the event of dam failure, which would reduce this risk to less than significant. Based on the above, the project's impacts associated with inundation from dam failure, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- j) Tsunamis are defined as sea waves created by undersea fault movement. A seiche is a long-wavelength, large-scale wave action set up in a closed body of water such as a lake or reservoir. The City is located over 50 miles from the Pacific Ocean and d future projects within the City would not be exposed to flooding risks associated with tsunamis. The City is located adjacent to the San Joaquin River; however, the River is not a closed body of water and risk from seiche would be low.

Mudflows typically occur on steep, unstable slopes. According to the General Plan EIR, the hillside topography surrounding the City to the south is generally stable and is not prone to mudflows. General Plan Policy 3.5.9.2-a, requires that all future development would be subject to project specific environmental review in accordance with the local, State and Federal environmental analysis requirements; therefore, environmental review required for new development would address the potential impacts that could result from mudflow hazards within the City of Antioch. Based on the above, the proposed project's impacts associated with inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on division of an established community.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on division of an established community.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of division of an established community.
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

### EXISTING SETTING

The City of Antioch has experienced several decades of growth as a predominantly residential community. With the exception of the northeastern and waterfront portions of the City, residential uses and, particularly, single-family detached residential uses are the most prominent land use in the City. Commercial uses are distributed throughout the City along major thoroughfares and in higher concentrations on Somersville Road near the Somersville Towne

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

Center mall, in Downtown Antioch, and along the Lone Tree Way, 18th Street, and A Street corridors. The northeast corner of the City is dominated by active and inactive industrial lands that reflect the City's industrial roots and the potential for a resurgence of industrial users and accompanying jobs, while balancing existing open space.

### RESIDENTIAL LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

The General Plan includes six residential land use designations to provide a full ranging of housing types in conjunction with residential development within the City's General Plan Focus Areas. These categories include the following:

**Estate Residential.** These land uses are planned as transitions between urban and rural areas characterized by single-family homes with lots 1 acre in size.

**Low Density Residential.** These areas are generally characterized by single-family homes in traditional subdivisions. Density for this category is 4 units per acre.

**Medium-Low Density Residential.** These areas generally include single-family homes in typical subdivision development, as well as other detached housing such as patio homes and duplexes. Six dwelling units per acre are allowed on these sites. Up to 10 Dwelling units per acre are allowed in this category.

**Medium Density Residential.** This designation allows for a wide range of living accommodations, including traditional and small-lot detached single-family homes, mobile homes, townhouses, and garden apartments.

**High Density Residential.** Two-story apartments and condominiums with surface parking typify this density, though structures of greater height with compensating amounts of open space would be possible. Residential development may range up to 20 units of gross acreage.

**Residential Transit Oriented Development (TOD).** This mixed-use classification is intended to create primarily residential neighborhoods within walking distance to retail, offices, local services, and mass transit. Residential densities range from 20 to 40 units per acres, with up to 100 square-feet of commercial spaces per residential until built.

### COMMERCIAL LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

The General Plan land use element includes to commercial land use designations which provides a broad range of retail and commercial services for existing and future residences and businesses.

**Convenience Commercial.** This designation is used to include small-scale retail and service uses on small commercial lots, generally ranging from 1 to 4 acres in size.

**Neighborhood/Community Commercial.** These areas are major commercial nodes of activity designed to serve defined neighborhoods and community areas and include anchor businesses such as supermarkets and drug stores. A neighborhood center would range from about 3 to 12 acres (30,000 to 100,000 square-feet); a community center would range from 10 to 20 acres or more (100,000 to 250,000 square feet).

**Regional Commercial.** These designations are characterized by large-scale retail commercial development and supporting services (such as a mall or integrated shopping center) designed to serve large populations within a 20-mile area. Regional Commercial centers are 30 to 50 acres or more.

#### **Focused Commercial Centers**

Antioch includes a wide range of retail, office, and community areas, including Sommersville Road Commercial, Community Retail District, Town Center Mixed Use, Marina/Support Services, Mixed Use, Mixed Medical Use Facilities, Office Facilities and Business Parks. Detailed descriptions of these are found in the 2003 Adopted General Plan.

#### **Office**

The General Plan land use map and Focus Area policies identify six employment-generating land use designations, which provide a broad range of employment opportunities for existing and future residents. The Office designation is intended to encourage the concentration of office uses near centers of commercial activity within the City, and to discourage isolated office buildings.

#### **Business Park**

The primary purpose of lands designated Business Park on the General Plan land use map is to provide for light industrial, research and development, and office-based firms seeking an attractive and pleasant working environment and a prestigious location.

#### **INDUSTRIAL**

Areas designated for industrial uses include General Industrial (large scale manufacturing and storage or raw materials), Light Industrial (auto parts and auto servicing), and Rail-Served Industrial.

#### **COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC LAND USE DESIGNATION**

The General Plan identifies two designations intended to provide for public and institutional activities, as well as to preserve open space. The Public/Institutional Category is used to designate public land and uses such as police stations, public schools, and libraries. The Open Space Land Use designation includes parks and other open space areas designed to protect natural resources.

#### **FOCUS AREAS**

Ten areas within the Antioch General Plan study area have been identified for focused policy analysis and direction. The purpose of these "Focus Areas" is to provide policy direction specific to each area, including appropriate land use types and development intensity, based upon analysis of the particular opportunities and constraints affecting each area. These Focus Areas include "A" Street Interchange, East Lone Tree Specific Plan, Eastern Employment Areas, Ginochio Property, Rivertown/Urban Waterfront, Roddy Ranch, Hillcrest Station Area, Sand Creek, Somersville Road Corridor, and the Western Gateway.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) The City is developed with existing urban development, including residential, commercial, and industrial development, open space areas, and roadways. The project does not propose any roadways or infrastructure with the potential to divide the City and would therefore not physically divide an established community. Therefore, impacts associated with physically dividing an established community would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- b) The project is an update to the City of Antioch General Plan Land Use Element. Since the General Plan was adopted in 2003, many changes have occurred over time in response to development applications, planning actions by other jurisdictions and agencies, and planning actions by the City. The project would revise goals, policies, and objectives for the Land Use Element, update the Land Use Map to reflect these changes, and revise land use intensities and distribution.

The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of commercial land uses. There would also be reductions in single-family residential units in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront, Somersville Road Corridor, and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units. This reduction would occur in the Estate Residential and Low Density Residential designations and in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. There would be a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units in the High Density Residential designation and the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

The project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in commercial, office, mixed-use, and in all Focus Areas other than the Ginochio Property. In some cases, the project would increase square footage in a land use designation or Focus Area, and in other cases there would be a reduction. Overall, square footage of commercial and office uses would be reduced by 14.2 percent.

For business park and industrial uses, the project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in business park, public institutional, and the Eastern Employment Areas, Ginochio Property, and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. In some cases, the project would increase square footage in a land use designation or Focus Area, and in other cases there would be a reduction. Overall, square footage of business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent.

Additionally, the project would include land use designation revisions, corrections, and updates that would bring the General Plan Land Use Element and map up to date with changes related to City resolutions; the 2015-2023 Housing Element; various Specific Plans; and changes to open space areas, commercial areas, and City-owned properties that have occurred since the 2003 General Plan Update.

Potential environmental impacts and policies/mitigation measures were identified in the General Plan EIR for aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geologic and seismic hazards, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, utilities, and transportation and traffic. Impacts to land use were less than significant.

The project's reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and in square footage of commercial land use designations would further reduce any impacts resulting from the 2003 General Plan. As a result, impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- c) The East Contra Costa County (ECCC) Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) was adopted by Contra Costa County, other member cities, the USFWS, and the CDFW in July 2007. The City of Antioch, however, declined to participate in the HCP/NCCP. Currently, the City is working with ECCC HCP/NCCP staff to assess the feasibility of joining; however, an agreement has not yet been reached. Therefore, the City is not located in an area with an approved HCP/NCCP, or local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan, and was not covered by such a plan at the time the 2003 General Plan EIR was certified. As a result, impacts would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on loss of known mineral resources of statewide importance.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on loss of known mineral resources of statewide importance.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of known mineral resources of statewide importance.
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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on loss of known mineral resources of local importance.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on loss of known mineral resources of local importance.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of known mineral resources of local importance.

### EXISTING SETTING

The California State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology identifies sites with mineral resource potential. The City of Antioch was not identified as having significant mineral resource deposits. There are no mines included on the Office of Mine Reclamation AB 3098 list operating within the City of Antioch. The nearest mine is Black Diamond Mine, which is now a regional park and is outside the City limits.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-b) The EIR concluded that the project area is not designated as a mineral resource by the state, is not used for mineral extraction, and does not contain any known mineral resources that are listed in the City's General Plan. This condition precludes related impacts. Similar to the analysis in the EIR, no impacts would occur.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XII. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional, or national regulations.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional, or national regulations.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of noise levels in excess of standards established by applicable local, regional, or national regulations.
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with groundborne vibration.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with groundborne vibration.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of groundborne vibration.
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on associated with a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR</b>	<b>Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</b>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with aviation noise.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with aviation noise.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of aviation noise.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with aviation noise.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with aviation noise.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of aviation noise.

### EXISTING SETTING

Land uses in the City include noise generated by traffic from residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Other noise sources include routine activities of daily life and equipment noise that are part of the non-transportation noise sources.

The Noise Element of the City's General Plan establishes guidelines regarding noise compatibility issues for a variety of land uses, and describes a range of allowable noise levels. Title 5, Chapter 17, of the City's Municipal Code contains the City's Noise Ordinance, which regulates noise

levels within the city limits. The General Plan Noise Element establishes guidelines regarding noise compatibility of various land uses with a range of environmental noise levels in terms of dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). Title 5, Chapter 17 of the City's Municipal Code contains the Noise Ordinance, which regulates noise levels within City limits.

## **DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

- a-d) The 2003 General Plan EIR provided an assessment of existing and long-term noise impacts associated with traffic/transportation, commercial, light industrial, and other noise generating sources. Noise in the City is generated by traffic from residential, commercial, and industrial uses and routine activities of daily life and equipment noise that are part of the non-transportation noise sources.

Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units and a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units. Overall, square footage of commercial and office uses would be reduced by 14.2 percent and business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent.

As described in Traffic and Transportation, average daily vehicle trips would be reduced by 367,411 trips (23.4 percent). Trips during the a.m. peak hour would be reduced by 41,116 trips (23.8 percent), and vehicle trips during the p.m. peak hour would be reduced by 39,260 trips (23.8 percent). Therefore, the project would result in fewer average daily trips than under the 2003 General Plan buildout, and would generate less noise from transportation uses. Additionally, the reduction in housing units and square footage of commercial, office, business parks, and industrial uses would reduce noise emanating from those land uses.

In accordance with General Plan Policy 11.6.2, any new development proposed under the project would require a noise analysis to assess construction noise exposure and recommend mitigation measures for noise reduction. New development would also comply with General Plan Policy 11.6.2, which requires proposed development adjacent to occupied noise sensitive land uses to implement a construction-related noise mitigation plan. Additionally, new development Policies 11.6.2 d-h, would also mitigate future stationary noise impacts. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to or generation of excessive noise in excess of the City's Noise Ordinance, groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, or a substantial permanent or temporary increases in ambient noise levels, would be likely be less than impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- e-f) As noted previously, the City is not located within the vicinity of a public or private airport and is not covered by an adopted airport land use plan. Therefore, the project's impacts related to such would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

## **CONCLUSION**

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

---

supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with growth inducement.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with growth inducement.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of growth inducement.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with displacement of housing.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with displacement of housing.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of displacement of housing.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with displacement of persons.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with displacement of persons.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of displacement of persons.

## EXISTING SETTING

The City of Antioch is one of 19 cities in Contra Costa County. The Department of Finance (DOF) estimated that Contra Costa County's population in 2014 was 1,087,008. As of January 1, 2016 the City of Antioch had an estimated population of 112,968 and a total of 35,822 households (CA Department of Finance, E-5 Tables). Antioch experienced a significant 45.6 percent population increase between 1990 and 2000, which was more than double the overall growth rate of the County (18.1 percent). Since 2000, the growth rate has slowed substantially to 13.1 percent between 2000 and 2010 and 4 percent between 2010 and 2014.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Sources: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau, 2015, [www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/](http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/); U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 STF 1, 2000 SF 1 and 2010 SF 1; Department of Finance, Report E-5, 2014.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

In 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau reported 32,252 households in Antioch, which marked a 9.9 percent increase from 2000. In Contra Costa County, the total number of households increased 9.1 percent during this time, while the total households in California increased 9.3 percent. The DOF provides data on occupied housing units, which corresponds to total households reported in the U.S. Census. The DOF reported 32,838 housing units in Antioch in 2014, a 1.8 percent increase from 2010. This represents a more rapid pace of increase than the County and the State experienced during this time, which are reported at 1.4 percent and 1.2 percent respectively.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. Under the proposed project, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units in the Estate Residential and Low Density Residential designations and in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. There would be a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units in the High Density Residential designation and the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Western Gateway Focus Areas.

For business park and industrial uses, the project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in business park, public institutional, and the Eastern Employment Areas, Ginochio Property, and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. In some cases, the project would increase square footage in a land use designation or Focus Area, and in other cases there would be a reduction. Overall, square footage of business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent citywide.

The EIR found that under the 2003 General Plan, population increase would exceed ABAG projections with or without the General Plan. The project's land use changes refine the 2003 Land Use Element and would decrease development intensities in the City. As a result, the reduction in housing units would decrease the projected population under the 2003 General Plan. Therefore, impacts to growth from the project would be less than found in the 2003 General Plan EIR, but would still exceed ABAG projections.

- b-c) The project does not propose the demolition or displacement of housing units and would therefore not displace people. Similar to the analysis in the EIR, impacts would be less than significant.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on fire protection.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on fire protection.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of fire protection.
b) Police protection?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on police protection.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on police protection.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of police protection.
c) Schools?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on schools. .	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on schools.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of schools.
d) Parks?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on parks.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on parks.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of parks.
e) Other public facilities?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on other public facilities.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on other public facilities.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of other public facilities.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

### EXISTING SETTING

The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCYPD) provides fire and emergency services to the City of Antioch. The CCCYPD is an “all-hazards” organization providing fire suppression, paramedic emergency medical services (EMS), technical rescue, water rescue, and fire prevention/investigation services to more than 600,000 residents across a 304-square-mile coverage area. The CCCYPD operates 25 fire stations and responds to approximately 45,000 incidents annually. Four of the fire stations are located within the City of Antioch. Police protection services for the City are provided by the Antioch Police Department (APD). The Antioch Police Station is located at 300 L Street.

The Antioch Unified School District serves approximately 19,000 students in the city of Antioch, California and part of the city of Oakley. The District serves 6 high schools, 4 middle schools, and 14 elementary schools.<sup>8</sup>

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-e) The EIR found that the increase in population, commercial, and industrial land uses would increase the demand for fire and police protection, schools, and parks. However, future development within the City would be required to comply with applicable General Plan policies and programs related to public services and facilities, including Policies: 3.5.2.1, 3.5.2.2, 3.5.3.1, 3.5.3.2, 3.5.8.1, 3.5.8.2, 8.8.2, 8.9.2, 8.10.2, 8.11.2, and 10.6.2. These policies would require new development to fund public services proportionate to the increase in population, and therefore, demand created.

The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. The land use changes refine the 2003 Land Use Element and would decrease development intensities in the City. Therefore, population projections under the 2003 General Plan would be reduced and the project would generate less demand for police and fire protection, schools, and parks than under the General Plan and this impact would be less than under the General Plan.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: Antioch Unified School District website. Accessed July 12, 2017 <https://www.antiochschools.net/>

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b>				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on deterioration of existing park lands.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on deterioration of existing park lands.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of deterioration of existing park lands.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on new or expanded park facilities.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of new or expanded park facilities.

## EXISTING SETTING

The City maintains 34 parks, recreation centers, and open space areas including Diablo West Park, Chaparral Park, Dallas Ranch Park, Heidorn Park, and Williamson Ranch Park. These facilities are operated by Antioch Recreation Department and the Parks & Recreation Commission.<sup>9</sup> Over 400 acres of parks and open space areas are located within the City, 200 acres of which are developed. The remaining 200 acres consist of acreage awaiting parkland development or are areas managed exclusively as open space.

## DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a, b) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. Under the proposed project, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units in the Estate Residential and Low Density Residential designations and in the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Somersville Road Corridor Focus Areas. There would be a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units in the High Density Residential designation and the Rivertown/Urban Waterfront and Western

<sup>9</sup> Source: Antioch Recreation Department website. Accessed July 12, 2017.  
<http://www.ci.antioch.ca.us/Recreation/recguide.asp>

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

Gateway Focus Areas. Overall, square footage of business park and industrial uses would be reduced by 37.4 percent citywide.

These land use changes refine the 2003 Land Use Element and would not increase development intensities. Therefore, population projections under the 2003 General Plan would be reduced and the project would generate fewer park users than under the General Plan and this impact would be less than under the General Plan.

The project would update the Land Use Map to show new parks and open space areas (that would no longer be available for proposed development). These changes include designating the Dow properties along the western edge of the waterfront area with appropriate open space designations; designating the existing ball fields along 10<sup>th</sup> Street as open space; designating City-owned parcels along the waterfront in the Rogers Point Area as open space; correctly designating the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge as open space; designating the former Sierra Vista subdivision would be designated as open space to reflect its acquisition by the East Bay Regional Park District; and designating parcels given to the City from the Black Diamond Estates subdivision as open space. However, the project does not propose construction of any park facilities, only the designation of land as open space. Therefore, impacts related to parks and recreation facilities would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a) 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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on measures of effectiveness of transportation.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on measures of effectiveness of transportation.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of measures of effectiveness of transportation.
b) 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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on congestion management program roadways.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on congestion management program roadways.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of congestion management program roadways.
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on air traffic patterns.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on air traffic patterns.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of air traffic patterns.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on hazards due to a design feature.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on hazards due to a design feature.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of hazards due to a design feature.
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on emergency access.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on emergency access.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of emergency access.
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

### EXISTING SETTING

The City of Antioch encompasses approximately 50 square miles, including the area of its jurisdictional boundaries as well as its sphere of influence. The City is situated between the San Francisco Bay Area and Central Valley. State Highway 4, which runs east to west, bisects the City and connects it to Interstate 680 and western Contra Costa County.

The City of Antioch has experienced several decades of growth as a predominately residential community. With the exception of the northeastern and waterfront portions of the City, residential uses and, particularly, single-family detached residential uses are the most prominent

land use in the City. Commercial uses are distributed throughout the City along major thoroughfares and in higher concentrations on Somersville Road near the Somersville Towne Center mall, in Downtown Antioch, and along the Lone Tree Way, 18<sup>th</sup> Street, and A Street corridors. The northeast corner of the City is dominated by active and inactive industrial lands that reflect the City's industrial roots and the potential for a resurgence of industrial users and accompanying jobs, while balancing existing open space.

A key consideration in defining the type, intensity, location, and mix of future land uses is achieving a balance between local employment and housing. The Antioch General Plan seeks to achieve such a balance as a means of addressing issues of traffic congestion, air quality, and energy conservation. The Land Use Element Update seeks to ease congestion and improve regional air quality by providing patterns of land use that support the use of transit. Such "transit oriented" development consists of high density, mixed-use development adjacent to transit nodes. Such transit nodes are proposed within the Downtown Specific Plan Area and within the Hillcrest Station Area Specific Plan.

Seven areas within the Antioch General Plan study area have been identified for focused policy analysis and direction. The purpose of these "Focus Areas" is to provide policy direction specific to each area, including appropriate land use types and development intensity, based upon analysis of the particular opportunities and constraints affecting each area. The Land Use Element Update proposes to reduce residential and non-residential land uses within a few of the Focus Areas in an effort to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. Non-residential land uses include commercial, office, business park and industrial.

#### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a, b) Traffic generated by the project was reviewed to determine if the proposed 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update traffic characteristics would be consistent with the EIR documentation for the currently adopted 2003 General Plan. This evaluation compares the vehicular trips generated from the currently adopted 2003 General Plan to the proposed 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update.

**Table 4-2** provides a comparison between the 2003 General Plan Land Uses and proposed General Plan Land Use Update for the entire Planning Area (City Limits and Unincorporated Area).

**Table 4-2**  
**Antioch General Plan Land Use Element Comparison**

	<b>Single Family Residential (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Multi-Family Residential (Dwelling Units)</b>	<b>Commercial / Office (Square Feet)</b>	<b>Business Park / Industrial (Square Feet)</b>
2003 General Plan	39,834	14,947	38,961,863	53,293,588
2017 General Plan	35,862	11,912	33,417,298	33,337,128
Difference (+/-)	-3,972	-3,035	-5,544,565	-19,956,460
Change (%)	-9.9%	-20.3%	-14.2%	-37.4%



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

As shown in the comparison table, a reduction in both residential and non-residential land uses are proposed as part of the Land Use Element Update. Throughout the City of Antioch, a reduction of 3,972 single family and 3,035 multi-family dwelling units are proposed. Compared to the 2003 General Plan, the overall 2017 General Plan shows a total reduction of 5,544,565 square feet of commercial/office and a total reduction of 19,956,460 square feet of business park/industrial. Refer to Appendix A for a detailed list of land uses and quantities for both the 2003 and 2017 General Plan.

### Trip Generation Consistency

The documentation for the City's 2003 General Plan EIR does not include a detailed breakdown of future land uses. The General Plan combines the commercial and office square footages and combines the business park and industrial square footages. For purposes of this analysis, Michael Baker International has assigned the general office trip rate to the commercial/office portion of the General Plan (2003 & 2017) and assigned the business park trip rate to the business park/industrial portion of the General Plan which provides a conservative analysis.

**Table 4-3** summarized the Institution of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standard trip generation rates for the land uses considered in this analysis.

**Table 4-3**  
**ITE Trip Generation Rates**

Land Use	ITE Code	Trip Rate	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
			Rate	In	Out	Rate	In	Out
Single Family Homes	210	9.52 / DU	0.75 / DU	25% : 75%		1.00 / DU	63% : 37%	
Apartment	220	6.65 / DU	0.51 / DU	20% : 80%		0.62 / DU	65% : 35%	
General Office	710	11.03 / KSF	1.56 / KSF	88% : 12%		1.49 / KSF	17% : 83%	
Business Park	770	12.44 / KSF	1.4 / KSF	85% : 15%		1.26 / KSF	26% : 74%	

Source: 2012 ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9 Edition

The trip generation for the 2003 General Plan Land Use Element is shown in **Table 4-4**. The 2003 General Plan land uses are estimated to generate a total of 1,571,339 daily trips with 172,891 AM peak hour trips and 174,304 PM peak hour trips.

**Table 4-4**  
**2003 General Plan Trip Generation**

Land Use	Intensity		ADT	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
				Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound
Single Family Homes	39,834	DU	379,220	29,876	7,469	22,407	39,834	25,095	14,739
Apartment	14,947	DU	99,398	7,623	1,525	6,098	9,267	6,024	3,243
General Office	38,961.863	KSF	429,749	60,781	53,487	7,294	58,053	9,869	48,184
Business Park	53,293.588	KSF	662,972	74,611	63,419	11,192	67,150	17,459	49,691
2003 General Plan Total Trip Generation			1,571,339	172,891	125,900	46,991	174,304	58,447	115,857

ADT = Average Daily Traffic

DU = Dwelling Unit

KSF = 1,000 Square Feet

Table 4-5 shows the trip generation estimated for the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update. As shown, the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update is estimated to generate 1,203,928 daily trips with 131,775 AM peak hour trips and 135,044 PM peak hour trips.

**Table 4-5**  
**2017 General Plan Trip Generation**

Land Use	Intensity		ADT	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
				Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound
Single Family Homes	35,862	DU	341,406	26,897	6,724	20,172	35,862	22,593	13,269
Apartment	11,912	DU	79,215	6,075	1,215	4,860	7,385	4,801	2,585
General Office	33,417.298	KSF	368,593	52,131	45,875	6,256	49,792	8,465	41,327
Business Park	33,337.128	KSF	414,714	46,672	39,671	7,001	42,005	10,921	31,084
2017 General Plan Total Trip Generation			1,203,928	131,775	93,486	38,289	135,044	46,779	88,265

ADT = Average Daily Traffic

DU = Dwelling Unit KSF 1,000 Square Feet

Table 4-6 provides a trip generation comparison between the 2003 and 2017 General Plan Land Use Element.

**Table 4-6**  
**Trip Generation Comparison**

Comparison	ADT	AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
		Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound
2003 General Plan Total Trip Generation	1,571,339	172,891	125,900	46,991	174,304	58,447	115,857
2017 General Plan Total Trip Generation	1,203,928	131,775	93,486	38,289	135,044	46,779	88,265
<b>Trip Difference (+/-)</b>	<b>-367,411</b>	<b>-41,116</b>	<b>-32,414</b>	<b>-8,702</b>	<b>-39,260</b>	<b>-11,668</b>	<b>-27,592</b>
<b>Trip Reduction (%)</b>	<b>-23.4%</b>	<b>-23.8%</b>	<b>-25.7%</b>	<b>-18.5%</b>	<b>-22.5%</b>	<b>-20.0%</b>	<b>-23.8%</b>

Table 4-6 shows that the overall planned development for the City's 2017 General Plan is generating approximately 367,411 less daily trips, 41,116 less AM peak hour trip and 39,260 less PM peak hour trips compared to the 2003 General Plan. As such, the 2017 General Plan Land Use Element Update would be expected to maintain or reduce traffic-related impacts identified in the City's 2003 General Plan EIR.

- c) The project does not propose any specific building development. The nearest airport to the project area is the Funny Farm Airport, a private airport located in Brentwood approximately 5 miles to the southeast of the City border. There are no public airports

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

- within 2 miles of the project area. Additionally, the project would not increase the demand for air travel as it proposes an overall reduction in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of nonresidential uses in the commercial, office, and mixed-use land uses. Therefore, impacts related to increases in air traffic levels or air traffic patterns from implementation of the project would not be any more severe than those identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- d) The project does not propose any specific development, including roadway design and development. Therefore, the project does not include any physical changes to existing roadways or the introduction of any design features that would be considered hazardous. Any future roadway improvements would be subject to review and approval by the appropriate federal, State, and local agencies. Therefore, impacts related to increases in hazards due to design features and/or incompatible uses would be less than or similar to impacts previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- e) The project does not propose any specific development, including roadway design and development. Therefore, the project would not obstruct or inhibit emergency access due to a project design feature. The project proposes land use changes that would result an overall reduction in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of nonresidential uses in the commercial, office, and mixed-use land uses. This reduction would result in a fewer vehicular trips and congestion than under the 2003 General Plan. Therefore, the project would not increase congestion in a manner that would impact the ability for emergency vehicles to respond in the City. Therefore, impacts related to inadequate emergency access would be less than or similar to impacts previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.
- f) The project does not propose any specific development. The proposed policy and land use changes would not conflict adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Impacts related to increases in hazards due to design features and/or incompatible uses would be less than or similar to impacts previously analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources:</b> Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, features, 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:				
i) A listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(k).	<b>Not previously analyzed</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on historical resources.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on historical resources.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of historical resources.
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 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.	<b>Not previously analyzed</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on tribal resources.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on tribal resources.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of tribal resources.

## EXISTING SETTING

At the time the 2003 General Plan EIR was written, Assembly Bill 52 had not been enacted. AB52 was enacted on July 1, 2015 and requires agencies to consult with Native American tribes for projects (as defined by CEQA) that submit a Notice of Preparation or Intent to Adopt a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration on or after July 1, 2015.

## DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

AB52 consultation was not required at the time of the EIR, therefore, tribal cultural resource identification efforts are not required for this project. As described in V. Cultural Resources b), future projects in the City would be subject to environmental review under CEQA, which would provide for analysis of impacts related to archaeological, as well as human remains.

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

---

In accordance with AB 52 (PRC Section 21084.2) lead agencies are required to consult with Native American tribes that have requested notification of projects that could have an impact to a Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) including a site feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object, of cultural value to the tribe and is listed on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or a local register.

Therefore, the City would be required to initiate consultation with a tribe with traditional and/or cultural affiliations within the City. Should the tribe respond requesting formal consultation, the City would work with the tribe or representative thereof to determine the level of environmental review warranted, identify impacts, and recommend avoidance or mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts. Future projects would adhere to all applicable General Plan policies and programs related to the protection of archaeological resources that could be considered as TCRs, including General Plan Policy 10.7.2, which requires surveys for projects having the potential to impact archaeological resources.

If human remains were discovered in the course of any earthmoving activities resulting from a project, project activities would be subject to State law regarding the discovery and disturbance of human remains including Health and Safety Code Section (b) and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

### **CONCLUSION**

The impact on Tribal Cultural Resources was not analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR and are not required for this project.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on wastewater treatment requirements.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on wastewater treatment requirements.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of wastewater treatment requirements.
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with new water or wastewater treatment facilities.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with new water or wastewater treatment facilities.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.
c) 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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on stormwater drainage facilities.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on stormwater drainage facilities.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of stormwater drainage facilities.
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on water supply.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on water supply.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of water supply.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<b>Environmental Issue Area</b>	<b>Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR</b>	<b>Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?</b>	<b>New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?</b>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on wastewater treatment capacity.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on wastewater treatment capacity.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of wastewater treatment capacity.
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on landfill capacity.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on landfill capacity.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of landfill capacity.
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts on statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts on statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

### EXISTING SETTING

The City of Antioch water service area extends from steep hilly terrain in the south and west portions of the service area to flat with a gentle slope in the northeast portion of the service area. Elevations in the service area range from sea level to over 700 feet. Generally, the service area is limited to elevations less than 560 feet. Four pressure zones are currently required to distribute water, and eventually six to seven pressure zones may be necessary depending on future land development. The principal sources of raw water supply are the Sacramento/San Joaquin Rivers Delta and the Contra Costa Canal. Raw water from the Contra Costa Canal can also be stored in the Antioch Municipal Reservoir. Contra Costa Canal water, purchased from the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), is pumped from Victoria Canal, Rock Slough, and Old River in the western delta.

Republic Services provides solid waste collection, disposal, recycling, and yard waste services to the City. Solid waste and recyclables are taken to the Contra Costa Transfer and Recovery

Station in Martinez prior to transfer to the Keller Canyon Landfill in Pittsburg. The Keller Canyon Landfill site is 1,399 acres, 244 of which comprise the actual current disposal acreage. The landfill is permitted to accept 3,500 tons of waste per day and has a total estimated permitted capacity of approximately 75 million cubic yards, with only approximately 12 million cubic yards (16 percent of total capacity) used to date.<sup>10</sup>

Stormwater collection in the City is overseen by the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Flood Control District). The City has over 110 miles of trunk lines to collect stormwater. These trunk lines are independent from the wastewater collection system and discharge to channels owned and maintained by both the City of Antioch and the Flood Control District.<sup>11</sup>

## DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a, b, d, e) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of commercial land uses. Under the proposed 2017 Land Use Element, there would be a 9.9 percent reduction in the projected number of single-family residential units and a 20.3 percent reduction in the number of multi-family residential units. The project would result in changes to square footages for nonresidential uses in commercial, office, mixed-use, resulting in an overall reduction in square footage of commercial and office uses by 14.2 percent and business park and industrial uses by 37.4 percent.

These reductions in land use development would result in reductions in the demand for wastewater treatment, the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, demand for water supplies from existing entitlements and resources, and/or determination by the DDS that it would not have adequate capacity to serve the City's projected demand. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater treatment and water supply would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

c) The project would result in development, which would create impervious surfaces and runoff that would need to be conveyed by stormwater infrastructure. However, future development would be subject to existing C.3 Standards, as well as policies and programs in the General Plan related to drainage and surface runoff. C.3 requirements include appropriate site design measures, source controls, and hydraulically-sized stormwater treatment measures to ensure that the rate or amount of runoff associated with the project site would be equal to or less than existing levels. In addition, future projects would be subject to Title 6, Chapter 9, in the City's Municipal Code, which requires projects to provide for appropriate detention and treatment of stormwater runoff. General Plan policies and programs related to water quality and waste discharge standards including Policy 8.7.2, which requires drainage within urban areas to be designed to prevent runoff from landscaped areas and impervious surfaces from carrying pesticides, fertilizers, and urban and other contaminants into natural streams and General Plan Policy 10.6.2, which protects water resources.

---

<sup>10</sup> Source: California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). Solid Waste Information System. Available at: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/). Accessed July 12, 2017

<sup>11</sup> Source: Addendum to the Antioch General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report for the City of Antioch Downtown Specific Plan. February 14, 2017



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and commercial land use designations. Therefore, the project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities beyond what was analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Impacts would be project would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- f-g) The project would result in reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and square footage of commercial land uses. Therefore, solid waste demand would be less than or similar to demand previously considered in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Future development within the City would be subject to all applicable federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts related to the landfill capacity and compliance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
<b>XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with degrading the quality of the environment, substantially reducing the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, causing a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threatening to eliminate a plant or animal community, reducing the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminating important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with degrading the quality of the environment, substantially reducing the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, causing a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threatening to eliminate a plant or animal community, reducing the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminating important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of degrading the quality of the environment, substantially reducing the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, causing a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threatening to eliminate a plant or animal community, reducing the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminating important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Issue Area	Same or Reduced Impact as the 2003 General Plan Update EIR	Do the Proposed Changes Involve New or More Severe Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New or More Severe Impacts?	New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with cumulatively considerable impacts.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with cumulatively considerable impacts	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of cumulatively considerable impacts
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No.</b> The proposed project does not involve changes that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	<b>No.</b> There are no new circumstances that would result in new or more severe impacts associated with environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.	<b>No.</b> No new information of substantial importance indicates the need for additional analysis of environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

### DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources section, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on listed species, migratory species, or riparian habitat. The General Plan Land Use Element project would be required to implement the same General Plan policies and mitigation measures as required in the 2003 General Plan EIR. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, construction activities as a result of development under the General Plan Land Use Element Update may encounter undiscovered cultural resources. However, General Plan policies and mitigation measures as required in the 2003 General Plan EIR would be implemented to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. Overall, the project's reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and in square footage of commercial

land use designations would further reduce any impacts resulting from the 2003 General Plan. As a result, 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 rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory would be less than or similar to impacts previously identified in the 2003 General Plan EIR.

- b) Potential environmental impacts and policies/mitigation measures were identified in the General Plan EIR for aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geologic and seismic hazards, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, utilities, and transportation and traffic. Overall, the project's reductions in housing units in single-family residential, multi-family residential, and in square footage of commercial land use designations would further reduce any impacts resulting from the 2003 General Plan. Cumulatively, the proposed project would not result in significant long-term impacts that would substantially combine with impacts of other current or probable future impacts. The proposed project would not create impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- c) The preceding sections of this addendum discuss various types of impacts that could have adverse effects on human beings, including aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geologic and seismic hazards, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, utilities, and transportation and traffic.

Each type of impact with the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings has been evaluated, and this addendum concludes that these potential impacts would not substantially increase with development of the proposed project, and would be consistent with the results concluded in the 2003 General Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on environmental effects.

### CONCLUSION

The project would not result in any new or more severe impacts than analyzed in the 2003 General Plan EIR. There would be no change in the circumstances in which the project would be undertaken that require major revisions of the EIR, or preparation of a new subsequent or supplemental EIR, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

## 5.0 REFERENCES

---

- Antioch, City of. 2017a. Addendum to the Antioch General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report for the City of Antioch Downtown Specific Plan. February 14, 2017
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2017b. Unified School District website. Accessed July 12, 2017 <https://www.antiochschools.net/>
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003a. General Plan Update. LSA Associates, Inc. Adopted November 23, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003b. General Plan Update—Environmental Impact Report Response to Comments. LSA Associates, Inc. October.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003c. Draft General Plan Update—Environmental Impact Report. LSA Associates, Inc. July.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Emergency Response Plan. April 15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Department of Community Development, 1992. Final Housing Element (1990-1995). October 27.
- BAAQMD Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2017. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. May 2017.
- CalRecycle (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery) 2017. Solid Waste Information System. Available at: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/). Accessed July 12, 2017
- DOC (California Department of Conservation) 2014. Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Contra Costa County Important Farmland 2014. Updated January 2017.
- Live Oak Associates, Inc. 2003. Sand Creek Resource Management Plan: Framework for Resource Management Plan for Sand Creek Focus Area. Prepared for Morrison and Foerster. July 11, 2003.
- U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey, 2015. [www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/](http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/)  
U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 STF 1, 2000 SF 1 and 2010 SF 1; Department of Finance, Report E-5, 2014.
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1994. Preliminary Geologic Map Emphasizing Bedrock Formations in Contra Costa County,
- Wagstaff and Associates, 1997. *Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Southeast Area Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation.*

## **5.0 REFERENCES**

---

This page intentionally left blank