



## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: Bank of Agriculture and Commerce and Auto Spa (PD-06-02, UP-06-14, AR-06-12)
2. Lead agency name and address:  
City of Antioch  
P.O. Box 5007  
Antioch, CA 94531-5007
3. Contact person and phone number:  
Mindy Gentry, Associate Planner, 925-779-7035
4. Project location: The project site is located at the intersection of Lone Tree Way and Country Hills Drive. (APN: 055-071-080).
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Richard Miller, 28 Marsala Way, Napa, CA 94558
6. General plan designation: Business Park                      7. Zoning: Planned Development (PD)
8. Description of project: Richard Miller requests approval of a planned development, use permit, and design review to develop an approximately 3,500 square full service bank and a 5,125 square foot car wash with two shade canopies on approximately 2.3 acres. The applicant also requests approval of a tentative map to create 2 parcels from one existing parcel.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site encompasses 2.32 acres that are currently vacant. The site will be subdivided into two parcels. The site is surrounded by urban development. Surrounding land uses are as follows:  
**North:** Western Career College and offices.  
**South:** A gas station and fast food restaurant.  
**East:** A vacant parcel of land.  
**West:** Single family residences.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) None.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project:

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials   | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |

### **DETERMINATION** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
-

Signature

Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project is not located within a scenic view corridor.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: Lone Tree Way and Country Hills Drive are not designated State scenic highways, and there are no State scenic highways in the vicinity.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed project will not result in the degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, and may enhance the visual character of the area by eliminating a vacant parcel in an urban area and through enhanced landscaping. The site aesthetics will also be updated and reviewed by the Design Review Board.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: This project is required to comply with the Antioch Municipal Code, §9-5.1715, which states that lighting shall not shine directly onto an adjacent street or property. The primary objective of project lighting is to create a safe environment for nighttime movement of vehicles and people, while avoiding glare and adverse impacts to surrounding properties. The project entitlement and building permit process will ensure that the project abides by the Code. The subject site is considered infill development. Additional lighting introduced by the project should not create significant adverse impacts.				
<b>2. 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
Discussion: The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency has not designated the project site as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. This site is not currently used as farmland and is not zoned for agricultural use.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: There is no agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contract governing the proposed site. The proposed project would not result in land use changes in the vicinity of the project site.				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: This site is not designated as Farmland on the Contra Costa County map of Important Farmlands and the site is not in close proximity to agricultural uses which could be potentially impacted by this project.				
<b>3. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The main purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area into compliance with federal and state air quality standards. The City of Antioch falls within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD has adopted the 2005 Ozone Strategy to comply with the federal air standards, the California Clean Air Act, and for continued progress to meet the State one-hour air quality standard for ozone. The plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region to achieve the long term goals of reducing ozone levels by reducing emissions of pollutants that form ozone.  This plan contains mobile source controls, stationary source controls and transportation control measures to be implemented in the region to attain the state and federal ozone standards within the Bay Area Air Basin. The project is consistent with the land use designation identified in the General Plan which is consistent with the 2005 Ozone Strategy. The project does not conflict with any of the growth assumptions made in the preparation of this plan nor obstruct implementation of any of the proposed control measures contained in the plan.				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would occur over the short				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>term in association with construction activities such as grading and vehicle/equipment use. Long-term emissions would result from vehicle trips associated with the commercial aspects of the project. The following discussion describes potential air quality violations that could occur as a result of the project:</p> <p><i>Construction Equipment Exhaust Emissions:</i> Construction period emissions would result from implementation of the proposed project. Construction activities are a source of organic gas emissions. Solvents in adhesives, non-waterbased paints, thinners, some insulating materials and caulking materials would evaporate into the atmosphere and would participate in the photochemical reaction that creates urban ozone. Asphalt used in paving is also a source of organic gases for a short time after its application. During construction various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment would be in use. In 1998, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified particulate matter from diesel fueled engines as a toxic air contaminant (TAC). The CARB has completed a risk management process that identified potential cancer risks for a range of activities using diesel-fueled engines. High volume freeways, stationary diesel engines and facilities attracting heavy and constant diesel vehicle traffic were identified as having the highest associated risk.</p> <p>Health risks from TACs are a function of both concentration and duration of exposure. Unlike the above types of sources, construction diesel emissions are temporary, affecting an area for a period of days or perhaps weeks. Additionally, construction-related sources are mobile and transient in nature, and the emissions occur within the project site. Because of its short duration, health risks from construction emissions of diesel particulate would be less than a significant impact.</p> <p><i>Construction Dust:</i> Construction dust would affect local air quality at various times during construction of the proposed project. The dry, windy climate of the area during the summer months creates a high potential for dust generation when and if underlying soils are exposed. Clearing, grading and earthmoving activities have a high potential to generate dust whenever soil moisture is low and particularly when the wind is blowing.</p> <p>The effects of construction activities would be increased dustfall and locally elevated levels of particulates downwind of construction activity. Construction dust has the potential to create a nuisance at nearby properties. In addition to nuisance effects, excess dustfall can increase maintenance and cleaning requirements and could adversely affect sensitive electronic devices.</p> <p>Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure AIR-1:</u> During the construction period of the proposed project, the construction contractor shall implement the following measures at the project site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) water all active construction sites at least twice daily;</li> <li>2) cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard;</li> <li>3) pave, apply water three times daily, or apply nontoxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access routes, parking areas, staging areas at inactive construction sites, or inactive construction sites;</li> <li>4) enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply nontoxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles and areas void of vegetation (until vegetation is established);</li> <li>5) sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; and</li> <li>6) sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.</li> </ol> <p><i>Long-term Emissions:</i> The BAAQMD has set thresholds of significance for operational period emissions. Below the thresholds, project operation emissions from mobile sources are anticipated to</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

have a less than significant impact; however, projects within 20% of the threshold are required to undergo a more detailed analysis. The BAAQMD threshold of significance for ozone precursors (reactive organic gases [ROG] and nitrogen oxide [NOx]) is 80 pounds per day. Projects generating fewer than 2,000 vehicle trips per day are assumed to contribute emissions below this threshold.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in:

- A walk up and drive through bank
- Car wash

*Local CO Hot Spots:* The primary mobile source pollutant of local concern is carbon monoxide (CO), which is a direct function of vehicle idling time caused by traffic flow conditions. While CO transport is limited, it does disperse over time with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels affecting local sensitive receptors (e.g. residents, school children, the elderly, and hospital patients). Typically high CO concentrations are associated with roadways or intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service or with extremely high traffic volumes. All intersections in the vicinity of the project site would operate at acceptable levels of service with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in the transportation section. The potential impacts related to CO emissions would be less than significant.

*Ozone and Particulate Matter:* The Bay Area is considered a non-attainment area for ground-level ozone under both the Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act. Vehicle emissions such as reactive organic gases (ROGs) and nitrous oxides (NOx) typically develop into ozone in the atmosphere. Under the California Clean Air Act, the Bay Area is also considered to be in non-attainment for PM<sub>10</sub> (also known as respirable particulates) and PM<sub>2.5</sub> (also known as fine particulate matter). According to BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, a project would have a significant environmental effect if it produced 80 pounds or more per day of ROGs, NOx, or particulate matter. Using the URBEMIS2007 model as recommended by the BAAQMD, the table below shows project emissions of these pollutants for vehicles entering and exiting the site.

Scenario	Modeled Daily Emissions in Pounds Per Day (lbs/day)		
	Reactive Organics Gases (ROGs)	Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)	Respirable Pariculates (PM <sub>10</sub> )
Proposed Sources	8	53	15
BAAQMD Thresholds	80	80	80

As shown in the above table, project operational emissions of ROGs, NOx, and particulate matter would each fall well below the significance thresholds; the project would therefore have a less than significant impact relative to production of ozone precursors and particulate matter.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	<b>X</b>	☐
---	---	---	----------	---

Discussion: Please refer to Section III-b. based on project related emission estimates, the proposed project would not result in substantial impacts to the levels of any criteria pollutant.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Greenhouse Gases and Global Warming Impacts: Global warming, the warming of the earth's temperature, is caused by the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Examples of such gases include methane, commonly emitted through agriculture (animal waste) and the out-gassing of landfills; carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) from fossil fuel combustion; ozone; nitrous oxide; and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), typically used in aerosols and coolants. When these gases are released into the atmosphere, they block heat and energy from being radiated back into space, and deflect this energy back to the earth's surface in what is known as the greenhouse effect. Although the greenhouse effect is a naturally occurring process, the release of greenhouse gases through human activities is increasing the amount of heat and energy deflected back to the earth, and therefore increasing the earth's overall temperature to abnormally high levels. This, in turn, is causing sea levels to rise as polar ice caps melt and storm weather patterns are changing across the globe.</p> <p>In California, transportation-related uses are estimated to be responsible for 41% of the State's greenhouse gas emissions. Global warming is a global problem: greenhouse gases are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants, which are of regional and local concern.</p> <p>In 2006, the State of California enacted Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act, requiring the State to lower its global warming emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The act requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to establish regulations and a reporting system to track global warming emissions across the State. AB 32 is anticipated to apply only to major producers of greenhouse gases. Specific regulations under AB 32 have not been finalized, nor have regional or local regulations or thresholds been developed.</p> <p>In response to the Global Warming Solutions Act the Climate Action Team (CAT) was created, consisting of the California Environmental Protection Agency, CARB, Business Transportation and Housing Agency, California Department of Food and Agriculture, State and Consumer Services Agency, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, California Energy Commission, Department of General Services, Department of Water Resources, Integrated Waste Management Board, and the California Public Utilities Commission. In its Proposed Early Actions to Mitigate Climate Change in California 2007 publication, CAT outlines a mitigation system in an effort to effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions to required levels.</p> <p><i>Group 1: Discrete Early Action Measures</i>  These regulations are those that can be put into place by January 2010. These include the Governor's Low Carbon Fuel Standard, reduction of refrigerant losses from motor vehicle air conditioning maintenance, and increased methane capture from landfills.</p> <p><i>Group 2: Additional Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies</i>  This group would include an additional 23 greenhouse gas emission reduction measures, some of which CARB has already incorporated. These proposed mitigation measures span across numerous sectors, including agriculture, commercial, education, electricity, fire suppression, forestry, oil and gas, and transportation, and are anticipated to yield a 20 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMT<sub>CO2E</sub>) reduction by 2020. This group consists of ten measures within the transportation and fuel sectors, that although they do not specifically address greenhouse gases, but rather air pollutants that also contribute to global warming.</p> <p>Preliminary legislative actions in response to AB 32 involve addressing stationary source emitters of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area, and would be the source of the most greenhouse gases emitted by the project. Vehicle travel associated with the project would generate CO<sub>2</sub>, along with nitrous oxide and methane. CO<sub>2</sub> would be the primary greenhouse gas</p>				



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>generated by the project. Other smaller sources of greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project would be energy used on the site that would be generated at fossil-fuel powered energy plants and on-site fuel combustion for heating (e.g. natural gas, etc.)</p> <p>To provide a context, it is useful to consider the State of California as a whole. California is a substantial producer of greenhouse gas emissions. CO<sub>2</sub> accounts for approximately 85% of total emissions, and methane and nitrous oxide account for almost an additional 14%. Each gas contributes to global warming at a different relative rate. Methane has a global warming potential 21 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>, while nitrous oxide is 310 times that of the same amount of CO<sub>2</sub>.</p> <p>According to CAT, total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in California from fossil fuel combustion in 2002 were 360 million tons, accounting for approximately 7 percent of U.S. emissions from this source. According to the California Energy Commission, California is the second largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the U.S. (trailing only Texas) and the 12<sup>th</sup> largest in the world, producing 492 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent emissions in 2004. However, California has relatively low carbon emissions intensity; in 2001, California ranked fourth lowest of the 50 states in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per capita from fossil fuel combustion and fifth lowest of the 50 states in CO<sub>2</sub> emission from fossil fuel combustion per unit of gross state product, largely as a result of the state's energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.</p> <p>There are currently no Federal, State, air district, or City of Antioch thresholds of significance by which the above emissions can be determined to be significant or not. According to an April 2007 "white paper" by the California Association of Environmental Professionals (California AEP), "neither CARB nor any air districts have submitted a comment letter during a Notice of Preparation period recommending that an EIR address GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions." The paper adds that the regulatory community in California is in "a state of flux regarding the potential impacts of global climate change and greenhouse gas emissions." As noted above, while AB 32 has set the state on a course to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, it will be at least 2009 before any quantifiable standards are developed; the first set of standards expected from AB 32 will relate to stationary sources of greenhouse gases, such as power plants. In June of 2008, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research issued a technical advisory which states that CEQA guidelines for climate change will be released no later than July 1, 2009. In the interim, public agencies are encouraged to develop their own significance criteria for determining climate change impacts.</p> <p>Although there are no formal standards related to greenhouse gas emissions and global warming at the Federal, State, regional, or local level, the absence of rules does not restrict the City of Antioch as lead agency from evaluating the project's potential environmental effects, including greenhouse gas emissions and global warming. The brief qualitative analysis included in this document is provided to assist the general public and City of Antioch decision makers in understanding the project's potential to produce greenhouse gas emissions, which may in turn have the potential to result in global climate change.</p>				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The operation of the proposed land use will not generate substantial pollutant concentrations. The BAAQMD defines sensitive receptors as schools, hospitals, or convalescent homes where there are children, elderly people, and the infirm, which are more susceptible to respiratory distress and other air quality related problems than the general public. In addition, residential areas and recreation areas are also considered sensitive, due to the duration of exposure in residential areas and the physical exertion in recreation areas. There are no schools, hospitals, convalescent homes, or recreation areas in the surrounding area. Furthermore, temporary significant air quality impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level.</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Residential areas are adjacent to the subject site; however with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 would reduce construction period impacts to sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Long term air pollution associated with the proposed project would be primarily vehicle related, and would not necessarily be concentrated in the vicinity of the project site. Based on the minimal amount of traffic the project would generate, long term emissions would be less than significant. Therefore implementation of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: During construction, various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on the site would create odors. These odors will be temporary, and are not likely to be noticeable beyond the project boundaries. The land use itself will not create objectionable odors, nor is the project located such that visitors would be exposed to a source of objectionable odors.</p>				
<p><b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b></p>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The burrowing owl is a California species of special concern. It is unlikely the site is used by the aforementioned species for nesting or foraging due to the high impact of human disturbance and marginal habitat quality. The vacant project site has been previously subject to disking. The site is also surrounded by urban development. The site is not known to contain or provide habitat for candidate, sensitive, or special status species.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure BIO-1:</u> A pre-construction survey is to be conducted to assess the use of the site by any raptors or migratory birds. If evidence the site is used by a species of concern, the applicant will implement one, or all, or a combination of the following mitigation measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passive relocation of the burrowing owls prior to the nesting season (September 1 through January 31)</li> <li>• For grading and construction activities within the burrowing owl nesting season (February 1 through August 31) a 75-meter (250-foot) radius circular buffer shall be erected around each active burrow and a qualified biologist shall monitor construction activities to ensure effectiveness of the buffer area for breeding activities. Construction-related activity shall not occur within the exclusion zone until the burrows are confirmed to be unoccupied and/or juveniles from the nest are foraging independently and capable of independent survival.</li> <li>• Retain tall grass cover on the site to discourage burrowing owl use of the site</li> <li>• If nests are found, an adequate setback shall be established around the nest location and construction activities are restricted within this no-disturbance zone until the qualified biologist has confirmed that the young birds have fledged and are able to function outside the nest location. Required setback distances for the no-disturbance zone shall be based on input received from the CDFG and/or USFWS and may vary depending on species and sensitivity to</li> </ul>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>disturbance. The no-disturbance zone shall be fenced with temporary orange construction fencing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A report of findings shall be prepared by the qualified biologist and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the initiation of grading and construction during the nest season. The report shall either confirm the absence of any active nests or shall confirm that any young are within a designated no-disturbance zone and construction can proceed.</li> </ul>				
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: The project will not have an adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. The site is not identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service as containing riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.</p>				
<p>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: There are no federally protected wetlands or other jurisdictional waters on the subject property.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Refer to section 4.a above.</p>				
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: The site does not contain any trees, therefore would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</p>				
<p>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
conservation plan?				
Discussion: There are no adopted conservation plans applicable to the project site.				
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: No historical resources are known to exist at the project site or in the immediate vicinity. There is the possibility that unidentified historical resources could be discovered during grading or excavation for the new development. If this were to occur, implementation of the following mitigation would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure CULT -1:</u> Should an archaeological deposit be encountered during project construction or demolition activities, the construction contractor shall halt ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find and notify the City. Construction activities shall be redirected and a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the City shall: (1) evaluate the archaeological deposit to determine if it meets the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological deposit or unique archaeological resource; and (2) make recommendations about the treatment of the deposit, as warranted. If the deposit does not meet the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource, then no further study or protection of the deposit is necessary. If the deposit does meet the CEQA definition of a historical or unique archaeological resource, then it shall be avoided to the extent feasible by project construction activities. If avoidance is not feasible, then adverse effects to the deposit shall be mitigated as specified in <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> section 15126.4(b) (for historical resources) or CEQA section 21083.2 (for unique archaeological resources). This mitigation may include, but is not limited to, a thorough recording of the resource on DPR Form 253 records, or archaeological data recovery excavation. If data recovery excavation is warranted, <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), which requires a data recovery plan prior to data recovery excavation shall be followed. If the significant identified resources are unique archaeological resources, mitigation of these resources shall be subject to the limitations on mitigation measures for unique archaeological resources identified in CEQA sections 21083.2(c) through 21083(f).</p>				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: No archaeological resources are known to exist at the project site or in the immediate vicinity. Although it is unlikely that archaeological resources would be encountered during the project construction period, impacts to such resources, if present and subject to disturbance, could be considered significant. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:</p> <p>Compliance with Mitigation Measure CULT-1 will fully mitigate the impact.</p>				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: No paleontological or unique geologic features are known to exist in the immediate vicinity of the site.				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: There are no known interment sites in the project vicinity or site.				
<b>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The site is not situated within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, which is a zone identified by the State with active fault traces. The nearest active fault is the Greenville Fault located 6.4 miles southwest of the site. Given that there is no known active or potentially active faults that cross or project toward the site, the potential for fault related surface rupture at the site is very low (KC Engineering Company, March 2006). Therefore the potential for impacts associated with fault rupture at the project site are less-than-significant.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Ground shaking presents the most widespread hazard to structures. Ground shaking intensity is highly variable from one site to another and is dependant on the distance of an area from the epicenter of an earthquake and the underlying substrate (soil and rock structure). Also, the effect of ground shaking on structures is related to the form, structural design, materials, construction quality, and location. Specifically, the site is located in an area with moderate seismic activity and could be subject to considerable ground shaking from an earthquake of moderate to high magnitude generated within the San Francisco Bay Area.  <u>Mitigation Measure GEO -1:</u> The project design and construction shall meet or exceed The California Building Code (CBC) standard structural design requirements so as to ensure that buildings will not collapse. New commercial development will be required to conform to the requirements of the CBC, which would largely prevent structural damage to buildings caused by ground shaking. The design of improvements would have to comply with the seismic design requirements of the City of Antioch and would be in accordance with the standard practices of the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California. Furthermore, the project design shall follow the recommendations the geotechnical investigation which was prepared by KC Engineering Company in March of 2006.				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: A common secondary hazard of strong ground shaking is liquefaction, which is the phenomenon in which saturated soil loses shear strength and deforms as a result of increased pore water pressure. The soils beneath the site are cohesive in nature with a very stiff to hard consistency. The soils primarily consist of clay with variable amounts of sand. Granular soil materials were not				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>encountered beneath the site within 25.5 feet of the ground surface. The geotechnical study conducted by KC Engineering Company in March of 2006 concludes that the potential for a liquefaction hazard at the site is very low. Measures to reduce the effects of liquefaction hazards required for construction will be incorporated into plans prior to issuance of building permits.</p>				
<p>The implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1 will fully mitigate to a level of less-than-significant.</p>				
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The site and surrounding areas have an insignificant topographic relief.</p> <p>The design of retaining walls shall incorporate the appropriate safety factors for the local and global stability of the retaining walls such as methods to dispose of excess water away. The implementation of the mitigation measure GEO-1 will fully mitigate the impact to a less-than-significant level.</p>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Grading and site preparation activities could expose soils and increase the potential for erosion during construction. A program of erosion control measures will be implemented through the City's grading permit conditions and through the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan required by state law. In addition, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure GEO-2</u>: Implement Mitigation Measure AIR-1.</p>				
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: As stated earlier the geographical location of the site and the composition of the soil on site, which consists primarily of very stiff to hard clay, is not a high risk for liquefaction, subsidence, or lateral spreading. The risk of soil instability at the project site and the topographic relief are nominal. Furthermore there are no known faults present onsite.</p>				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Following the requirements of the Uniform Building Code would largely mitigate structural damage to buildings caused by expansive soils. The design of the foundation would have to match the recommendation in the geotechnical report in order to minimize damage from the expansive soils; in turn minimizing the risk to life and property.</p>				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: The site is served by the public sewer.</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project will consist of a walk up and drive through bank and a car wash. Although small quantities of commercially available hazardous materials could be used during project construction activities (e.g. oil, paint), these materials would not be used in significant quantities to pose a threat to human or environmental health. Operation of the proposed project would not increase the use of hazardous materials within and around the project site. Therefore implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment though the routine 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase the risk of an accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. As noted in the previous response (7.a), the scale and type of hazardous materials to be used during construction would be commonplace and of relatively low risk.				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project is not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The subject site is not located near a public use airport.				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The subject site is not located near private airstrips.				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed project would not impair or interfere with emergency response plans.				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: There is no potential for wildland fire on this site.				
<b>8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project will comply with the non-point discharge requirements under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program through preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which addresses both construction and operation activities. In addition, the project will comply with provision C.3 of the NPDES and through this provision the project will implement a Storm Water Control Plan. The Storm Water Control Plan addresses runoff from impervious surfaces by filtering water through infiltration planters, vegetated swales, and media filtration units.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure HYD-1:</u> Preparation of a SWPPP to reduce the potential impacts to surface water quality through the project construction period. The SWPPP shall include specific and detailed BMPs designed to mitigate construction-related pollutants. At minimum, BMPs shall include practices to minimize the contact of construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies (e.g. fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, adhesives) with storm water.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure HYD-2:</u> The applicant shall submit a Storm Water Control Plan compliant with the C.3 provision of the NPDES with review and approval by the City of Antioch. The City shall review and approve the design-level stormwater control plan prior to approval of the grading plan. The plan shall treat runoff to the maximum extent practicable in compliance with the County NPDES permit.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure HYD-3:</u> The car wash will require an oil water separator to maintain water quality.</p> <p>Project waste water would be conveyed to the Delta Diablo Wastewater Treatment Facility. The</p>				



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
treatment plant is currently meeting all State and Federal wastewater 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed project would not substantially deplete or interfere with groundwater supplies. The new development would not draw water supplies from groundwater supplies. The project will comply with all applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board standards.				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would not alter the drainage course of any creeks or tributaries. It is possible that the project could cause hydromodification to downstream creeks in the area by increasing the rate and volume of runoff. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that potential impacts associated with hydromodification are reduced to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure HYD-4:</u> Per the C.3 guidelines and as a condition of approval the final grading and drainage plans for the project, the applicant shall demonstrate through detailed hydraulic analysis that implementation of the proposed drainage plans will not create potential hydromodification impacts downstream by implementing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project applicant's licensed professional engineer shall work cooperatively with the City of Antioch to incorporate BMPs into the final drainage plan that will result in post-project runoff curve (i.e. storm water flow/duration graphs) that closely resembles the pre-project curve;</li> <li>• Include drainage components that are designed in compliance with the City of Antioch standards. The grading and drainage plans shall be reviewed for compliance with these requirements by the City of Antioch; and</li> <li>• The project applicant shall establish a self-perpetuating drainage system maintenance program (to be managed by an entity set up by the applicant) that includes annual inspections of detention basins, sedimentation basins, drainage ditches, swales, and drainage inlets. Any accumulation of sediment or other debris shall be promptly removed and necessary maintenance to insure continued operation shall be performed.</li> </ul>				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface area at the site. Proposed site improvements will be required to properly contain and discharge all storm water per the requirements of the City of Antioch and the Contra Costa County Flood Control District. The project will also comply with provision C.3 of the NPDES and through this provision the project has implemented a Storm Water Control Plan. The Storm Water Control Plan addresses runoff from impervious surfaces by filtering the water through infiltration planters, vegetated swales, and media filtration units.</p> <p>Compliance with C.3 of the NPDES and the implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-2 will mitigate the impact to a level of less-than-significant.</p>				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Stormwater runoff generated by construction would be discharged into existing flood control channels. There could be potential surface water pollution during construction and after project completion. The introduction of vehicles to the site could introduce urban pollutants. Runoff from the project is directed to concrete diversion swales and through C.3 mechanisms to minimize any water quality impacts.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-2 will mitigate to a less-than-significant level.</p>				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1, HYD-2 and HYD-3 will be adequate mitigations to avoid a substantial degradation of water quality.</p>				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: No housing is proposed. The proposed project is not located within a 100-year flood zone as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).</p>				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: See 8.g above.</p>				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: See 8.g above.</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: There is no significant risk of a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow event at the project site.				
<b>9. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: No, the project will not divide 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project does not conflict with existing plans or ordinances. The project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations for the site.				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project site does not fall under habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans.				
<b>10. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: There are no known mineral resources located at the project site.				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: There are no known mineral resources located at the project site.				
<b>11. NOISE – Would the project result in:</b>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
<p>Discussion: The City of Antioch General Plan maximum noise standard for the front setback of commercial use is 70 decibels (dBA) and 60 decibels within rear yards for single family residential on the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) scale. Noise would be generated during the construction phase (e.g. heavy equipment operating in and around the project site).</p> <p>Once the proposed project is operational, it is not expected that noise will be generated in excess of 60 dBA on the CNEL.</p> <p>Potential Construction Period Impacts:  Typical construction noise levels vary up to a maximum of 90 dBA at 50 feet from the construction site during the noisiest phases of construction. Therefore, it is likely that commercial uses surrounding the project site could be exposed to noise levels in excess of 70 dBA CNEL for short periods of time during the construction period. Construction activities would occur during normal working hours. Implementation of the following mitigation measure, which is standard construction noise reduction measure, would reduce construction period noise impacts to a less-than-significant level:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure NOISE -1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit all construction-related activities that would generate noise levels in excess of 60 dBA CNEL at the nearest single family residential rear yard to between the hours of 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday and on the weekend from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays and public holidays.</li> <li>• Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with the manufacturer's standards. Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.</li> <li>• Locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all phases of construction.</li> </ul> <p>Potential Project Generated Noise Impact:  The project will be utilizing a 4 blower system with four motors to dry the vehicles as they leave the car wash tunnel. There are two blowers overhead with one on the right and one on the left. The blowers will be located entirely in the tunnel on the east end. The blower will terminate approximately 10 feet from the opening of the tunnel. A noise analysis was conducted on the system with noise readings from 5 and 20 feet away from the blowers. The A-Weighted measurement results for 5 feet away from the blower was 82.5 dBA and 20 feet from the blower was 79.4 dBA. The CNEL is based the average sound level occurring over a 24-hour period, with a weighting factor of 5.0 dBA adjustment for events occurring between 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM and 10 dBA adjustment for events occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM. The hours of operation for the car wash are from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. The adjacent residential homes are in the opposite direction of the blowers which is approximately 400' from the property line. It is not anticipated that the blowers will impact the adjacent residential units by exceeding the General Plan level of 60 dBA CNEL within the rear yard since sound falls off quickly and the noise from the blowers was not based on an average noise level over a given period of time.</p>				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project would not introduce a new permanent source of ground borne				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
vibration or ground borne noise levels. Construction activities associated with the proposed project could temporarily expose persons in the vicinity of the project site to ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. The implementation of NOISE-1 mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Refer to Section 11.a and 11.b above.				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Refer to section 11.a and 11.b above.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a private airstrip.				
<b>12. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project is a commercial development that will not induce substantial population growth.				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The project is proposed on a vacant site which is zoned Planned Development, with a				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
General Plan designation of Business Park.				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: Refer to section 12.b above.				
<b>13. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed project would not result in a significant increased demand for fire or police protection. The proposed project would not require additional schools or cause an increase in demand for public parks. The proposed project would not require additional public facilities.				
<b>14. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed project will not increase use of parks or other recreational facilities.				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: This project does not include or require the construction of recreational facilities.				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: A traffic impact study was performed by Abrams Associates (Appendix 'A') in October 2008 for this project. The analysis indicates that the project will generate 58 AM peak hour trips and 195 PM peak hour trips. The intersections that were studied were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lone Tree Way and James Donlon Boulevard,</li> <li>• Lone Tree Way and Dallas Ranch Road/Eagleridge Drive,</li> <li>• Lone Tree Way and Country Hills Drive/Mokelumne Drive,</li> <li>• Lone Tree Way and Deer Valley Road, and</li> <li>• Lone Tree Way and Hillcrest Avenue</li> </ul> <p>All of the aforementioned intersections studied will operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) of D or better except for the intersections of Lone Tree Way and Deer Valley Road and Lone Tree Way and Hillcrest Avenue, which will operate at a LOS E in the cumulative with and without the project. This is expected to occur even without the project being built. The proposed project would not be considered to have a significant impact on these conditions since the project would only increase the volume to capacity ratio, which is the ratio LOS is based on, by less than 0.01 and would increase the cumulative traffic volumes by less than one percent. Furthermore, with cumulative (2030) traffic conditions, the re-stripe of the existing right turn lanes on Lone Tree Way to shared through-right lanes, which is to occur within the next year, will improve LOS to acceptable levels.</p> <p>A queue length study was also conducted for the project for both near-term plus project and cumulative plus project conditions. The queues at the three of the project study intersections on Lone Tree Way would exceed the length of the existing turn pockets but only the adjacent intersection at Country Hills Drive would experience increased queues as a result of the project. The left turn pocket will need to be lengthened by 150 feet with the appropriate deceleration in order to accommodate the future traffic conditions.</p> <p><u>TRAN-1:</u> The eastbound left turn lane at the intersection of Lone Tree Way and Country Hills Drive shall be lengthened by approximately 150 feet and shall include space for adequate deceleration.</p>				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: Several planned and programmed regional roadway and transit improvements are identified in Contra Costa Transportation Authority's "The 2004 Update: Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan". Many of these improvements are designed to accommodate future growth. The proposal would not restrict future transit improvements or exceed County standards.</p>				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
Discussion: The project will not impact air traffic patterns.				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed project design will not create a hazard due to a design feature or incompatible use.				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: No, the proposed project provides adequate emergency access.				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion:				
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
Discussion: Development of the proposed project would not affect alternative transportation programs.				
<b>16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project requires connection to the existing City owned and operated water and wastewater treatment system. However, the project will not necessitate the creation of new or the expansion of existing facilities in order to provide service to the project.				
c) Require or result in the construction of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
Discussion: The storm water drainage system for the project will be connected into the existing municipal storm drain system. However, the project will not necessitate the creation of new or the expansion of existing facilities in order to provide service to the project.				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The City's 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) includes land which may be developed throughout the period of the General Plan. The UWMP states the City will have an adequate water supply during normal years, single dry years, and multiple dry years through 2025 with existing entitlements. Therefore, the proposed project would be served by existing entitlements and no new or expanded entitlements would be needed.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The local treatment plant has sufficient capacity to accommodate flows of wastewater generated by the proposed project. The project will not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Solid waste disposal capacity would not pose a constraint to the solid waste disposal needs of the project. Solid waste collection and disposal in the Antioch areas is provided by Pleasant Hill Bayshore Disposal, which would have no difficulty serving the project.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project would be required to comply with solid waste regulations. See section 16.f above.				
<b>17. 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>				
<p>Discussion: The proposed project is a walk in and drive through bank and a car wash that would not result in significant impacts with regional or State-wide environmental implications. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures will ensure that the project does not: degrade environmental quality; adversely affect plant and animal communities, or associated natural communities; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.</p>				
<p>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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The proposed use of the site is consistent with the City's planning policies and land use projections. These land uses have already been considered as part of the overall growth in the City (including consideration of increases in traffic, noise, changes to air quality, stormwater, etc.) as part of the EIR prepared for the General Plan. Therefore the project would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts that were not identified in the General Plan EIR.</p>				
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Discussion: The implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this initial study would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level and the project would not result in impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</p>				