



## **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. Project title: Extended Consolidation Area in association with the Remediation of Landfill Sites Along Markley Creek
2. Lead agency name and address:  
City of Antioch  
P.O. Box 5007  
Antioch, CA 94531-5007
3. Contact person and phone number:  
Joseph G. Brandt, Director of Community Development, 925-779-7035
4. Project location: The project site is located at the southeast corner of Somersville Road and James Donlon Boulevard (APN: 076-021-015).
5. Project sponsor's name and address:  
City of Antioch  
P.O. Box 5007  
Antioch, CA 94531-5007
6. General plan designation: Business Park
7. Zoning: Planned Business Park (PBC)
8. Description of project: On July 24, 2007 pursuant to Resolution No. 2007/55, the Antioch City Council adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration ("2007 MND") for the Remediation of Landfill Sites Along Markley Creek Project following a duly noticed public comment period. Option 2 for the Project (Figure 3-4 in the 2007 MND) included the potential to remove approximately 11,000 cubic yards of additional waste on the Somersville Gentry property in the area south of Markley Creek shown as Area D (APN 076-010-034). Pursuant to Figure 3-7 in the 2007 MND, waste from Area D was to be placed in the South Waste Consolidation Area.

However, more waste than anticipated was removed from the Base Project and the area for disposing of the waste in the South Consolidation cell was limited because PG&E did not underground and remove its pole lines from the area as anticipated. Accordingly, the City is contemplating placing some or all of the waste from Area D across James Donlon Boulevard in the waste stockpile area to the south of the South Waste Consolidation Area, which was also part of the Old Antioch Landfill ("Extended Consolidation Site"). (see attached Diagram 1)

The Extended Consolidation Site will accommodate between approximately 11,000 – 20,000 cubic yards of fill and reach a height of 4-8 feet above current grade. A February 29, 2008 Biological Constraints Analysis for the Project site prepared by EDAW (Attachment A) identified two drainage areas which may require 401 permits if disturbed and may fall under the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. These areas will remain undisturbed by the Project as shown on the attached Diagram 1. Additionally, the designated haul access will be located either on James Donlon Road or Somersville Road in an area that will not impact the drainage swale along Somersville Road and the drainage areas shall be staked off during the Project operations in order to avoid disturbance. A subsequent Biological Constraints Analysis for the Project prepared by EDAW dated September 24, 2008

(Attachment C) also identified that the site has limited potential to contain special status species or habitat. Mitigation measures have been created that would lessen any potential impacts to special status species or habitat to a less than significant level.

The Project will continue to observe the applicable control measures identified in the 2007 MND and those control measures are incorporated into this document and project description by reference (see Attachment B).

It has been determined that although it is questionable that the Extended Consolidation Site creates new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant effects in the 2007 MND, in an abundance of caution, this Supplemental 2008 Mitigated Negative Declaration ("Supplemental 2008 MND") has been prepared and will be circulated for public comment.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site encompasses 4.1 acres that are currently vacant. Surrounding land uses are as follows:
  - North:** Location of Markley Creek Remediation Project and former Contra Costa and City of Antioch Sanitary Landfills
  - South:** Vacant
  - East:** Vacant land and single family homes
  - West:** Somersville Road, Markley Creek and a single family subdivision beyond
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) The following public agencies have already been contacted about approving the use of the Extended Consolidation Site: Regional Water Quality Control Board, County Environmental Health Department, Integrated Waste Management Board and the California Department of Fish and Game.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

	Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology / Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources	Noise	Population / Housing
	Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems	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.
- X 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?					<b>X</b>
Discussion: The Project area was formerly used for municipal solid waste disposal. The Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill (CCSL) across the street from the Project site, is the dominant topographic feature in the immediate vicinity. The vegetation on the project site is highly disturbed. There are no vistas in the area and no scenic resources. The proposed Project is a short-term construction project and will not create a new source of light and glare.					
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					<b>X</b>
Discussion: See discussion under 1a above.					
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				<b>X</b>	
Discussion: Placement of fill in the Extended Consolidation Area will result in a less than significant change in landform. The Extended Consolidation Site will accommodate between approximately 11,000 – 20,000 cubic yards of fill and reach a height of 4-8 feet above current grade. Surfaces shall be covered with cover soil and hydroseeded to soften its appearance and allow it to blend in with the larger topographical presence (hills) that exists to the east and south of the Extended Consolidation Site. Thus the visual impact associated with this change in landform is less than significant.					
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					<b>X</b>
Discussion: See discussion under 1a above.					
<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					<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?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: The Project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. However, there are no issues associated with agricultural resources in the Project area because the Project area was formerly used for solid waste disposal and currently has no agricultural value. The Project site is not contracted lands under the California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act). Additionally, the site is designated as Business Park in the City's General Plan, and zoning of this parcel is Planned Business Center.</p>				
<p><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:</p>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			<b>X</b>	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			<b>X</b>	
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>	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			<b>X</b>	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			<b>X</b>	
<p>Discussion: The proposed Project is a short-term construction project and it is anticipated that it can be completed in one construction season. Residential land uses exist within about 270 feet of the western border of the project site. With the construction season from April to October and prevailing wind directions during this time of year from the west, the residential areas to the east would potentially be more vulnerable to air quality and/or odor impacts. The nearest residential property to the east is</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>approximately 83 feet east of the project site.</p> <p>The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has identified a set of feasible PM<sub>10</sub> control measures for construction activities, which have been incorporated into the Project by the City and reflect BAAQMD requirements. These measures are best management practices which address all aspects of a construction project which has substantial soil disturbance and will be incorporated into the Contract Documents for the Project. Because these measures are consistent with BAAQMD requirements, the Project would be consistent with BAAQMD rules, regulations, and relevant planning documents, and would have a less-than-significant air quality impact.</p> <p>Regarding objectionable odors, it is likely that most of the readily degradable organics within the waste material being moved to the Project site have decomposed, resulting in a stable material with minimal, if any, odor-producing potential. Results from the site characterization and field investigations performed for the 2007 MND revealed a variety of waste materials with little to no odor-producing potential, such as plastics, concrete blocks, appliances, glass, pottery, metals, ash, and burnt wood fragments.</p> <p>In addition, Control Measures have been incorporated into the Project to reduce the potential for odor generation. In all waste management cases, the actual excavation area will be minimized as overlying soil and waste material is excavated and transported to the consolidation areas. Potential odor impacts are less than significant.</p>				
<p><b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</b></p>				
<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?</p>		<p><b>X</b></p>		
<p>Discussion: According to the Biological Constraints Analysis prepared by EDAW on February 29, 2008 (Attachment A) and September 24 (Attachment C), the habitat within the Project Site (former portion of the Old Antioch landfill) is expected to support a low diversity of native wildlife species because of its degraded condition and its proximity to urban development. The majority of the area, approximately 90%, has been scraped for prior construction purposes. Vegetation was limited to the two drainages on the northwestern and northeastern sides of the site. The trees and shrubs in these drainages provide habitat for some common wildlife species including western fence lizard (<i>Sceloporus occidentalis</i>), mourning dove (<i>Zenaidura macroura</i>), Anna's hummingbird (<i>Calypte anna</i>), and black phoebe (<i>Sayornis nigricans</i>). Other species observed at the site include western bluebird (<i>Sialia mexicana</i>) and killdeer (<i>Charadrius vociferus</i>). The Project plan, Diagram 1, shows that placement of fill will not impact the drainage areas. In addition, the drainage areas shall be staked off during the Project operations in order to avoid disturbance. Designated haul roads will not impact the drainage areas.</p> <p>Two special-status wildlife species have limited potential to occur on or adjacent to the Project site and could represent constraints to implementation of the proposed Project: the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (<i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>), and the Burrowing Owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>): One large elderberry shrub has been observed on the Project site. The shrub is currently less than 15 feet from the edge of the proposed construction area. This shrub had 5 stems with a diameter greater than one inch and 2 stems with a diameter greater than three inches. There were no exit holes observed on the shrub. This shrub may provide suitable habitat for valley elderberry longhorn beetle. No burrowing owls or burrows have been observed at the extended consolidation site. However, should burrows become</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>available at this location before construction begins, burrowing owls could potentially move onto the property.</p> <p>The following mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project to reduce potential impacts to sensitive or special status species to less-than-significant levels:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Bio 1: Project activities shall be avoided within a 100 foot radius of the elderberry shrub in the northwest drainage on the site. This area shall be staked off during Project operations in order to avoid contact.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Bio 2: Between approximately 2-4 weeks prior to the start of construction a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for any burrowing owls at the site. Any identified active burrowing owl burrows should be protected with a 300-foot buffer from construction activities; this buffer may be reduced by a qualified biologist if the biologist determines that a small buffer area would provide adequate protection. If take of an active burrowing burrow could occur, consultation with CDFG is recommended prior to initiating any construction activity onsite.</p>				
<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>				<b>X</b>
<p>Discussion: 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>			<b>X</b>	
<p>Discussion: According to a February 29, 2008 Biological Constraints Analysis (Attachment A) prepared for the Project site, two drainage areas were identified within the 4-acre parcel. These drainages are located on the northwestern and northeastern sides of the parcel. Both drainages appear to be hydrologically isolated from other waters of the United States because the drainages do not flow off site and terminate in topographically low areas. Both drainages are characterized by culverts at the northern most termini of the features, but lack clear evidence of hydrology (i.e., do not possess scour lines indicative of an ordinary high water mark). A preponderance of hydrophytic vegetation, which is a characteristic of wetlands, was not observed. The drainages are not subject to USACE jurisdiction as waters of the United States because these features appear to collect water from adjacent paved roadways. Additionally, the drainages appear to terminate in topographically low areas that are not connected to other waters of the United States, or areas that support wetland plant species. However, these roadside features may be subject to Section 401 and fall under the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. As part of the Project description these drainage areas will remain undisturbed. The Project plan, Diagram 1, shows that fill will not impact the drainage areas. In addition, the drainage areas shall be staked off during the Project operations in order to avoid disturbance. Designated haul roads will not impact the drainage areas.</p>				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
Discussion: The habitat within the Project Site is expected to support a low diversity of native wildlife species because of its degraded condition and its proximity to urban development. The Project site is not identified as being part of a wildlife corridor nor will it impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
Discussion: Trees located on site are not protected under the City of Antioch's tree preservation ordinance. The Project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
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?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
Discussion: There are no known historical resources on the Project site. The Project entails bringing in fill from an adjacent site. If there are unknown resources underground they will not be disturbed by this Project.				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<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.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	
<p>Discussion: As part of the Control Measures incorporated into the Project, the Contractor will prepare the existing waste consolidation area(s) to accept additional waste and/or final cover. Subgrade preparation will include a delineation of the waste area footprint, and grading and compaction of existing waste to achieve the lines and grades necessary to support the final cell configuration. Sideslopes of the final waste consolidation area configurations will be regraded to 3H:1V or flatter. With the Control Measures in place, Geology and Soils Impacts are less than significant.</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?			<b>X</b>	
<p>Discussion: The Project entails consolidation of waste material from the Markley Creek Site which may contain materials considered hazardous. Control measures have been included in the Project to address this issue. These measures include appropriate training of site workers, medical surveillance and use of respirators as necessary, development of a site-specific Health and Safety Plan which will identify site hazards and required personal protective equipment, covering excavated waste in the waste consolidation cells with 2 feet of compacted soil to prevent direct contact with waste following Project completion, development of protocol of maintaining site security, and compliance with imported soil management plan specifications to assure this soil is protective of public health. Numerous dust abatement Control Measures have also been included in the Project to comply with BAAQMD requirements. These measures will also help address any on-site and off-site exposure to dust from a health and safety standpoint. With these control measures, the potential health and safety and environmental risks associated with the possible presence of hazardous materials will be reduced to less-than-significant levels.</p>				
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>X</b>	
Discussion: See discussion under 7a above.				
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>X</b>
Discussion: The Project site 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?				<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				<b>X</b>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
working in the project area?				
Discussion: The Project site is not located near a public use airport.				
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>X</b>
Discussion: The Project site is not located near private airstrips.				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				<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?				<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?			<b>X</b>	
Discussion: The proposed Project's Control Measures require compliance 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. Once the Project is complete drainage will be directed to the storm drainage system. The waste material placed on the site will be adequately covered as to prevent interface between storm water and waste.				
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>X</b>	

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion: The Project would not affect groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Water supply for Antioch residents is provided by the City from the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta and the Contra Costa Water District. Thus, the impact to groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge is less than significant.				
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>X</b>	
Discussion: The proposed Project would not alter the drainage course of any creeks or tributaries. Although fill will be placed on the site, the existing drainage pattern will not be substantially altered.				
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?			<b>X</b>	
Discussion: See discussion under 8c above. The Project will not cause on or off site 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>X</b>	
Discussion: Stormwater runoff is not expected to substantially increase as a result of the Project. Therefore system capacity is not an issue. The separation of waste from stormwater required by the project will prevent polluted runoff.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			<b>X</b>	
Discussion: The implementation of all Project Control Measures will reduce any potential impact to water quality to less than significant.				
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>X</b>
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).				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				<b>X</b>
Discussion: See 8g above.				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
Discussion: The Project would not 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.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
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?				X
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?				X
Discussion: The Project does not conflict with City of Antioch's General Plan. The site is currently vacant and will remain so at completion of the project.				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
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?				X
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,				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
specific plan or other land use plan?				
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 established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			<b>X</b>	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?			<b>X</b>	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				<b>X</b>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>
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>X</b>
Discussion: The Project site is relatively quiet, with traffic on Somersville Road and James Donlon Boulevard being the only major noise source. The largest existing residential area to the east is about 270 feet from the Project Site. To the east, the closest residential lot is approximately 83 feet from the project site.				
Noise abatement and control is regulated under the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. According to the General Plan, projects shall not cause noise levels within rear yards of single-family residences to exceed a Community Noise Equivalent Level of 60 decibels (dBA). A noise control plan must be approved by the City for construction projects near residential areas. The plan would be incorporated by the City into the grading plan approval process with the Contractor. Implementation of the Control Measures will reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.				

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<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)?				<b>X</b>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				<b>X</b>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				<b>X</b>
Discussion: The Project site is vacant and will remain vacant at the conclusion of the project therefore there will be no impacts to population and housing.				
<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?				<b>X</b>
Police protection?				<b>X</b>
Schools?				<b>X</b>
Parks?				<b>X</b>
Other public facilities?				<b>X</b>
Discussion: The proposed Project entails moving waste material from one site to another. The Project will not impact fire protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. The Project contractor will provide traffic control which will eliminate potential impacts to Police services.				
<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?				<b>X</b>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Discussion: The Project site is currently vacant and will remain so at the conclusion of the project. Access to Black Diamond Mines Regional Park, located to the south of the Project site, will remain open during grading operations. There will be no impact to recreational facilities.				
<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)?			X	
Discussion: The Project incorporates all Transportation/Traffic Control Measures identified in Attachment B. The increase in truck trips associated with this Project (approximately 500-2000 additional truck trips depending on the amount of waste that is excavated) is not considered substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Hauling across any public right of way/street shall be coordinated and limited to avoid commute times and directions. In addition, this Project is temporary and once complete there will be no trips associated with the Project site.				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
Discussion: See discussion under 15a above.				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
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)?				X
Discussion: The proposed Project design will not create a hazard due to a design feature or incompatible use.				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion: The roadways adjacent to the Project site will continue to provide adequate emergency access to the surrounding area and to the Project site if needed during grading operations. Once the project is complete the site will be vacant and it is not anticipated that emergency access will be needed to the site.				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				<b>X</b>
Discussion: Parking is not required.				
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				<b>X</b>
Discussion: The Project will 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?				<b>X</b>
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>X</b>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				<b>X</b>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				<b>X</b>
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?				<b>X</b>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				<b>X</b>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
Discussion: The Project site is currently vacant and will remain so at the conclusion of the project. The Project will have no impact and utilities or utility services.				
<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 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?		X		
Discussion: According to the Biological Assessment prepared for the Project and attached as Attachment C, the site has limited potential to contain special status species or habitat. Mitigation measures have been created that would lessen any potential impacts to special status species or habitat to a less than significant level. 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.				
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)?			X	
Discussion: The Project is an abbreviated grading project, so most issues are short-term in nature and will not have a cumulative impact.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
Discussion: The areas where human beings could be adversely affected relate to dust generation, possible exposure to hazardous materials during grading activities, and safety concerns associated with construction equipment and trucks accessing the site. A variety of Project control measures will reduce potential adverse effects to less-than-significant levels.				