

### III. EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

In the course of its initial scoping for this EIR, the City staff determined that a number of checklist items contained in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines either were not applicable to the project or were items under which the project would clearly result in no impact or a less-than-significant impact. These items are listed below, along with a brief discussion supporting a determination of a less-than-significant impact in each case.

#### 1. Aesthetics

*Would the project:*

*(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Less-than-Significant Impact: The project site is located in the low-lying Lone Tree Valley, which is almost fully developed with urban uses. The project site is visible for distances of up to ½ mile from the ridgelines to the northwest and south. However, the quality of the foreground views from these ridgelines has already been diminished by substantial suburban development. The additional development of a relatively small 3.7-acre parcel on the valley floor would not significantly alter the relatively low-quality vistas from nearby ridgelines, and would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

*(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

Less-than-Significant Impact: There are no designated scenic highways or routes in the project vicinity. The views along Lone Tree Way and Hillcrest Avenue in the project vicinity have relatively low visual quality, and the site does not contain rock outcroppings or significant trees. The project site is located approximately 1,000 feet northwest of the Williamson Ranch complex, a recorded historic site located on the south side of Lone Tree Way east of Indian Hill Drive. Due to the urban development of the lands adjacent to the ranch, and the construction of Lone Tree Way as four-lane arterial along the front of the ranch complex, the integrity of the original context of the ranch complex has not been retained. The proposed project would have no direct impact on the Williamson Ranch complex and would have no further impact on the visual quality of the ranch context.

#### 2. Agricultural Resources

*Would the project:*

*(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact: The expansion site is not designated as “Farmland” on the Contra Costa County map of Important Farmlands as compiled by the USDA and the California Department of

Conservation. The native soils of the 3.7-acre expansion site consists of Pescadero clay loam which is Classified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as Class IV farmland (with a Storie Index rating of 35), which indicates that it is not prime farmland. The site was historically used for cattle grazing but has not been in agricultural use for many years. The project would not result in a significant impact in terms of conversion of prime agricultural land to urban uses.

*(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact: Neither the project site nor other lands in the site vicinity are currently zoned for agricultural use or subject to a Williamson Act Land Conservation contract. As such, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

*(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?*

No Impact: There are no remaining agricultural operations in the site vicinity. All adjacent and nearby lands have either been developed, or are in public use. As such, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to urban use.

### 3. Biological Resources

*Would the project:*

*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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact: As discussed in Section II. C. *Biological Resources*, the entire expansion site is covered with non-native grasses and weedy vegetation. This habitat is characterized as “ruderal” which has no special-status or protection. There is no riparian habitat, wetlands, or other sensitive natural communities within the project site.

*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?*

No Impact: Since there are no federal- or state-protected wetlands on the project site, it is highly unlikely that the project would adversely affect wetland habitat. The adjacent channel of East Antioch Creek contains wetlands, but the expansion site itself consists entirely of upland habitat. The project is not expected to affect the adjacent wetland habitat given the erosion, sedimentation, and water quality controls which will be implemented during and after project construction.

*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?*

No Impact: As discussed in Section II. C. *Biological Resources*, the adjacent channel of East Antioch Creek would constitute a minor movement corridor but it would not be considered a significant movement corridor for any locally occurring wildlife. Since the project site is otherwise surrounded by urban development, the site is not expected to function as a major movement corridor between areas of natural habitat for most native species. Certain bird species may use this habitat for foraging during fall or spring migration, but aside from this, movements of native wildlife on the site would mainly be confined to those of resident animals moving within the site itself. The proposed project would not substantially interfere with wildlife movements.

*e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No Impact: There are no mature trees on or adjacent to the project site which would be removed or adversely affected by the project. The expansion site is occupied almost entirely by herbaceous species with a few small trees and shrubs present along the margins.

*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?*

No Impact: The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCP/HCP), which was implemented in early 2008, does not include the City of Antioch. The City of Antioch does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan, and there is no other known adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan affecting the site.

#### 4. Geology and Soils

*Would the project:*

*a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

*i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?*

No Impact: The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the site is not otherwise known to be underlain by an active or inactive earthquake fault. Therefore, the possibility of ground surface rupture at the site is remote. The nearest active faults are the Greenville fault located 9 miles to the southwest, and the Concord-Green Valley fault located 14 miles west of the site. Two other significant seismic sources include the Calaveras and Hayward faults located 18 and 27 miles to the west of the site, respectively.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

No Impact: Given the stiff soil materials underlying the site and depth to the groundwater table (30 to 40 feet below ground surface), the potential for soil liquefaction in response to seismic shaking is considered low.

iv) *Landslides*

No Impact: There are no known landslides on the site or the vicinity. Flat terrain of the site makes landslides unlikely.

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?*

No Impact: The project site is not susceptible to landsliding or stability problems, and the site soils have a low potential for seismically-induced liquefaction.

(e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

No Impact: Since the project would be entirely served by a municipal sanitary sewer system and wastewater treatment facility, this Initial Study Checklist item is not applicable to the project.

## 5. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

*Would the project:*

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?*

No Impact: The proposed expansion would not involve the use of substantial quantities of hazardous materials, such as storage of fuel or hazardous waste. The store operation within the expansion area would involve the incidental use of cleaning agents and solvents and similar products in small quantities. Any accidental spills of such products would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Impact: Since the project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, this Initial Study Checklist item is not applicable to the project.

d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.*

No Impact: According to the earlier Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Twining Labs, the site is not included on the Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or any other list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, it is unlikely that development of the project site would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The earlier Phase I report identified a former exploratory oil well that was properly abandoned and sealed prior to construction of the existing Walmart store over the former well site.

*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 safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airports are the Byron Airport located over 10 miles to the southeast, and Buchanan Field located over 10 miles west in Concord. Since the project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public or public use airport, this Initial Study Checklist item is not applicable to the project.

*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?*

No Impact: Since the project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, this Initial Study Checklist item is not applicable to the project.

*g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

No Impact: The proposed project is located south of the State Route 4 freeway, and one mile west of the State Route 4 Bypass. California State freeways that are constructed in part with Federal funds are considered emergency transportation corridors. The project would result in no fundamental changes to the surrounding street system which would interfere with emergency access to or transportation on these emergency transportation routes, or otherwise impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan.

*h) Expose people or structures to 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?*

No Impact: The project site is not located within or near a fire wildland hazard area as mapped in the Contra Costa County General Plan. Areas subject to potential wildland fire hazard occur primarily in the southern portion of the City on hilly undeveloped lands covered with natural grasslands and brush. The project site is surrounded by urban development which disconnects it from wildlands which may be subject to fire hazard. The coverage of the site and surrounding lands with buildings, pavement, and irrigated landscaping will generally reduce the susceptibility of the site to wildfires.

## 6. Hydrology and Water Quality

*Would the project:*

a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Water quality standards can refer to drinking water standards or surface water standards. Further, there are separate surface water standards for discharges from wastewater treatment plants and for discharges of stormwater. These are discussed in turn below.

Drinking Water Standards - No Impact: Drinking water standards are implemented by the state Department of Public Health, and apply to the City of Antioch which is the local water provider. Since the project does not propose to install an independent private water system, the drinking water standards are not directly applicable to the project. (See Section II. L. *Utilities and Services* for a detailed discussion of water supply impacts.)

Stormwater Standards – Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: With respect to surface water quality, the project will be subject to the City of Antioch’s requirements related to water quality of stormwater discharges, as well as the Regional Water Quality Control Board Provision C.3 which requires reduction of pollutants in stormwater for individual projects. (See Section II. G. *Hydrology and Water Quality* for a detailed discussion of surface water quality impact.)

Wastewater Treatment Standards – No Impact: Waste Discharge Requirements refers to standards applied to local wastewater treatment facilities by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for quantities and quality of wastewater discharge. This issue is more specifically addressed by the Initial Study Checklist item: “Exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board,” which is listed as a significance criterion in Section II. L. *Utilities and Services Impacts*. The City’s wastewater treatment facility is operating in conformance with the Regional Board’s treatment 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)*

No Impact: The City of Antioch obtains all of its domestic water supply in the form of treated surface water from the San Joaquin River and the Delta. No municipal water is pumped from local groundwater. Therefore, while the impervious surfaces added by the project may result in a minor reduction of infiltration to the groundwater table, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

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?*

No Impact: Since the project does not include a residential component, this Initial Study Checklist item is not applicable to the project.

*h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

Less-than-Significant Impact: The 100-year flood flows in the project vicinity are entirely contained within the channel of the East Antioch Creek flood control channel. Therefore, the project would not involve the placement of structures within the 100-year flood hazard area.

*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?*

No Impact: The project site is not located within a mapped inundation zone due to failure of the Contra Loma Dam or any other impounded water body, and therefore would not be subject to risk of flooding as a result of dam or levee failure.

*j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

No Impact: Seiches are seismically-induced waves in an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir. There are no water bodies in the project vicinity. As such, the project site would not be subject to potential impacts due to seiches.

Tsunamis are large and rapidly moving ocean waves that result from sudden and large scale fault movement on the ocean floor. Due to its inland location more than 50 miles from the Pacific Ocean, and given its elevation at about 135 feet above sea level, the project would not be subject to inundation from tsunamis.

Mudflows occur when unstable hillsides or mountain slopes fail as a result of a seismic event and/or oversaturated conditions. The nearest hillsides are located several hundred feet to the west and are relatively stable and not prone to mudflows or debris flows which could affect the project.

## 7. Land Use and Planning

*Would the project:*

*a) Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact: The majority of the 21.6-acre Walmart site is developed with the existing discount store and surrounding parking, loading, and landscaped areas. The westerly 3.7-acre portion of the site (i.e., planned expansion area) is vacant and is covered with non-native grasses and weedy vegetation. The expansion site is flanked on three sides by existing commercial retail development, and the project would be compatible with those adjacent uses. The site is bounded on the north by the East Antioch Creek flood control channel which provides a transitional buffer with the existing residential neighborhood to the north, and in fact divides the residences to the north from the commercial uses to the south. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would physically divide an established community, or otherwise result in land use impacts due to conflicting land uses.

*c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact: The East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCP/HCP), which was implemented in early 2008, does not include the City

of Antioch. The City of Antioch does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan, and there is no other known adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan affecting the site.

## 8. Mineral Resources

*Would the project:*

*a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

No Impact: The project site is not located within or near any areas mapped as potential mineral resource sites. The Brentwood natural gas field lies several miles to the west, but most if not all recoverable natural gas has been extracted from this area. The nearest aggregate recovery site is on the east slope of Mount Diablo.

*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 lands use plan?*

No Impact: There are no important mineral resource recovery sites mapped or identified on or near the project site. Thus there is no potential that the project would result in the loss of such resource recovery sites.

## 9. Noise

*Would the project result in:*

*b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground born noise levels?*

No Impact: The most common source of excessive vibration during construction would be pile driving. However, neither pile driving nor any other source of excessive vibration is anticipated during project construction. Low speed trucks circulating on the site would cause very low levels of localized ground vibration on project driveways. The East Antioch Creek Channel would buffer the any vibrations resulting from proposed construction activities. There are no sources of vibration associated with project operation that would be perceptible beyond the project boundaries. The most common source of groundborne noise is underground rail transit systems which can generate noise at adjacent land uses. No sources of groundborne noise are anticipated during project construction or operation.

*e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airports are the Byron Airport located over 10

miles to the southeast, and Buchanan Field located over 10 miles west in Concord. Therefore, this Initial Study item is not applicable to the project.

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?*

No Impact: Since the project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, this Initial Study Checklist item is not applicable to the project.

## 10. Population and Housing

*Would the project:*

a) *Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

Less-than-Significant Impact: The project does not include a residential component so it will not directly induce population growth in the area. Since the additional staff needed for new and expanded operations is expected to be drawn from Antioch and the surrounding area, the project would not directly result in population growth. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the area. (For a discussion of general growth inducement, see Section VI. *Growth-Inducing Effects of the Proposed Project.*)

b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact: The project site contains no housing that could be displaced by the project. Likewise, there are no residential uses in the immediate vicinity that would be directly or indirectly displaced by the project.

c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact: There are no people currently living on the site or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the project will not displace any people.

## 11. Public Services

*Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable serve ratios, response times of other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

- *Schools*

Less-than-Significant Impact: The project does not include a residential component and thus will not generate school-aged children. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant

impact on schools. However, as mandated by State law, the project will pay a school mitigation fee, as required for all commercial development.

- *Parks*

Less-than-Significant Impact: Demand for parks and recreation is mainly generated by residential development. While the employees of the project would likely make some use of parks in the area, the amount of use is expected to be minor in comparison to use by residents. As such, the project would not result in the need to acquire or develop new parks and recreational facilities, and the project impacts on parks would be less than significant.

- *Other Public Facilities*

No Impact: As a commercial retail development, the project would not generate significant demand for libraries or other governmental services.

## 12. Recreation

*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?*

No Impact: The project does not include a residential component which could result in substantially increased use of or demand for neighborhood or regional 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?*

No Impact: The project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, nor would generate substantial demand for recreational facilities to the extent that it would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

## 13. Transportation/Circulation

*Would the project:*

*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?*

No Impact: The project does not involve construction at an airport, nor is it located near an airport. The commercial retail businesses at the project would not entail transportation of goods or people by air. Therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that could result in substantial safety risks.

#### 14. Global Climate Change

[Note: The following items are not included in the Appendix G checklist, but have been added here pending the amendment of the CEQA Guidelines to include checklist items relating to global climate change.]

*Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant climatic effect?*

Less-than-Significant Impact: While numerous human activities contribute greenhouse gas emissions, the atmospheric processes by which these emissions contribute to incremental climate change are global in scope. The proposed project, in itself, would not result in sufficient greenhouse gas emissions to have a measureable effect on global climate. (For detailed discussion, see Section II. N. *Global Climate Change*.)

*Would the project be subject to significant adverse effects as a result of global climate change?*

Less-than-Significant Impact: It is expected that the predicted general increase in average temperatures will result in a number of environmental changes globally. The anticipated environmental effects to California are described in detail in the draft *California Climate Adaptation Strategy* report, released in August 2009, and are summarized in Section II. N. *Global Climate Change*.) The potential impacts of climate change upon the proposed project would be less than significant, as discussed below.

Flooding: Although higher average temperatures are expected, there is no consensus on whether that will mean milder winters with more or less rain. It is also undetermined whether the changes will result in more intense rainfall. For the project site, wetter weather could result in an increased frequency of shallow ponding of water on the site during large rainfall events. However, as discussed in Section II. G *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the project drainage system is designed to convey and release excess stormwater to the adjacent channel of East Antioch Creek during the most severe storm events in order to prevent damage to buildings and property. The channel of East Antioch Creek is fully improved to convey 100-year flood flows. Thus, although the frequency of large storm events may increase, the severity of the flooding is not expected to increase as a result of global climate change.

Sea Level Rise: Current estimates of sea level rise as a result of global climate change are in the range of one to two meters by the end of the century. The project site is located about 135 feet (41 meters) above sea level and about three miles inland, and thus is highly unlikely to be subject to flooding due to sea level rise.

Water Supply: Unless atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are brought into equilibrium by the end of the century, it is estimated there could be 70 to 90 percent loss in Sierra snowpack. While the overall quantity of precipitation is not expected to change dramatically, more of it will fall as rain and flow downstream rather than being stored as snowpack. Since Antioch's water supply originates from intakes in the Delta and Carquinez Strait, with some supplies stored at Los Vaqueros Reservoir, the City does not rely on late season snowmelt for peak summer supplies, and thus is less vulnerable to supply reduction than other locales. However, sea level rise is anticipated to result in seawater intrusion of inland waterways and the Delta and would likely

increase salinity at existing raw water intake locations for the City's water supplies. It is expected that the water supply agencies will anticipate and plan for these conditions and undertake measures as needed to meet drinking water standards. Although retail centers are not heavy water users, overall water demand is expected to increase due to increases in average temperatures, particularly for landscape irrigation. The rising cost of water due to supply or water quality constraints will place greater emphasis on water conservation, recycling and reuse. Overall, however, any constraints on water supply resulting from global climate change are not expected to have a significant impact on the project.

Public Health: More severe weather events, including increases in ambient air temperature and increases in extreme heat events would result in potential health impacts such as heat stroke, heat exhaustion, and the exacerbation of existing medical conditions such as cardiovascular and respiratory diseases, diabetes, nervous system disorders, emphysema, and epilepsy. Climate change is expected to result in an overall decline in air quality resulting in increased mortality due to cardiovascular and lung disease particularly among the elderly, as well as health impacts to infants and young children. Climate changes also potentially result in increases in allergenic plant pollen and more frequent exposure to smoke from wildfires. At the project site, individual exposures to increased heat, poor air quality, and increased allergens and wildfire smoke would be minimized by the Walmart store's climate control system which would maintain comfortable interior temperatures and air quality. In the outdoor areas of the project site, landscape trees, roof overhangs, porticoes and trellises would provide shade for customers walking to and from their vehicles or transit stops. Thus the public health effects of global climate change on the project and its users would be less than significant.

Energy: With the expected increase in average temperatures due to global climate change, project energy demand for air conditioning and water demand for landscape irrigation will likely increase but this is not expected to have a significant impact on the project. Higher summer temperatures will result in greater power demands for air conditioning. At the same time, reduced summer meltwater flows in the Sierra will result in reduced hydroelectric power generation during the peak summer period which will need to be replaced by other more-expensive power sources. Rising energy costs will likely result in an even greater emphasis on energy efficiency and conservation, but otherwise will not have a significant impact on the project.

Other impacts that are expected to arise in California due to climate change include: increased potential for wildfires; impacts to biological diversity and habitats; and impacts to agriculture, forestry, and coastal resources. The resources and risks associated with these impacts do not occur on or near the project site and thus these impacts would not affect the project. In summary, the impacts of global climate change upon the project would be less than significant.

---

## REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY

City of Antioch, *Code of Ordinances*, as amended through June 10, 2008.

City of Antioch, *Draft General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report*, July 2003.

City of Antioch, *General Plan*, November 2003.

### III. Effects Found Not to be Significant

City of Antioch, *Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Williamson Ranch Plaza Project*, May 1998.

City of Antioch, *Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Williamson Ranch Plaza Project, Phases 3 & 4*, August 2000.

City of Antioch, *Urban Water Management Plan Update*, January 2006.

County of Contra Costa, *Contra Costa County General Plan 1995- 2010*, July 1996.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), *Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Contra Costa County (Unincorporated Areas), California, Community Panel Number 0600250355 C*, Map Revised: September 7, 2001.

Illingworth & Rodkin, *Walmart Expansion, Williamson Ranch Plaza, Antioch, California, Air Quality Assessment*, October 2009.

Kimley-Horn and Associates, *Traffic Impact Study –Walmart Expansion, Antioch, CA*, November 2009.

Live Oak Associates, *Biotic Evaluation, Walmart Expansion Site, Antioch, Contra Costa County, California*, August 2008.

Robert A. Karn & Associates, *Hydrology/Hydraulics Review for Walmart Store #2697 Expansion, Williamson Ranch Plaza, Antioch, California*, December 2008.

Robert A. Karn & Associates, *Stormwater Control Plan for Walmart Store #2697 Expansion, Antioch, California*, October 2008.

Twining Laboratories, *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, Proposed Williamson Ranch Plaza, Antioch, California*, April 1998.

Twining Laboratories, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Northwest of Lone Tree Way and Hillcrest Avenue, Antioch, California*, October 1997.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, *Soil Survey of Contra Costa County*, 1977.