INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION
[Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080(c) and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15070-15071]

LEAD AGENCY: San Joaquin County Community Development Department

PROJECT APPLICANT: Kusalakari Corporation/Brian McNamara

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): PA-1800177 (UP)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly facility for a maximum of 185 attendees. This facility will also host silent meditation retreats for an average of fifty (50) people at a time, and will occur an average of eight (8) times per year. An average of fifteen (15) attendees visit the site during the week and an average of 65 attendees visit the site on the weekends. The facility anticipates a maximum attendance of 185 attendees on average of four (4) times per year during special holiday events.

The project is planned for construction in two (2) phases over six (6) years. Phase 1 includes the conversion of an existing 5,000 square foot agricultural building to a mixed use worship building, a 3,700 square foot kitchen addition to the mixed use worship building, and the conversion of an existing 1,803 square foot building to a private garage. Phase 2 includes the construction of five meditation retreat buildings totaling 7,800 square feet (approximately 1,500 square feet a piece), a 5,900 square foot pagoda building, a 600 square foot maintenance building, and the conversion of the 1,803 square foot private garage to an administration building. The project site will be served by private septic systems for sewage disposal, private well for water, and on-site storm water retention basin. The existing single family residence is not included as a part of this application. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. (Use Types: Religious Assembly-Neighborhood)

The project site is located on the east side of South Priest Road, 0.8 miles south of East French Camp Road, French Camp

ASSESSOR PARCEL NO.: 193-220-15

ACRES: 5.0-acres

GENERAL PLAN: R/L

ZONING: AU-20

POTENTIAL POPULATION, NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS, OR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF USE(S):
A religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees with nine (9) buildings totaling of 24,803 square feet

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

NORTH: Agricultural with scattered residences
SOUTH: Agricultural with scattered residences
EAST: Agricultural with scattered residences
WEST: Agricultural with scattered residences

REFERENCES AND SOURCES FOR DETERMINING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Original source materials and maps on file in the Community Development Department including: all County and City general plans and community plans; assessor parcel books; various local and FEMA flood zone maps; service district maps; maps of geologic instability; maps and reports on endangered species such as the Natural Diversity Data Base; noise contour maps; specific roadway plans; maps and/or records of archeological/historic resources; soil reports and maps; etc.

Many of these original source materials have been collected from other public agencies or from previously prepared EIR's and other technical studies. Additional standard sources which should be specifically cited below include on-site visits by staff (note staff knowledge or experience; and independent environmental studies submitted to the County as part of the project application(TRAFFIC TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM: Traffic Impact Analysis Review for Buddhist Religious Assembly dated October 29, 2017. SOIL SUITABILITY, NITRATE LOADING STUDY: Kusalakari Property, dated September 4, 2019, addendum dated November 20, 2019). Copies of these reports can be found by contacting the Community Development Department.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

No

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Does it appear that any environmental feature of the project will generate significant public concern or controversy?

   ☐ Yes ☒ No

   Nature of concern(s): Enter concern(s).

2. Will the project require approval or permits by agencies other than the County?

   ☒ Yes ☐ No

   Agency name(s): Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

3. Is the project within the Sphere of Influence, or within two miles, of any city?

   ☒ Yes ☐ No

   City: **Stockton, Lathrop**

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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.

Giuseppe Sanfilippo — 4/27/2020

Signature: Giuseppe Sanfilippo
Associate Planner

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publically accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-d) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years. Phase 1, with building permits issued within eighteen (18) months, includes the conversion of an existing 5,000 square foot agricultural building to a mixed use worship building, a 3,700 square foot kitchen addition to the mixed use worship building, and the conversion of an existing 1,803 square foot building to a private garage. Phase 2, with building permits issued within six (6) years, includes the construction of five meditation retreat buildings totaling 7,800 square feet, a 5,900 square foot pagoda building, a 600 square foot maintenance building, and the conversion of the 1,803 square foot private garage to an administration building.

The proposed pagoda building's total overall height is sixty-two (62) feet; comprised of a twenty-three foot, nine inch tall building and a steeple-like architectural feature that is thirty-eight feet, four inches in height. The steeple-like architectural feature does not have any additional floor space. Development Title Section 9-1005.3(b)(5) states that provided no space above the height limit is allowed for the purpose of additional floor space and no heights are permitted above the maximum allowed under an County Ordinance relating to airports, a steeple may be erected above the height limits prescribed in the Development Title. In a response dated June 7, 2019, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) states that ALUC review is only required for proposed structures that are one-hundred (100) feet or more in height. The project site is not located along a designated scenic route pursuant to 2035 General Plan Figure 12-2, and the surrounding area is a mixture of agricultural and residential uses. As a result, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an impact on aesthetics.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-e) A religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees is classified under the Religious Assembly-Neighborhood use type, and may be a conditionally permitted use in the AU-20 (Agriculture-Urban Reserve, 20-acre minimum) zone with an approved Use Permit application. The project site is not under Williamson Act contract. The parcel is not designated as Prime Farmland, and the proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland to a non-agricultural use, nor remove any land from agricultural production. The closest parcels with farming activity are 175 feet southwest, and 400 feet east across a railroad track and a canal. The project will not affect any agricultural uses, and there are no properties under Williamson Act contracts in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed application will have a less than significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-d) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years for a total buildout of 24,803 square feet. The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has been established by the State in an effort to control and minimize air pollution. In a response dated June 11, 2019, the SJVAPCD states an Air Impact Assessment will be required prior to issuance of Building Permit for the project. This requirement will be incorporated into the final Conditions of Approval. At the time of construction for this project, the applicant will be required to meet the requirements for emissions and dust control as established by SJVAPCD. As a result, any impacts to air quality will be reduced to less-than-significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-f) The Natural Diversity Database list the Swainson's hawk (Buteo Swainsoni) as rare, threatened, or endangered species in the project vicinity. There is no riparian habitat or natural waterways in the project vicinity. The San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) has determined that the project is subject to the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), and the applicant has confirmed that they will participate. As a result, participation in the SJMSCP, and will be included in the conditions of project approval for this proposal, and participation will be required prior to issuance of any building permits. Pursuant to the *Final EIR/EIS for San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP),* dated November 15, 2000, and certified by SJCOG on December 7, 2000, participation in the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to§ 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-c) In the event human remains are encountered during any portion of the project, California state law requires that there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county has determined manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation (California Health and Safety Code - Section 7050.5). At the time development, if Human burials are found to be of Native American origin, the developer shall follow the procedures pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5(e) of the California State Code of Regulations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:					
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a,b) The California Energy Code (also titled The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings) was created by the California Building Standards Commission in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The code's purpose is to advance the state's energy policy, develop renewable energy sources and prepare for energy emergencies. These standards are updated periodically by the California Energy Commission. The code includes energy conservation standards applicable to most buildings throughout California. These requirements will be applicable to any development at the time of building permit. This will ensure that any impacts to the environment due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy will be reduced to less than significant and help to prevent any conflict with state or local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil and create direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

(a-f) 2. c. The Soil Survey of San Joaquin County classifies the soil on the parcel as *Tinnin loamy coarse sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes, Veritas fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes* and *Honeycut sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes*

Tinnin loamy coarse sand's permeability is rapid and water capacity is low. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, orchards, or vineyards. *Tinnin loamy coarse sand* has a storie index rating of 57 and a land capability of IIIs irrigated and IVe nonirrigated.

Veritas fine sandy loam's permeability is moderately rapid and water capacity is moderate. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, orchard, and vineyard crops. *Veritas fine sandy loam* has a storie index rating of 57 and a land capability of IIs irrigated and IVs nonirrigated.

Honeycut sandy loam's permeability is moderately rapid and water capacity is moderate. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, orchard, and vineyard crops. *Honeycut sandy loam* has a storie index rating of 95 and a land capability of I irrigated and IVc nonirrigated.

The proposed project will not cause the risk of injury or death as a result of a rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic activity, or landslides because there are no faults located near the project site, and the site is relatively flat. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The proposed project will not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. The proposed project is not 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project: a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-b) Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, and city, and virtually every individual on earth. An individual project's GHG emissions are at a micro-scale level relative to global emissions and effects to global climate change; however, an individual project could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact. As such, impacts related to emissions of GHG are inherently considered cumulative impacts.

Implementation of the underlying project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO_2) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO_2 equivalents ($MTCO_2e/yr$).

As noted previously, the underlying project will be subject to the rules and regulations of the SJVAPCD. The SJVAPCD has adopted the *Guidance for Valley Land- use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* and the *District Policy – Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency.**1*** The guidance and policy rely on the use of performance-based standards, otherwise known as Best Performance Standards (BPS) to assess significance of project specific greenhouse gas emissions on global climate change during the environmental review process, as required by CEQA. To be determined to have a less-than-significant individual and cumulative impact with regard to GHG emissions, projects must include BPS sufficient to reduce GHG emissions by 29 percent when compared to Business As Usual (BAU) GHG emissions. Per the SJVAPCD, BAU is defined as projected emissions for the 2002-2004 baseline period. Projects which do not achieve a 29 percent reduction from BAU levels with BPS alone are required to quantify additional project-specific reductions demonstrating a combined reduction of 29 percent. Potential mitigation measures may include, but not limited to: on-site renewable energy (e.g. solar photovoltaic systems), electric vehicle charging stations, the use of alternative-fueled vehicles, exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards, the installation of energy-efficient lighting and control systems, the installation of energy-efficient mechanical systems, the installation of drought-tolerant landscaping, efficient irrigation systems, and the use of low-flow plumbing fixtures.

It should be noted that neither the SJVAPCD nor the County provide project-level thresholds for construction-related GHG emissions. Construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change.

---

1 San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA*. December 17, 2009.San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. *District Policy Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*. December 17, 2009.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-g) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years for a total buildout of 24,803 square feet. The project site is not 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 not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The project would not result in, create or induce hazards and associated risks to the public. Construction activities for the project typically involve the use of toxic or hazardous materials such as paint, fuels, and solvents. Construction activities would be subject to federal, state, and local laws and requirements designed to minimize and avoid potential health and safety risks associated with hazardous materials. No significant impacts are anticipated related to the transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials during construction activities.

The project site falls within Zone 7b of the Airport Influence Area the comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan boundaries for the Stockton Metropolitan Airport. The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) submitted a response letter dated June 7, 2019 stating that the project is compatible with the 2018 San Joaquin County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), and the project shall abide by the applicable Airport Land Use

Plan for the Stockton Metropolitan Airport. As a Condition of Approval, the project will be subject to the Airport Land Use Commission's rules and regulations. As a result, impacts to airport flight paths are considered to less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
iii) 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; or	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-e) The project site is located in the Flood Zone X flood designations. A referral was sent to the Department of Public Works Flood Control Division for comments. If approved, any new developments will have to comply with Development Title Section 9-1605 regarding flood hazards.

The project area is located approximately 1.21 miles south of the French Camp Slough. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

A Soil Suitability/Nitrate Loading study dated September 4, 2019, and addendum dated November 20, 2019 were prepared, and reviewed by the Environmental Health Department. The Environmental Health Department has determined that the use of on-site septic tanks and wells will have a less than significant impact on groundwater quality provided the following mitigation measures are included as conditions of approval for the project:

- The Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) shall utilize supplemental treatment and meet performance requirements in section 10.9 of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- A Registered Civil Engineer shall submit complete engineered a design plan to the Environmental Health Department for approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

- A separation of twenty (20) foot between the bottom of the OWTS and ground water must be maintained.

- Applicant must obtain an annual OWTS permit through the Environmental Health Department.

- Samples must be submitted to the Environmental Health Department on a quarterly basis to determine the effectiveness of the supplemental treatment system.

- A source of potable water that can provide a consistent source of safe and clean water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes for the proposed building must be established prior to the issuance of building permits.

- Documentation that the parcel can accommodate the OWTS and the 100% replacement area for the proposed development project within the required setbacks from any water well must be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit. The site map must be drawn to scale and must show the location of all buildings, driveways, OWTS, and OWTS replacement areas and any water wills within 200 feet of the proposed OWTS and replacement areas.

As a Condition of Approval, the applicant shall have a permit to operate a Small Public Water System approved by the Environmental Health Department prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, an annual permit to operate the public water system will be required by the Environmental Health Department prior to the sign off of the certificate of final occupancy.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

b) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years. Phase 1, with building permits issued within eighteen (18) months, includes the conversion of an existing 5,000 square foot agricultural building to a mixed use worship building, a 3,700 square foot kitchen addition to the mixed use worship building, and the conversion of an existing 1,803 square foot building to a private garage. Phase 2, with building permits issued within six (6) years, includes the construction of five meditation retreat buildings totaling 7,800 square feet, a 5,900 square foot pagoda building, a 600 square foot maintenance building, and the conversion of the 1,803 square foot private garage to an administration building. The project is not a growth-inducing action nor is it in conflict with any existing or planned uses. The Religious Assembly-Neighborhood use type may be conditionally permitted in the AU-20 (Agriculture-Urban Reserve, 20-Acre minimum) zone subject to an approved Use Permit application.

The zoning and the General Plan for the project site will remain the same if the project is approved. Additionally, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact to surrounding parcels and will not create premature development pressure on surrounding agricultural lands to convert land from agricultural uses to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, this project is not a growth-inducing action.

The proposed project will not set a significant land use precedent, and is consistent with all applicable plans adopted by the County.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XII. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a, b) The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of a resource recovery site because the site does not contain minerals of significance or known mineral resources. San Joaquin County applies a mineral resource zone (MRZ) designation to land that meets the significant mineral deposits definition by the State Division of Mines and Geology. Although the project site is in an area designated MRZ-1, there is currently no mining activity in the area, and the surrounding area is developed with residential and agricultural uses. Therefore, the proposed project applications will have less than a significant impact on the availability of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites within San Joaquin County.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-c) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years for a total buildout of 24,803 square feet. Typical activities such as worship, prayer, and meditation associated with a religious assembly will be conducted entirely within buildings. The applicant proposes an average of eight (8) meditation retreat events that last an average of ten (10) days, for an average of fifty (50) people. During these meditation retreat events, the students are completely silent.

The nearest single family residence is located approximately 170 feet south of the project site. Development Title Section 9-1025.9 lists the Residential use type as a noise sensitive land use. Development Title Section Table 9-1025.9 Part II states that the maximum sound level for stationary noise sources during the daytime is 70 dB and 65dB for nighttime. Development Title Section 9-1025.9 lists the Residential use type as a noise sensitive land use. Development Title Section Table 9-1025.9 Part II states that the maximum sound level for stationary noise sources during the daytime is 70 dB and 65dB for nighttime. This applies to outdoor activity areas of the receiving use, or applies at the lot line if no activity area is known. Additionally, noise from construction activities are exempt from noise standards provided the construction occur no earlier than 6:00 A.M. and no later than 9:00 P.M. The proposed project would be subject to these Development Title standards. Further, the applicant is proposing a six (6) foot tall masonry wall around the perimeter of the project site, and the six (6) foot masonry wall will be included as a Condition of approval which will provide a barrier between the religious assembly and adjacent residential uses, and aid in land use compatibility. This is consistent with the requirement of Development Title Section 9-1022.4(d), which states that a masonry wall six (6) to seven (7) feet in height is required for projects that abut a residential zone, or an area shown in the General Plan for residential use. Therefore, noise impacts from the proposed project are expected to be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-b) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years for a total buildout of 24,803 square feet. The project proposes five (5) meditation cabins. However the buildings will only be utilized during meditation retreats, and not used as permanent full time residences. Therefore, the project will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The project also will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing as there is no reduction in the number of available housing units. Therefore, the project's impact on population and housing will be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.					
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years for a total buildout of 24,803 square feet. The existing fire protection is provided by the French Camp-McKinley Fire District, existing law enforcement protection is provided by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department, and the existing school services are provided by the Manteca Unified School District with the nearest school located approximately 1.0-miles northeast of the project site. There are no parks in the vicinity, and none are required to be provided. Therefore, the project will not result in the need for additional fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XVI. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a,b) The proposed project will not substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks because there is no increase in permanent housing with this application. Additionally, the project does not include recreation facilities or require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Impacts to recreation opportunities are anticipated to be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-d) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years for a total buildout of 24,803 square feet. The Department of Public Works has reviewed a Traffic Technical Memorandum dated October 29, 2017, has determined the Traffic Technical Memorandum meets the minimum requirement of a confirmation of no significant impact in traffic, and no additional mitigation measures are required. The project will generate less than fifty (50) vehicle trips per hour, and projects that have a traffic volume that is less than 50 trips per hour have a less than significant impact on traffic pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1150.4(a).

The project is not expected to conflict with any program plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the vehicle circulation system. There will be no changes to the geometric design of roads or to emergency access routes. The project proposes two driveways that are a minimum of twenty (20) feet in width for one-way access. The northern driveway is designed to be an entrance, while the southern driveway is designed to be an exit. All driveways and maneuvering areas will be surfaced in asphalt concrete, and the project site has direct access from South Priest Road. As a result, proposed project will have adequate emergency access.

The project site falls within Zone 7b of the Airport Influence Area the comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan boundaries for the Stockton Metropolitan Airport. The project site is located approximately 2.25 miles southwest of the nearest runway. The project shall abide by the applicable Airport Land Use Plan for the Stockton Metropolitan Airport. As a condition of approval, the project will be subject to the Airport Land Use Commission's rules and regulations. As a result, impacts to airport flight paths will be reduced to less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.					
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

a) At the time development, if Human burials are found to be of Native American origin, the developer shall follow the procedures pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5(e) of the California State Code of Regulations. If human remains are encountered, all work shall halt in the vicinity and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the finds. If Human burials are found to be of Native American origin, steps shall be taken pursuant to Section 15064.5(e) of Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act. The project site is not on a historical resource, and there is no reason to believe there are any tribal cultural resources on site.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-c) There are no public services available in this area for water, sewer, or storm water drainage. Parcels zoned for agricultural use may be developed with a well for water, a septic tank for sewer, and retain all drainage on-site. Any new development will have to be accommodated by an on-site well for water, and septic system for sewage. Storm water drainage will be required to be retained on-site.

A Soil Suitability/Nitrate Loading study dated September 4, 2019, and addendum dated November 20, 2019 were prepared and reviewed by the Environmental Health Department. As a result of the review, the Environmental Health Department has determined that the use of on-site septic tanks and wells will have a less than significant impact with the following mitigation measures:

- The Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) shall utilize supplemental treatment and meet performance requirements in section 10.9 of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- A Registered Civil Engineer shall submit complete engineered a design plan to the Environmental Health Department for approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
- A separation of twenty (20) foot between the bottom of the OWTS and ground water must be maintained.
- Applicant must obtain an annual OWTS permit through the Environmental Health Department.
- Samples must be submitted to the Environmental Health Department on a quarterly basis to determine the effectiveness of the supplemental treatment system.

- A source of potable water that can provide a consistent source of safe and clean water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes for the proposed building must be established prior to the issuance of building permits.

- Documentation that the parcel can accommodate the OWTS and the 100% replacement area for the proposed development project within the required setbacks from any water well must be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit. The site map must be drawn to scale and must show the location of all buildings, driveways, OWTS, and OWTS replacement areas and any water wills within 200 feet of the proposed OWTS and replacement areas.

As a Condition of Approval, the applicant shall have a permit to operate a Small Public Water System approved by the Environmental Health Department prior to issuance of building permits. Additionally, an annual permit to operate the public water system will be required by the Environmental Health Department prior to the sign off of the certificate of final occupancy.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-d) This project is a Use Permit application to establish a religious assembly for a maximum of 185 attendees in two (2) phases over six (6) years. Phase 1, with building permits issued within eighteen (18) months, includes the conversion of an existing 5,000 square foot agricultural building to a mixed use worship building, a 3,700 square foot kitchen addition to the mixed use worship building, and the conversion of an existing 1,803 square foot building to a private garage. Phase 2, with building permits issued within six (6) years, includes the construction of five meditation retreat buildings totaling 7,800 square feet, a 5,900 square foot pagoda building, a 600 square foot maintenance building, and the conversion of the 1,803 square foot private garage to an administration building. Pursuant to the San Joaquin Fire Severity Zone map, the project site is located in an area with moderate fire zone designation. The project proposes two driveways a minimum of twenty (20) feet in width, in accordance with fire road standards. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact wildfire hazards.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

a-c) The proposed application does not have the potential to degrade the environment or eliminate a plant or animal community. The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

ATTACHMENT: (MAP[S] OR PROJECT SITE PLAN[S])

