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: Our Lady of Fatima

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): PA-0900179 (UP)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A Use Permit to establish a community assembly facility, including the conversion of an existing 12,000 square foot building into an assembly hall, and utilization of an existing special event arena. (Use Type: Community Assembly)

The project site is located on the east side of N. Sacramento Boulevard, 575 feet north of Oak Street, within the unincorporated community of Thornton.

ASSESSORS PARCEL NO(S).: 001-220-32

ACRES: 8.45 acres

GENERAL PLAN: R/L (Low Density Residential) & R/M (Medium Density Residential)

ZONING: R-L (Low Density Residential & R-M (Medium Density Residential)

POTENTIAL POPULATION, NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS, OR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF USE(S):
A community assembly facility totaling 12,000 square feet, and an existing special event arena.

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

NORTH: Residential, agricultural with scattered residences, Sacramento County
SOUTH: Residential, commercial, agricultural with scattered residences
EAST: Union Pacific (Sacramento) Railroad, residential, industrial, agricultural with scattered residences, Mokelumne River
WEST: Residential, Commercial, Interstate 5, 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; staff knowledge or experience; and independent environmental studies submitted to the County as part of the project application. 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):

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

Agency name(s):

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

City:

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.

Stephanie Sowers
Signature

6/25/20
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:

The proposed project will have no impact on aesthetics. The proposed project site is located within the unincorporated community of Thornton, and proposes to convert an existing structure into the community assembly facility. Additionally, the site is not located along a scenic route or roadway as defined in the 2035 General Plan. The project site will be required to install parking lot and security lighting pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1015.5(g), however, lighting shall be designed to confine rays to the premises; no spillover beyond the property lines is permitted, as a result, the required lighting will have adversely affect day or nighttime views.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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:

The proposed project will have no impact on agriculture or forestry resources. The project site is not located within an area designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of statewide Importance. Additionally, the proposed development is located within the unincorporated community of Thornton, within an existing developed area that is zoned R-L (Low Density Residential), and no new construction is proposed.

III. AIR QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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:

The proposed project will convert an existing 12,000 square foot building into a community assembly facility and utilization of an existing special event arena. 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. This project was referred to the SJVAPCD for review on March 3, 2017. At the time of development, 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.

IV. BIOLOGICAL 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) 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:

The proposed project includes the conversion of an existing building to a 12,000 square foot community assembly facility and utilization of an existing special event arena. The project was referred to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) on March 3, 2017, and SJCOG determined that the project was not subject to the Multi Species & Habitat Conservation Plan because no new development is proposed. The project site is located on a developed parcel within an urban community, and, as a result, no impact on biological resources is anticipated.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.					
Would the project:					
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:

The proposed project will convert 12,000 square foot building into a community assembly facility and utilization of an existing special event arena. All development is proposed within the existing disturbed areas on site. As a result, no impact on cultural resources is anticipated. Should human remains be discovered during any ground disturbing activities, all work shall stop immediately in the vicinity (e.g. 100 feet) of the finds until they can be verified. The County coroner shall be immediately contacted in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 7050.5(b). Protocol and requirements outlined in Health and Safety Code sections 7050.5(b) and 7050.5(c) as well as Public Resources Code section 5097.98 shall be followed.

	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:

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 the proposed project, and will be triggered at the time of building permit application, ensuring that any impact to the environment due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy will be less than significant and preventing any conflict with state or local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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:

The geology of San Joaquin County is composed of high organic alluvium, which is susceptible to earthquake movement. The project will have to comply with the California Building Code (CBC) which includes provisions for soils reports for grading and foundations as well as design criteria for seismic loading and other geologic hazards based on fault and seismic hazard mapping. All recommendations from a soils report must be incorporated into the construction plans. Therefore, impacts to seismic-related (or other) landslide hazards will be less than significant.

The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project includes the conversion of existing structures, and no additional development. Any required improvements will be subject to grading and/or building permits. As a result, impacts to soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be less than significant.

The project site is relatively flat terrain where landslides have not historically been an issue. A soils report will be required for grading and foundations and all recommendations from a soils report must be incorporated into the construction plans. Therefore, any risks resulting from being located on an unstable unit will be reduced to less than significant.

The project will be served by an onsite septic tank or alternative waste water disposal system for the disposal of waste water. The Environmental Health Department is requiring a soil suitability/nitrate loading study to determine the appropriate system and design prior to issuance of building permit(s). The sewage disposal system shall comply with the onsite wastewater treatment systems standards of San Joaquin County prior to approval. A percolation test that meets absorption rates of the manual of septic tank practice or E.P.A. Design Manual for onsite wastewater treatment and disposal system is required for each parcel. With these standards in place, only soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks will be approved for the septic system.

The San Joaquin County General Plan 2035 indicates that the county will protect significant archeological and historical resources by requiring an archeological report prepared by a qualified cultural resource specialist prior to the issuance of any discretionary permit or approval in areas determined to contain significant historic or prehistoric archeological artifacts that could be disturbed by project construction. In this way, the County can minimize damage to unique paleontological resources or sites or geologic features.

	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:

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 proposed 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 (CO2) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O) 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 CO2 equivalents (MTCO2e/yr).

As noted previously, the proposed 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.11 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. As such, the analysis herein is limited to discussion of long-term operational GHG emissions.

11 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.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) 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:

The proposed project is for the establishment of a community assembly facility, which will convert an existing 12,000 square foot structure, ant utilization of a special event arena. The proposed use does not include the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials nor could there be an accidental release of hazardous materials, therefore, the project will have no impact on the environment due to hazardous materials.

The project site is not included on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database map, compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and, therefore, will have no impact on the safety of the public or the environment.

The scope of the proposed project indicates that no additional emergency services will be required to provide for safe evacuation and adequate access to emergency equipment. As such, the project will not impair implementation of, or interfere with, County-adopted emergency response plans.

Pursuant to the California Building code requirement, the project structure will have fire sprinklers installed inside the structure for safety. Implementation of this safety standard will result in any impact to people or structures from wildland fires being less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
Would the project:					
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:

The proposed project's impact on hydrology and water is expected to be less than significant. The project will be served by the existing onsite septic system. Water and storm drainage services will be provided by County Service Area 12, though existing services. The existing septic system constructed under permit by the Environmental Health Department. The sewage disposal system must comply with the onsite wastewater treatment systems standards of San Joaquin County. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on these resources will be less than significant.

The proposed project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river. The subject site is located within CSA 12, and will utilize. All necessary drainage improvements onsite will be required as conditions of the construction of the project. The project will not result in substantial soil erosion because the site will be paved and landscaped subject to building code requirements.

Development Title Section 9-1135.2 requires all development projects to provide drainage facilities within and downstream from the development project. Storm water runoff shall be conveyed into a terminal drain or may be retained in a retention

basin. The Department of Public Works requires that drainage facilities be provided in accordance with the San Joaquin County Development Standards. The proposed project plans call for storm water to be retained in an on-site retention pond. The Department of Public Works will determine the feasibility of the proposed retention pond.

The proposed project site is not in a tsunami or seiche zone. Therefore, there is no risk of release of pollutants due to inundation.

	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:

The proposed project will convert an existing 12,000 square foot building into a community assembly facility, and utilization of an existing special event arena. The project is not a growth-inducing action nor is it in conflict with any existing or planned uses. The Community Assembly use type is a conditionally permitted in the R-L (Low Density Residential) zone subject to an approved Use Permit application.

The proposed project will not be a conflict with any existing or planned uses or set a significant land use precedent. The proposed project is not in conflict with any Master Plans, Specific Plans, or Special Purpose Plans, or any other applicable plan adopted by the County.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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:

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. The proposed project is not in a designated MRZ zone. Therefore, the proposed project applications will have no 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:

The proposed project will convert an existing building into a 12,000 square foot community assembly facility, and utilization of an existing special event arena. The project site has a zoning designation of R-L (Low Density Residential), and is located within a developed residential area. The residential use type is considered a noise-sensitive land use pursuant to the Development Title. The nearest residence is located 90 feet northwest of the proposed assembly building, and 25 feet from the property line. Due to the close proximity of the proposed community assembly and existing residences, an acoustical analysis was performed by J.C. Brennan & Associates, dated October 16, 2019. The acoustical analysis found that the proposed building did not have adequate thresholds to prevent sound from flanking under the doors. The applicant worked with J.C. Brennan & Associates and Mike Smith Engineering to determine structural changes that will result in compliance with County standards. J.C. Brennan & Associates utilized Marshall Day Acoustics Sound Insulation Prediction software to evaluate proposed improvements to the building, and found that the proposed improvements would mitigate the impact on surrounding residences to less than significant.

The following structural changes and mitigation measures will be included as Conditions of Approval:

Wall Assemblies:

- Retain existing exterior siding. The siding shall be reinstalled with factory tech screws and fitted with rubber gaskets;
- 1" gap supported by metal girt and attached to 2x6 wood stud wall;
- R19 insulation in the stud cavities;
- 2 layers of 5/8th inch gypsum board mounted on resilient channels on the interior. The north, south, and west facades should include mounting the 2 layers of gypsum board using PAC International RSIC clips;
- No windows shall be installed on the north, south, and west facades;
- All exterior doors on the north, south, and west facades shall include :Overly Door Company Model No. 4812035 (Rated STC 48), or similar, which has a 30 dB insertion loss at the 125 Hz 1/3 octave band center frequency.

Ceiling Assemblies:

- 4-inch insulated roof panel (such as Kingspan);
- New metal roof
- An additional layer of ½ inch plywood adhered to the bottom or top of the insulated roof panel;
- Roof panels shall have a minimum of a 26 gauge thickness.

Interior and Exterior Noise Level Requirements:

- Interior music noise levels shall be limited to a maximum of 86 dBA at a distance of 40-feet from the music stage to

comply with the daytime noise level standards. Interior music noise levels shall be limited to a maximum of 81 dBA at a distance of 40-feet from the music stage to comply with the nighttime noise level standards. This will require staff, or a qualified individual with a Type 1 or 2 sound level meter

- Exterior noise levels shall not exceed the County daytime standards. If music occurs after 10:00 p.m., the exterior noise levels will be required to comply with the county nighttime standards;
- Initial monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant.

Additional Requirements:

- The applicant shall contact a consultant to install a system that will notify staff, and alert the music operator of potential exceedances of the interior noise level limits. It also must time-stamp each exceedance during each event.

These requirements have been included in the project Conditions of Approval, and must be satisfied before finalization of any building permits.

	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:

The proposed project will not induce unplanned population growth, or displace an existing people or housing. The proposed project will establish a community assembly facility, which will serve the existing developed unincorporated urban community of Thornton. The project proposes no new development.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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:

The proposed project will establish a community assembly facility within an existing 12,000 square foot building, and utilization of an existing special event arena. The project site is located in the Thornton Fire District, and the New Hope and Galt Union School Districts. Both agencies were provided with the project proposal and invited to respond with any concerns or conditions. No response was received. The project site is served by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office. The office was provided with the project proposal and invited to respond with any concerns or conditions. No response was received. As proposed, the project is not anticipated to result in a need for a substantial change to public services.

	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:

The proposed project will establish a community assembly facility. The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks, as it will not increase residents or homes within the vicinity. The project is anticipated to have no impact on existing recreational facilities, and will not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed project will additionally provide private recreational services for the community above and beyond those already provided through existing neighborhood and regional parks. Due to the limited scope of the proposed project, impacts to recreation opportunities are anticipated to be less than significant

XVII. TRANSPORTATION.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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:

This project has been under review since submitted in 2009, with long periods of time on hold. In 2014, the Department of Public Works reviewed the project site and project description and determined that the project met the Development Title criteria for a traffic study. A study was prepared in July of 2014 by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. This study found that the impacts from the project would create a less-than-significant impact on traffic, and stated that no mitigation measures were required..

After completion of the traffic study, the project was placed on hold while noise impacts were thoroughly analyzed. During this time, the traffic study became in valid, as, pursuant to the Department of Public Works Traffic Study Guidelines, studies are considered antiquated and irrelevant after two years. As a result, as the project was removed from hold in 2020, a technical memorandum to update the traffic study was required. The technical memorandum was completed on March 2, 2020, and it found that the 2014 traffic study findings were still valid. As a result, the Department of Public Works determined that the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on transportation.

	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:

The proposed project will establish a community assembly facility, which will utilized an existing 12,000 square foot structure and require surface grading only. The project was referred to the North Valley Yokuts Tribe, and no response was received. Should human remains be discovered during any ground disturbing activities, all work shall stop immediately in the vicinity (e.g. 100 feet) of the finds until they can be verified. The County coroner shall be immediately contacted in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 7050.5(b). Protocol and requirements outlined in Health and Safety Code sections 7050.5(b) and 7050.5(c) as well as Public Resources Code section 5097.98 shall be followed.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
Would the project:					
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:

The proposed project will convert an existing 12,000 square foot building into a community assembly facility, and utilization of an existing special event arena. The Community Assembly use type may be conditionally permitted in the R-L (Low Density Residential) zone. The project will be served by the existing onsite septic system. Water and storm drainage services will be provided by County Service Area 12, No new development is proposed at this time, and the existing services will remain in use. The Environmental Health Department and the Department of Public Works will determine the size of these systems and ensure they comply with all applicable statutes and regulations.

	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:

The project location is in the unincorporated urban community of Thornton, which is not identified as a Community at Risk from Wildfire by Cal Fire's "Fire Risk Assessment Program". Communities at Risk from Wildfire are those places within 1.5 miles of areas of High or Very High wildfire threat as determined from CDF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have no impact of wildfire risk.

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:

Review of this project has not indicated any features which might significantly impact the environmental quality of the site and/or surrounding area. Mitigation measures have been identified in areas where a potentially significant impact has been identified and these measures have reduced these impacts to a less than significant level.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Pub. Resources Code; Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

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