

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: Bradly Christy / Jeff Sanguinetti

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): PA-2100079 (AUP)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An Administrative Use Permit for a truck and farm equipment sales facility in 2 phases over 5 years. The project spans a single, legal lot that is comprised of APNs 013-220-32 and 013-220-34 which are divided by N. State Route 99 W. Frontage Road. Phase 1 includes development of both parcels with grading for parking sales inventory and construction of a 288 square foot office on APN: 013-220-32. Phase 2 includes construction of a 5,000 square foot shop on APN 013-220-32. The project will utilize driveways off of N. State Route 99 W. Frontage Road, one driveway to each parcel, that are opposite on another. An onsite well, septic system, and retention basin are proposed to be located on APN 013-220-32. (Use Types: Truck Services - Sales and Rentals; Equipment Sales, Repair, and Storage - Farm Machinery, Sales)

The project site is located on the southwest corner of N. State Route 99 W. Frontage Rd. and E. Woodbridge Rd. and on the east side of N. State Route 99 W. Frontage Rd., 900 feet south of E. Woodbridge Rd., Acampo.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NOS.: 013-220-32 and 013-220-34

ACRES: 4.10

GENERAL PLAN: Agriculture Industry (A/I)

ZONING: Agriculture Industry (A-I)

POTENTIAL POPULATION, NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS, OR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF USE(S):
An equipment sales yard with 5,288 square feet of building space at full buildout.

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

NORTH: Industrial; Agriculture with scattered residences
SOUTH: Mokelumne River; Agricultural with scattered residences
EAST: State Route 99; Industrial; Agricultural with scattered residences
WEST: Union Pacific Railroad; Industrial, Agriculture 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 (San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Air Impact Assessment dated January 26, 2023). 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): California Department of Transportation

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.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Alisa Goulart
Signature

11-20-2024
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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Impact Discussion:

- a) San Joaquin County is set within the greater Central Valley, composed of large expanses of generally flat, agricultural lands and urban development, and framed by the foothills of the Diablo Range to the west and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada to the east. According to the County's General Plan, primary scenic resources within San Joaquin County are the natural, rural, and agricultural landscapes of non-urbanized areas of the County, and the agricultural and natural landscapes of the Delta. (County of San Joaquin 2035).

The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a truck and farm equipment sales facility. The project site is located on the N. State Route 99 W. Frontage Road in Acampo and is adjacent to State Route 99. The area is relatively flat, with agricultural uses and scattered residences. Because the site is not highly visible with the exception of highway traffic and because the site is not a part of a larger scenic vista, the project's impact on a scenic vista is expected to be less-than-significant.

- b) There are two officially designated state scenic highways in San Joaquin County: I-580 and I-5 (County of San Joaquin 2035). Due to distance, the project site is not visible from I-580 or I-5 and therefore is not expected to impact scenic resources.

In addition, the County has designated 26 roadways within the County as local scenic routes (County of San Joaquin 2035), however, none are in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact associated with scenic resources within a state- or locally- designated scenic route.

- c) The project site is not located near any scenic vista, scenic site, or scenic roadway therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact associated with the existing visual quality or character of the site or its surroundings.
- d) The existing lighting and glare conditions in the project area are typical of a rural area. New lighting for the project would include outdoor building lighting and parking lot lighting. Parking lot lighting standards stipulate that all lighting be designed to confine direct rays to the premises, with no spillover beyond the property line except onto public thoroughfares, provided that such light does not cause a hazard to motorists (Development Title Section 9-1015.5). Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact from new sources of light or glare on day or nighttime views in the area.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a-e) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a truck and farm equipment sales facility. The proposed project will have no impact on agriculture or forestry resources. The project site does not include areas designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of statewide Importance, nor is the project site under a Williamson Act contract or zoned for forest land or timberland.

	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a truck and farm equipment sales facility. The project site is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin which lies within the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (APCD). APCD is the local agency established by the State to regulate air quality sources and minimize air pollution.

District Rules and Regulations are intended to reduce a project's impacts on air quality through compliance with regulatory requirements. The project was referred to APCD for review on June 7, 2024. APCD will require permits from the applicant including an Authority to Construct. With implementation of the District Rules' requirements and submittal for any required permits, the project's impact on air quality is 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
<u>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</u>					
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-f) Referrals have been sent to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG), the agency responsible for verifying the correct implementation of the *San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan* (SJMSCP), which provides compensation for the conversion of Open Space to non-Open Space uses which affect the plant, fish and wildlife species covered by the Plan. Pursuant to the Final EIR/EIS for SJMSCP, dated November 15, 2000, and certified by SJCOG on December 7, 2000, implementation of the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a level of less-than-significant.

SJCOG responded to this project referral in a letter dated June 21, 2021, that the project is subject to the SJMSCP. The applicant has confirmed that he will participate in SJMSCP. With the applicant's participation, the proposed project is consistent with the SJMSCP and any impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project will be reduced to a level of less-than-significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</u>					

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a-c) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a truck and farm equipment sales facility.

A search of the National Register of Historic Places, the Office of Historic Preservation's list of California Historical Resources, and of the Register of Historic Places within San Joaquin County did not uncover any known historical resources on the project site as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

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.

In this way, the project would have a less-than-significant impact with regard to an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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. The code includes energy conservation standards applicable to most buildings throughout California. These requirements will be applicable to the proposed project 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.

	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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil and create direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The project site is adjacent to State Route 99 in Acampo. The Soil Survey of San Joaquin County classifies the dominant component of the soil of the project area as *Tokay Acampo*, described as moderately well-drained to well-drained, moderately coarse-textured soils that are deep to a cemented hardpan or very deep, with low expansive potential, and with 0 to 2 percent slopes.

According to the California Department of Conservation's California Geological Survey, the project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone. However, similar to other areas located in seismically active Northern California, the project area is susceptible to strong ground shaking during an earthquake, although the site would not be affected by ground shaking more than any other area in the region.

The Project would be required to comply with the most recent version of the California Building Code (CBC), which

contains universal standards related to seismic load requirements and is codified within the San Joaquin County Ordinance Code under Section 8-1000. In addition, a soils report is required pursuant to CBC § 1803 for foundations and CBC appendix § J104 for grading. All recommendations of the Soils Report will be incorporated into the construction drawings. As a result, impacts associated with seismic ground shaking or possible ground liquefaction are expected to be less than significant.

The project site is located in an area that is relatively flat and does not contain any slopes that could result in landslides. Therefore, the project is expected to have no impact that could cause landslides.

- b) The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will require a grading permit and plan to control erosion, in conjunction with a building permit. Therefore, the grading will be done under permit and inspection by the San Joaquin County Community Development Department's Building Division. As a result, impacts to soil erosion or loss of topsoil is expected to be less than significant.
- c) As part of the project design process, a soils report will be required for grading and foundations and all recommendations from a soils report must be incorporated into the construction plans. As a result of these grading recommendations, which are required by the California Building Code (CBC), the project would not be susceptible to the effects of any potential lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction. Compliance with the CBC and the engineering recommendations in the site-specific soils report would ensure structural integrity in the event that seismic-related issues are experienced at the project site. Therefore, impacts associated with unstable geologic units are expected to be less than significant.
- d) The Soil Survey of San Joaquin County classifies the project site soil type as having a low expansion quotient. As a result, the effects of expansive soil on the project buildings are expected to be less than significant.
- e) The project will be served by an onsite septic system for the disposal of wastewater. 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. 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 systems 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. As a result, impacts to soils from wastewater are expected to be less than significant.
- f) The project area has not been determined to contain significant historic or prehistoric archeological artifacts that could be disturbed by project construction, therefore, damage to unique paleontological resources or sites or geologic features is 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
<u>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</u>					

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 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*.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. As such, the analysis herein is limited to discussion of long-term operational GHG emissions.

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.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Impact Discussion:

- a-c) Pursuant to the Hazardous Materials Disclosure Survey submitted with the application, there will be no storage of hazardous materials on site nor will hazardous materials be transported. Regulations related to the storage of hazardous materials require the owner/operator to report the use or storage of these hazardous materials to the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) and must comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the storage of hazardous materials. In this way, impacts related to the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant. Additionally, the nearest school is Houston Elementary School located 3 miles north of the project site and there are no schools planned within a one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore the facility will not impact an existing or planned school within one-quarter mile of the project site.
- d) The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database map, compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and, therefore, will not result in creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- e) The project site is not located within 2 miles of an airport or in an area with an airport land use plan. The nearest airport is Lodi Airport located 3 miles north of the project site. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to safety hazards or excessive noise.
- f) According to the County of San Joaquin Emergency Operations Plan, major transportation routes in the County, including I-5 and SR99, would be possible evacuation routes in the event of an emergency. The Project would not affect this route, and moreover, the Project would not affect the County's ability to implement its Emergency Operations Plan in the event of an emergency. The Project would not impede access to any public route that might be needed as an evacuation route. As a result, the Project will not have an impact on emergency response or evacuation activities.
- g) The project location 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 impact of wildfires on the 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
<u>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u>					
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The project's impact on hydrology and water is expected to be less than significant. The project, an Administrative Use Permit for a truck and farm equipment sales facility, will be served by a private onsite well and a private, onsite septic system. Construction of a well and sewage disposal system will be under permit and inspection by the Environmental Health Department to ensure that it complies with the well and onsite wastewater treatment systems standards of San Joaquin County.

For stormwater discharges associated with construction activity in the State of California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has adopted the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit) to avoid and minimize water quality impacts attributable to such activities. The Construction General Permit applies to all projects in which construction activity disturbs 1 acre or more of soil. Because land disturbance for this project will exceed one acre, the project applicant would be required to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit issued by the SWRCB prior to the start of construction. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include and specify water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to prevent

pollutants from contacting stormwater and keep all products of erosion from moving off site into receiving waters. Routine inspection of all BMPs is required under the provisions of the Construction General Permit, and the SWPPP must be prepared and implemented by qualified individuals as defined by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

During project operation, stormwater quality is regulated by the Stormwater Quality Control Criteria Plan (SWQCCP), which sets standards that apply to all new development. As part of the project, a new engineered stormwater drainage system would be designed and constructed to collect and treat all on-site stormwater in a method that meets the requirements of the SWQCCP.

In summary, project construction would be completed in accordance with an NPDES-mandated SWPPP, which would include standard BMPs to reduce potential off-site water quality impacts related to erosion and incidental spills and hazardous substances from equipment. Surface water runoff during project operations would be managed through an engineered stormwater drainage system, as required by the SWQCCP. Therefore, impacts associated with water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, and surface water or groundwater quality are expected to be less than significant.

- b) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. The project includes an onsite retention pond for storm water drainage sized appropriately and under permit from the Department of Public Works. Once constructed, it is anticipated that the pond will have a positive impact on groundwater supplies by providing a facility to recharge the area's groundwater supply. Therefore, with the stormwater system returning stormwater to the ground, the project's depletion of groundwater is expected to be less than significant.
- c) The construction of the proposed project would result in grading and soil-disturbing activities and the installation of new impervious surfaces. A grading permit will be required which requires plans and grading calculations, including a statement of the estimated quantities of excavation and fill, prepared by a Registered Design Professional. The grading plan must show the existing grade and finished grade in contour intervals of sufficient clarity to indicate the nature and extent of the work and show in detail that it complies with the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC). The plans must also show the existing grade on adjoining properties in sufficient detail to identify how grade changes will conform to the requirements of the CDC. A drainage plan must be submitted for review and approval, prior to release of a building permit. In this way, any impacts to the existing drainage pattern of the site will be less than significant.
- d) The flood zone information contained on the San Joaquin County Flood Information viewer is provided using the Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map data received from the US Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Pursuant to this information, the area containing the project site is not a flood zone area.

The project site is not located in a tsunami nor a seiche zone. With the requirements for building above the flood depth, the risk of release of pollutants due to inundation of the project site is expected to be less than significant.

- e) The applicant will apply for permits from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) to protect surface and groundwater on site and to ensure that the project doesn't conflict or obstruct a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. The project site is located outside of General Plan communities. The project does not propose a highway, roadway, bridge, storm channel, or any other physical barrier that would divide an established community or interfere with existing connectivity of areas of a community.
- b) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. These uses are permitted uses in the A-I (Agriculture Industrial) zone with an approved Administrative Use Permit therefore, the proposed uses will be consistent with all land use policies and regulations of the County Development Code and 2035 General Plan, therefore, the project's impact on the environment due to land use conflict is 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
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The proposed project, an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility, will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource 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 located in the designated MRZ-1 zone. The MRZ-1 zone is defined as areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. This zone is applied where well-developed lines of reasoning, based on economic-geologic principles and adequate data, indicate that the likelihood for occurrence of significant mineral deposits is nil or slight. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on the availability of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites within San Joaquin County 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
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility on a site that is adjacent to State Route 99. The site is located entirely within the 65dB noise contour of State Route 99 where noise levels exceed 65dB. The project will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise level and vibration associated with project construction activities to include grading and use of heavy machinery and equipment, however noise from the operation of the project will consist of occasional running of a truck engine for testing which will not exceed the sound level of traffic on adjacent State Route 99. Therefore, noise impacts from the proposed project and impacts on vibrations are expected to be less than significant.
- c) The project site is not located within 2 miles of an airport or in an area with an airport land use plan. The nearest airport is Lodi Airport located 3 miles north of the project site. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to safety hazards or excessive noise.

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The project will not induce substantial population growth in the area either directly or indirectly because the project is not anticipated to result in an increase in the number of jobs available. The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because no residences will be removed. Therefore, the project's impact on population and housing is 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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a) The project site is located in unincorporated San Joaquin County, 1.5 miles north of the City of Lodi and one mile south of the community of Acampo. The site is located in the Woodbridge Fire District, which provides fire, rescue, and emergency medical services to the rural communities of Woodbridge, Acampo, Lodi, Forest Lake, Flag City, and Tower Park. The district covers approximately 197 square miles and 500 nautical miles in the Delta and serves an approximate population of 15,000, with major highways including State Route 99, Interstate 5, and State Route 12. The district maintains 4 fire stations and staffs 4 engine companies through the staff of 1 chief, 1 administrative officer, 3 captains, 9 lieutenants, 5 firefighters, and 11 firefighter trainees. Annual calls average approximately 2,000.

Police protection services are provided to the project area by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office employs over 800 sworn and support personnel. The project site is located within the Lodi Unified School District. The District serves approximately 27,000 students in 50 schools. The site is near the recreation areas on Lodi Lake Park and the Woodbridge Wilderness Area. Additionally, the Mokelumne River is located 0.5 miles south of the project site.

The public service agencies listed above were provided with the project proposal and invited to respond with any project concerns or conditions. No agencies responded with conditions or concerns. Additionally, the project will not result in new employment or housing opportunities so an increase in the area residential population will not result from the project. Therefore, the project is not expected to have a significant impact on the ability of these service providers to maintain current levels of service and the project's impact on these services is 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
<u>XVI. RECREATION.</u>					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Impact Discussion:

a-b) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks, as it will not increase the number of residents or homes in the vicinity, and the project does not include recreational facilities. For these reasons, the project will not impact recreation opportunities.

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. San Joaquin County has determined the project will generate less than 110 automobile trips per day and, therefore, is considered a small project according to the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, as published by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in December 2018. According to this OPR guidance, a small project that generates or attracts "fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact" with regards to VMT.

The project is located adjacent to State Route 99 (SR99) and is accessed from N. State Route 99 E. Frontage Road. Both properties are next to the southbound SR99 off- and on-ramps. Driveway encroachment permits will be required from the Department of Public Works. If there is any work done in the Caltrans right-of-way, the applicant is required to apply for an encroachment permit from Caltrans. The project as designed 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 driveways will be required to be a minimum width of 25 feet which will provide adequate emergency access. As a result, the 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:

a) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. A referral was sent to the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), North Valley Yokuts Tribe, and the Buena Vista Rancheria for review related to potential Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR). Responses were received from the UAIC and the Buena Vista Rancheria stating that they had reviewed the project and had no objections but to always include measures for Inadvertent Discovery.

If any suspected TCR are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the find. A tribal representative from culturally affiliated tribes shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a TCR pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074. The tribal representative will make recommendations regarding the treatment of the discovery. Preservation in place is the preferred alternative under CEQA and UAIC protocols, and every effort must be made to preserve the resources in place, including through project redesign. Work at the discovery location cannot resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery under the requirements of CEQA, including AB 52, has been satisfied. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the lead agency to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary. This has been incorporated into the project's Conditions of Approval.

Additionally, if human remains are 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.

As a result of the Conditions of Approval for the inadvertent discovery of TCRs and meeting the existing Health and Safety Code regulations, the impact to tribal cultural resources is 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
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

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:

- a) The project is an Administrative Use Permit for a farm equipment and truck sales facility. The project proposes utilizing an onsite wastewater treatment system, an onsite private well, and a storm water detention basin. These onsite facilities will be constructed under permit from the Environmental Health Department and the Department of Public Works. Therefore, the project will be served by private, onsite services and will not require relocation of existing facilities or require new facilities.
- b) The project proposes an onsite private well to supply water for the site. Currently, the Central Valley/San Joaquin Valley Aquifer System can supply water to a small project such as this and the scale of the project will not cause a significant reduction in available ground water.
- c) The project will utilize an onsite sewage disposal system constructed under permit from the Environmental Health Department and subject to the onsite wastewater treatment system regulations that will comply with the standards of San Joaquin County.
- d-e) The project site is currently within the boundaries of Waste Management, one of five solid waste collectors providing service under franchise to San Joaquin County. The San Joaquin County Code requires that solid waste be collected from residential generators a minimum of once a week, and at least twice a week for commercial and industrial generators (San Joaquin County 2016a). Solid waste is transported and disposed of primarily at three active sanitary landfills in San Joaquin County. The North County Landfill on East Harney Lane has available capacity to 2048, and the Foothill Sanitary Landfill on North Waverly Road has available capacity to 2082 (CalRecycle 2021). The Forward Landfill on Austin Road near Stockton was to have reached its capacity in 2020; however, the County Board of Supervisors recently approved an expansion of Forward Landfill that would extend its life to 2036 (Crunden 2020). California Senate Bill 1383 (SB 1383) requires jurisdictions in California to recycle organic waste, including paper, cardboard, yard materials, food scraps, and food-soiled paper with a goal of diverting 75% of organics from reaching

the landfill by 2025. San Joaquin County passed SB 1383 Organic Waste Diversion Ordinance in February of 2022 mandating that business must comply with SB 1383 mandates by 1) subscribing to a SB 1383 compliant waste collection system through a licensed collector; 2) qualifying for a waiver or; 3) utilizing acceptable alternative compliance methods. In this way, the project is expected to be in compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>XX. WILDFIRE.</u>					
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The project location is located 1.5 miles north of the City of Lodi, CA, adjacent to State Route 99, the community of Acampo. The project site is in an area of local responsibility. Additionally, the area of the project site is not classified as a fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, the project's impact on emergency response plans is expected to be less than significant. The site is primarily flat and farmed therefore, the project has no factors likely to exacerbate a wildfire. Development of the project will require observance of regulations of the California Fire Code which may require onsite water storage for fire protection which will be determined at the time of building plan submittal.

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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.

PA-2100079 (AUP) - Initial Study

