



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- 1) Project Title:** MINOR DISCRETIONARY PERMIT 2026-06
- 2) Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Turlock
156 South Broadway, Ste. 120
Turlock, CA 95380
- 3) Contact Person and Phone Number:** Tania Hernandez – Assistant Planner
(209) 668-5640
- 4) Project Location:** 1231 S. Kilroy Road (Stanislaus County APN: 044-010-010)
- 5) Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Northstar Propertiiz
17314 Polaris Ct
Lathrop, CA 95330
- 6) General Plan Designation:** Industrial (I)
- 7) Zoning:** Industrial (I)

8) Description of the Project:

The applicant is requesting to develop a 6.79-acre parcel as a truck parking facility for semi-trucks and trailers in two (2) phases located at 1231 South Kilroy Road (Stanislaus County APN: 044-010-010).

Phase 1 will include demolition of existing barns and construction of 116 truck and trailer parking stalls, an 8,800-square-foot truck repair shop with an adjacent 400-square-foot office, a 30-foot-long open wash bay, and 18 personal automobile parking stalls. Frontage improvements including curb, gutter, and sidewalk will be constructed along South Kilroy Road. On-site paving, landscaping, security lighting, storm pond, and perimeter fencing will be constructed.



Phase 2 will include the conversion of the existing single-family residence to an extra office for the facility.

9) Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

The property to the north is zoned Industrial (I) and is developed with a truck parking lot for semi-trucks and trailers. The property to the west is zoned Industrial (I) and has an abandoned residence and row crops. The properties to the south are zoned Industrial (I) and one has a horse ranch. The other has no residence and only has row crops onsite. The City of Turlock's storm drain basin, waste water treatment plant and other City properties are located to the east.



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

10) Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement).

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

11) 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.?

The Yokuts tribe was contacted in writing on May 28, 2026, with the project description, and subsequently on August 11, 2026, with a revised description as part of the Early Public Consultation process. Consultation has not been requested by the Yokuts tribes for this project.

12) EARLIER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. [Section 15183]

a) Earlier analyses used. (Available for review at the City of Turlock – Development Services, 156 S. Broadway, Suite 120, Turlock, CA).

City of Turlock General Plan, 2012 (City Council Resolution No. 2012-173)
Turlock General Plan – EIR, 2012 (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2012-156)
City of Turlock, Housing Element, Certified in 2016
City of Turlock, Waste Water Master Plan Update, 2003 (updated 2009)
Turlock Parks Master Plan, 1995 (Reviewed in 2003)
City of Turlock, Waste Water Master Plan, 1991 (Updated 2014)
City of Turlock, Storm Water Master Plan, 2013 (Adopted 2016)
City of Turlock, Urban Water Management Plan, 2010 (Adopted 2011)
City of Turlock, Sewer System Master Plan, 2013
Turlock Municipal Code
City of Turlock Capital Facilities Fee Nexus Study (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2013-202)
Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017)
Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006)
Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007; September 2017)

b) Impacts adequately addressed. (Effects from the checklist below, were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed during an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis).

As identified in the Turlock General Plan EIR and the Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) MEIR & Addendum, development in the project area would result in significant, and unavoidable, impacts in the areas of transportation/traffic, regional air quality, and the eventual loss of agricultural land and soil resources. The magnitude of these impacts can be reduced, but not eliminated, by applying the policies, programs and mitigation measures identified in the Turlock General Plan and the WISP to the project and identifying mitigation measures as necessary in this initial study. The intensity of the proposed development will result in project level impacts that are equal to or of lesser severity than those anticipated in the General Plan EIR and the WISP EIR and Addendum, and they would not be different from cumulative effects anticipated by the Turlock General Plan EIR and WISP EIR and Addendum. Potential secondary environmental impacts from the project will be of equal or lesser severity than those identified in the General Plan EIR and WISP EIR and Addendum. Therefore, mitigation measures identified in the General Plan



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

EIR and the WISP EIR and Addendum, and their respective Statements of Overriding Considerations (contained in Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2012-156), are adequate to mitigate the impacts from the proposed project where feasible, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

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

Project level impacts will be mitigated by application of mitigation measures identified in this initial study, and by appropriate conditions of approval. All cumulative environmental effects related to the ultimate development of the project area will be mitigated through compliance with the policies, standards, and mitigation measures of the Turlock General Plan and General Plan MEA/EIR, the WISP MEIR and Addendum as well as the standards of the Turlock Municipal Code, and are herein incorporated by reference where not specifically identified.

The project is not located on a site which is included in one or more Hazardous Waste and Substance Site Lists, compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5.

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. However, these impacts would result in a less than significant impact on the environment by incorporating appropriate mitigation measures.

X	Aesthetics	X	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	X	Public Services
X	Agricultural and Forestry Resources		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Recreation
X	Air Quality	X	Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation/Traffic
X	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Tribal Cultural Resources
X	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
X	Energy	X	Noise		Wildfire
X	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		Mandatory Findings of Significance

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS: Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080(c)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(1), the City of Turlock, as lead agency for the proposed project, has prepared an initial study to make the following findings:



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080(c)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c)(1), the City of Turlock, as lead agency for the proposed project, has prepared an initial study to make the following findings:

1. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the proposed activity is adequately described and is within the scope of the General Plan EIR and the WISP MEIR and Addendum.
2. All feasible mitigation measures developed in the General Plan EIR and WISP EIR and Addendum have been incorporated into the project.
3. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c)(2) and 21157.5, the initial study prepared for the proposed project has identified potential new or significant effects that were not adequately analyzed in the General Plan EIR or WISP EIR and Addendum, but feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated to revise the proposed subsequent project to avoid or mitigate the identified effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur.
4. There is no substantial evidence before the lead agency that the subsequent project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment.
5. The analyses of cumulative impacts, growth inducing impacts, and irreversible significant effects on the environment contained in the General Plan EIR and WISP EIR and Addendum are adequate for this subsequent project.
6. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, a Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for the General Plan EIR (City Council Resolution 2012-156). As identified in the Turlock General Plan EIR, development in the project area would result in significant, and unavoidable, impacts in the areas of noise, regional air quality, and the eventual loss of agricultural land. The magnitude of these impacts can be reduced, but not eliminated by the mitigation measures referenced in the initial study prepared for this project and General Plan EIR. Therefore, mitigation measures identified in the General Plan EIR, and its respective Statements of Overriding Considerations, are adequate to mitigate the impacts from the proposed project where feasible, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Pursuant to Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines the lead agency prepared an addendum to a previously certified Environmental Impact Report if some changes or additions to the project are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 have occurred.

7. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21157.6(b), having reviewed the General Plan EIR and Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR, the City of Turlock finds and determines that:
 - a. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the General Plan EIR and WISP MEIR were certified, and
 - b. That there is no new available information which was not and could not have been known at the time the General Plan EIR and WISP MEIR were certified.
8. Whereas, on September 2017, the City of Turlock adopted minor changes, deletions, and additions to the project described in the Final Master Environmental Impact Report for the Westside Industrial Specific Plan and certified an Addendum to the Final EIR demonstrating that the preparation of a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was not required, pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Environmental Quality Act, because none of the following findings could be made:
 - (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

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.	X
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 "potential 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 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.	

Tania Hernandez, Assistant Planner

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less 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 Section 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis 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 that 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 analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Aesthetics – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
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 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?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		
Response: a) The General Plan recognizes the relatively flat topography of Turlock results in few scenic vistas and notes that brief panoramic views of surrounding farmland are visible from highway overpasses on the City's boundary and at its agricultural edge. There are no scenic vistas located within the project area. The project would convert an underdeveloped property designated for Industrial (I) development to urban uses, impacting the existing visual character or quality of the vacant site. However, this is considered a less than significant impact as the magnitude of this impact is no greater than the anticipated urban development for the area under the Turlock General Plan. Pursuant to CEQA §15162, the project will not create any adverse aesthetic impacts that warrant additional environmental documentation over and above the impacts addressed in the Turlock Area General Plan MEA/EIR and the Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) and Addendum. (General Plan EIR pg. 3.7-1, 3.7-7, 3.7-9, WISP pgs. 3.1, 3.4)				
b) There are no scenic or historic resources on the project site. There is an 1,800 square foot residence currently on the property. There is currently residential landscaping but no other distinctive natural or historic resources. There are currently no highways in the General Plan study area eligible or officially designated as scenic highways by The Master Plan of State Highways Eligible for Official Scenic Highway Designation. (General Plan EIR pr. 3.7-1, WISP EIR pgs. 3-1 through 3-5)				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

c) The 6.79-acre property currently has an 1,800 square foot home and associated accessory structures. The properties to the north, east, and west are developed with industrial/light industrial uses. The properties to the south are zoned for industrial use but one currently contains an equine ranch with a small residence and accessory buildings, and the other one contains row crops. The WISP notes that the existing visual character of agricultural fields and orchards will be replaced with urban development, including business, industrial, and commercial uses that will be different in character from current agricultural uses. The WISP requires landscaping and architectural standards for many uses in the commercial and industrial use areas. These standards are required as part of the conditions of approval for this project which will result in an attractively landscaped road and project site. These standards and policies contained in the Turlock General Plan and WISP specifically improve the visual character throughout the city and are designed to minimize any negative impacts on visual character from proposed projects. The project will not conflict with the applicable zoning designation or other regulations regarding scenic quality. (*Design Guidelines* pgs. 32-42, *WISP* pgs. 4-35 through 4-47, *WISP EIR* pg.3-4)

d) The WISP recognizes that proposed development in the agricultural open space areas will constitute new sources of light and glare. The development of the project site will produce additional light and glare from required on-site security lighting. Given that the areas proposed for new development in the WISP area are contiguous with existing development, some nighttime light and glare already exist in the area. The impact of light and glare from the proposed project can be minimized by incorporating design features and operating requirements that limit light and glare on-site. (*General Plan EIR* pg. 3.7-11, *WISP* pgs. 4-35 through 4-47, *WISP EIR* pgs. 3-4 through 3-5)

Sources: *City of Turlock, General Plan and MEIR, 2012; City Design Element, 2012; City of Turlock, Standard Specifications, Section 18; City of Turlock Beautification Master Plan, 2003; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)*

Mitigation:

1. AV-2.1 All lighting fixtures must be shielded to confine light spread within the site boundaries.
2. AV-2.2 Building illumination and architectural lighting shall be indirect. Floodlights are prohibited.
3. AV-2.3 Light standards for parking areas shall not exceed thirty (30') feet in height.
4. AV-2.4 Security lighting fixtures shall not project above the fascia or roofline of the building and are to be shielded. The shields shall be painted to match the surface to which they are attached.
5. AV-2.5 Provide minimal street lighting to meet safety standards and provide direction.
6. AV-2.6 Lights shall be placed to direct and control glare. Obtrusive light, light trespass, and poorly directed up-lighting shall not be permitted.
7. AV-2.7 Lighting sources shall be thoughtfully located and shall have cut-off lenses to avoid light spillage and glare on adjacent properties.
8. AV-2.8 Provide directional shielding for street and parking lot lighting.
9. AV-2.9 Automatic shutoff or motion sensors shall be used for lighting to be used intermittently or for safety purposes.



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. 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 Department 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 states 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, Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources agency, to non-agricultural use?		X		
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use of a Williamson Act contract?				X
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))				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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?			X	
Response: a) The project is proposed to be developed on property designated as "Vacant or Disturbed Land" on the 2022 Stanislaus County Important Farmland Map as compiled by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. This farmland type consists of open field areas that do not qualify for an agricultural category, mineral and oil extraction areas, and rural freeway interchanges. Some properties in the surrounding project area remain in agricultural production. The WISP allows agricultural activity to continue on lands designated for urban use, until urban development is imminent. The project site is currently underdeveloped with an approximately 1,800 square foot home, related accessory buildings, and residential landscaping; however, no agricultural uses are currently active on the property, therefore the project will not be converting prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. (WISP pg. 3-3, WISP EIR pgs. 4-11 through 4-13)				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

b) The property is not enrolled in Williamson Act contracts or adjacent to any properties that are enrolled in the Williamson Act. The site is zoned for urbanized uses and will not conflict with any agricultural zoning districts or land held in Williamson Act Contract. (*General Plan pg. 7-10, General Plan EIR pg. 3.1-3, WISP EIR pg. 4-12*)

c), d) The project site is located within the City of Turlock in an area designated for urban uses and development. There are no forest lands or timberlands within the City of Turlock.

e) The site is currently designated for industrial uses. The surrounding properties to the north, east, and west have been developed with industrial use. The properties to the south are zoned for industrial use and one is currently underdeveloped with a ranchette, associated out buildings, and the other one has row crops. Development of the site will not involve changes in the existing environment which will result in conversion of farmland or forest land. (*WISP pg. 3-3, WISP EIR pgs. 4-11 through 4-13*)

Sources: CA Dept. of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2016: City of Turlock, General Plan, Land Use Element, 2012; City of Turlock, General Plan EIR, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)

Mitigation:

1. AG-1.1 Agricultural activity will be allowed to continue as a permitted by right use on lands designated for urban use.
2. AG-3.3 Right-to-farm disclosure notices shall be recorded on the title of all new development in the WISP.
3. AG-3.4 The property shall be graded so that finished grading elevations are at least six (6) inches higher than irrigated ground. A protective berm shall be installed to prevent irrigation water from reaching non-irrigated properties. Stub-end streets adjoining irrigated ground must have a berm installed at least 12-inches above the finished grade of the irrigated area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Air Quality - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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?		X		
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?		X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)		X		
Response: a), b), c) The project will not conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the 2007 PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan, the 2016 Ozone Plan, or the 2012 and 2015 PM_{2.5} Plan or related subsequent progress reports of these plans. SJVAPCD has established thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ & PM_{2.5} emissions. The project will be subject to San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) rules and regulations designed to control criteria pollutants, such as Rule 9510, Rule 4002, Rule 4601, and Regulation VIII. The project is required to obtain these permits to construct and operate. As such, the project is not expected to cause a conflict with, or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. Based on the CalEEMod 2022.1.1.45 air quality impact analysis run on August 19, 2026, the project is located in an urbanized area surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential uses with wind speeds 3.1 m/s, and 29 days precipitation frequency. When the construction emissions and operational emissions were calculated in the CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45 models, it was found that emissions would not exceed the established Air Quality Thresholds of Significance for both Construction and Operational Emissions for ROG (10 tons per year), NO_x (10 tpy), PM₁₀ (15 tpy) & PM_{2.5} (15 tpy) emissions. The construction emissions and operational emissions calculated in the CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45 models, will not exceeded 5 tons per year for each of the established thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ & PM_{2.5}. <u>Overall Construction Emissions</u> CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45 2026: ROG 0.06395 tpy, NO_x 0.57050 tpy, CO 0.61312 tpy, SO₂ 0.00100 tpy, PM₁₀ 0.20660 tpy and PM_{2.5} 0.10844 tpy. 2027: ROG 0.19663 tpy, NO_x 1.10484 tpy, CO 1.54125 tpy, SO₂ 0.00273 tpy, PM₁₀ 0.04588 tpy and PM_{2.5} 0.03808 tpy. <u>Overall Operational Emissions</u> CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45 2027: ROG 0.13456 tpy, NO_x 0.25275 tpy, CO 0.87101 tpy, SO₂ 0.00211 tpy, PM₁₀ 0.16603 tpy and PM_{2.5} 0.04668 tpy. CalEEMod quantifies sulfur oxide emissions as sulfur dioxide (SO₂); therefore, SO₂ emissions are used as a surrogate for comparison with the SJVAPCD SO_x significance threshold. SO_x is a general term for sulfur-containing oxides primarily SO₂ and, to a lesser extent, SO₃. In addition, the letter received from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, dated June 8, 2026, stated that based on the information provided to the District, project-specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the following SJVAPCD significance thresholds: 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of sulfur (SO_x), 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM₁₀), or 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM_{2.5}). Therefore, the District concluded that the Project would have a less-than-significant impact on air quality relative to these annual criteria pollutant emissions significance thresholds. To ensure compliance with District standards the mitigation measures identified below will				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

be incorporated as conditions of approval for the project.

A variety of toxic air contaminants (TACs) are of environmental concern. The California Air Resources Board's (CARB) *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* provides recommended setback distances for sensitive land uses from major sources of TACs such as gas stations, freeways and high traffic roads, distribution centers and dry cleaners. The SJVAPCD defines sensitive receptors "*people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling unit(s).*" The truck parking project is not a sensitive receptor and does not involve siting a new sensitive receptor within any recommended setback distance of any existing source of TACs. Additionally, the truck parking project does not fall into the CARB category of a major source of TACs, and therefore would not expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions.

The CARB also identifies diesel particulate matter (DPM) from diesel-fueled engines as a TAC. High volume freeways, stationary diesel engines, and facilities attracting heavy and constant heavy diesel semi-truck traffic, such as distribution centers, are identified as having the highest associated health risks for DPM. The CARB handbook identifies significant sources of DPM as land uses accommodating 100 heavy diesel semi-trucks per day. The proposed truck parking lot is passive in nature and would generate 50-60 heavy diesel semi-trucks to the property daily. As such the proposed truck parking lot would not generate a substantial amount of DPM per the CARB handbook. Based on the consideration above, the truck parking lot with a repair shop would not cause sensitive receptors to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The project will not violate any air quality standards, result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Compliance with the General Plan policies and standards, and the SJVAPCD Rules and Regulations is expected to reduce the project impacts; however, the Turlock General Plan EIR found that there would be significant and unavoidable air quality impacts even with implementation of these measures. A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been adopted as part of that process.

Furthermore, the City of Turlock adopted an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Element demonstrating that the General Plan would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Compliance with the State's greenhouse gas emissions targets for 2030 relied on the adoption of the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). StanCOG's SCS has been adopted and was approved by the California Air Resources Board. Additionally, StanCOG has found that the City of Turlock's General Plan complies with the SCS. This project is consistent with the General Plan; therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions. (*General Plan pgs. 8-1 through 8-37, CARB Handbook pgs. 1-7*)



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- d) The truck parking facility with a minor repair shop is an infill project proposed to be constructed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use. The project site is located in an area surrounded by a mix of industrial, light industrial, commercial, and agricultural uses. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's letter dated June 8, 2026, concluded that the Project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the District significance thresholds. The proposed development is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to increased pollutants. The project may produce odors during the construction phase; however, these impacts are short-term in nature and are anticipated to be of a less-than-significant impact. During operation, the truck parking facility and minor repair shop may generate odors associated with diesel vehicles and truck maintenance; however, these activities are consistent with the site's industrial zoning and the surrounding land uses. Given the project's location and the limited nature of the proposed repair activities, operational odors are not expected to adversely affect a substantial number of people. (General Plan EIR pg. 3.4-41, WISP EIR pgs. 1-15 through 1-20)

Sources: San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District 2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard, 2010 PM-10 Maintenance Plan, 2012 and 2015 PM-2.5 Plan; SJVAPCD's Guide For Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (revised March 19, 2015); Turlock General Plan EIR, 2012, Turlock General Plan, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Element Section, 2012; Statement of Overriding Considerations (Turlock City Council Resolution 2012-156); SJVUAPCD (June 2005) Air Quality Guidelines for General Plans; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); MDP 2026-06 (1231 S. Kilroy Road – truck parking) CalEEMod Air Quality Analysis report dated August 19, 2026, available upon request; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated June 8, 2026



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Mitigation:

- 1. The applicant shall comply with all applicable San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations.**
- 2. WISP 6.8-a, AQ-2.15 Comply with the SJVAPCD Compliance Assistance Bulletin for Fugitive Dust Control.**
- 3. AQ-1.3 Submit development proposals to the SJVAPCD for review and comment prior to decision.**
- 4. AQ-2.17 Construction activity plans shall include and/or provide for a dust management plan to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard.**
- 5. AQ-2.18 Soils stabilization is required at all construction sites after normal working hours and on weekends and holidays, as well as on inactive construction areas during phased construction. Methods include short-term water spraying, and long-term dust suppressants and vegetative cover.**
- 6. AQ-2.19 Construction equipment shall be equipped with particulate filters and/or catalysts, or proof shall be provided as to why it is infeasible.**
- 7. AQ-2.20 Diesel engines shall be shut off while not in use to reduce emissions from idling. Minimize idling time of all other equipment to 10 minutes maximum.**
- 8. AQ-2.21 Sandbags, or other erosion control measures, shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from construction sites with a slope greater than one percent (1%).**
- 9. AQ-2.22 Wheels on all trucks and other equipment shall be washed prior to leaving the construction site.**
- 10. AQ-2.23 Wind breaks shall be installed at windward sides of construction areas.**
- 11. AQ-2.24 Excavation and grading activities shall be suspended when winds exceed 20 mph.**
- 12. AQ-2.25 Limit areas subject to excavation, grading and other construction activities to the minimum required at any one time.**
- 13. AQ-2.26 Limit and expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours.**
- 14. AQ-2.27 Use alternative fuel construction equipment, where feasible.**
- 15. AQ-2.28 Construction activities shall be curtailed during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations.**



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. Biological Resources - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Wildlife Service?				X
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?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Response:

- a) The General Plan states that the Study Area contains mostly human-modified habitats, with almost all the land being urban (52%) or under agricultural production (46%). The General Plan further states that development proposed under the General Plan would be situated on infill sites or land contiguous to existing development. The truck parking facility with a minor repair shop is proposed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial (I) use. Surrounding properties are under agricultural production and/or industrial use. The proposed project would not have any direct effects on species, riparian habitat, wetlands, nor would it interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish, conflict with policies protecting biological resources or the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. Virtually all of the land within the urban boundaries of Turlock, as well as unincorporated land within the City's Sphere of Influence, have been modified from its native state, primarily converted into urban or agricultural production. The site has been actively cleared for many years.

The California Natural Diversity Database has identified two special-status species within the General Plan Study area, the Swainson's Hawk and the Hoary bat. While the General Plan Study Area does not contain land that is typical for the Hawk's breeding and nesting, it is presumed to be present and mitigation measures have been incorporated to address any potential impacts. The proposed project site is vacant and there are no trees on the property that offer nesting habitat for Swainson's Hawk. The Hoary bat is not listed as a Species of Special Concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife but it is monitored in the CNDDB. The subject site is out of the area in which the Hoary bat is presumed to be present. Due to the property's proximity to urban development, the property has little habitat value for these species. Mitigation measures identified in the General Plan EIR and the WISP EIR, have been added to the project to reduce the impacts of the project to a less than significant level. The General Plan concludes that potential impacts on biological resources would be reduced to less than significant through implementation of General Plan policies, as well as regional, State, and federal regulations. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.9-1 through 3.9-14, WISP EIR pgs. 1-21 through 1-22*)

- b) There are no rivers, lakes or streams located within the City of Turlock. There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities within the WISP area. There are no irrigation facilities, such as canals, located on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on riparian habitats or species. (*General Plan EIR pg. 3.9-13, WISP EIR pgs. 1-21 through 1-22*)

- c) The General Plan EIR and WISP EIR identifies the federally protected wetlands located within the City of Turlock and the surrounding Study Area. These areas are not identified on the subject property. (*General Plan EIR pg. 3.9-13, WISP EIR pgs. 1-21 through 1-22*)

- d) The project is located within the City of Turlock. No migratory wildlife corridors have been designated on, near or through the project site; therefore, the project would not impede the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The General Plan and WISP identify mitigation measures that will be incorporated in to the project requiring the investigation of the existence of any wildlife nursery sites on the project site. (*General Plan EIR pg. 3.9-13, WISP EIR pgs. 1-21 through 1-22*)

- e) There are no trees or other natural features on the property that offer habitat opportunities except the land itself which could potentially offer foraging habitat for Swainson's Hawk. The property currently has an 1,800 square foot ranchette onsite; however, no agricultural activity has occurred on the property in a number of years. See "a" above for mitigation measures.



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- f) There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local or regional conservation plan that encompasses the project site. (General Plan EIR pg. 3.9-14, WISP EIR pgs. 1-21 through 1-22)

Sources: California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife: Natural Diversity Data Base; California Native Plant Protection Act; U.S. Dept. of Agriculture: Land Capability Classification Maps; California Dept. of Conservation: Important Farmlands Maps & Monitoring Program; Stanislaus County Williamson Act Contract Maps; Turlock General Plan, Conservation Element, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); US Fish and Wildlife Service – Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, 1998

Mitigation:

1. GP Policy 7.4-e, 7.4-f, B-1.1 (WISP MEIR) If ground disturbing activities, such as grading, occurs during the typical nesting season for songbirds and raptors, February through mid-September, the developer is required to have a qualified biologist conduct a survey of the site no more than 10 days prior to the start of disturbance activities. If nests are found, no-disturbance buffers around active nests shall be established as follows until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist determines that the birds have fledged and are no longer on the nest for survival: 250 feet for non-listed bird species; 500 feet for migratory bird species; and one-half mile for listed species and fully protected species.
2. GP Policy 7.4-e, 7.4-f; B-1.1 (WISP MEIR) If Swainson's Hawks are found foraging on the site prior to or during construction, the applicant shall consult a qualified biologist for recommended proper action, and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures. Mitigation may include, but are not limited to: establishing a one-half mile buffer around the nest until the breeding season has ended or until a qualified biologist determines that the birds have fledged and are no longer dependent on the nest for survival. Mitigating habitat loss within a 10-mile radius of known nest sites as follows: providing a minimum of one acre of habitat management land or each acre of development for projects within one mile of an active nest tree; provide a minimum of .75 acres of habitat management land for each acre of development for projects within between one and five miles of an active nest tree; provide a minimum of .5 acres of habitat management land for each acre of development for projects within between five and 10 miles of an active nest tree.
3. WISP MEIR B-1.2, B-4.1 The project proponent shall satisfy applicable U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA), California Endangered Species Act (CESA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and other applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulation provisions through consultations with the Permitting Agencies and local planning agencies, and incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Cultural Resources - Would the project:				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Response:

a) The proposed truck parking lot is an infill project proposed to be constructed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for industrial uses. The property has an 1,800 square foot residence and had been in agricultural use in prior years. The project would not alter or destroy any historical site, building, structure, or object, nor would it alter or affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict religious or sacred uses. The City has conducted a Cultural Survey as part of the preparation of the update to the present Turlock General Plan and the MEIR for the Westside Industrial Specific Plan. The Central California Information Center at California State University Stanislaus conducted a records search for the WISP MEIR cultural resources study. No previously recorded Native American archeological resources were found within the WISP Study Area. The City of Turlock consulted with California Native American tribes as required under SB 18 when developing the General Plan EIR. The only site of historic significance within the WISP area is a segment of the Tidewater Southern Railroad south of West Main, approximately .5-mile west of the project site. The closest historic resource identified in the General Plan EIR, the Turlock Assembly Center, is located approximately 1½ -miles away.

The Yokuts tribe was contacted in writing on May 28, 2026, with the project description as part of the Early Public Consultation process. Consultation has not been requested by the Yokuts tribes for this project. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.8-4, 3.8-5, 3.8-12, 3.8-13, WISP EIR pgs. 1-23 through 1-24*)

b) and c) The proposed truck parking facility and repair shop project is proposed to be constructed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for industrial use. The property has an 1,800 square foot home onsite and had been in agricultural use in prior years. The project would not alter or destroy any historic archaeological site, building, structure, or object, nor would it alter or affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict religious or sacred uses. The City of Turlock consulted with California Native American tribes as required under SB 18 when developing the General Plan EIR. The closest historic resource identified in the General Plan EIR, the Turlock Assembly Center, is located approximately 1½-miles away. In addition, the City has conducted a Cultural Records Search as part of the Turlock General Plan and found no evidence of significant historic or cultural resources on or near this site. There are no known sites of unique prehistoric or ethnic cultural value. Mitigation measures have been added in the event anything is discovered during construction. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.8-4, 3.8-5, 3.8-12, 3.8-13, WISP EIR pgs. 1-23 through 1-24*)

Sources: *Turlock General Plan, Conservation Element, 2012; City of Turlock General Plan EIR, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); Cultural Resources Records Search, 2008*

Mitigation:

1. WISP MEIR C-1.1 The one previously recorded historic site within the WISP Study Area, a



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

segment of the Tidewater Southern Railway, shall be protected in compliance with State guidelines listed above in Section 7.3.2. Protection measures may include, but are not limited to: planning construction to avoid the resource; incorporation of the site within parks or other open space; or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement.

2. GP Policy 7.5a, 7.5c; WISP MEIR C-1.2, C-1.3 In accordance with State Law, if potentially significant cultural, archaeological, or Native American resources are discovered during construction, work shall halt in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find, and, if necessary develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with Stanislaus County, Native American tribes, and other appropriate agencies and interested parties.
3. C-2.1 If previously unrecorded archaeological resources, as defined by State Law are discovered, construction activities shall be suspended and a qualified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American shall be called to evaluate the find and to recommend proper action.
4. GP Policy 7.5a, 7.5c; C-3.1 If human remains are discovered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required and if the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?		X		
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Response:

- a) and b) The truck parking facility is proposed on a 6.79-acre underdeveloped property surrounded by industrial and agricultural uses. The construction phase of the proposed project is temporary in nature and will not exceed any air emission thresholds during construction. The project will comply with construction best management practices and may be required to complete a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as part of construction and operational permits. Once completed the truck parking facility will be mostly passive in nature and will not use an excessive amount of energy. The new truck parking lot will have access to existing electrical services for onsite security lighting. No new transportation, electrical or telecommunication facilities are required to support the project leading to unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Compliance with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District standards during construction and operation of the project will further ensure the efficient consumption of energy resources. (General Plan EIR pgs.3.5-16; WISP EIR pg. 1-17)

Sources: Turlock General Plan, Conservation Element, Air Quality & Greenhouse Gases Element, 2012; City of Turlock General Plan EIR, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); California Building Standards Code; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Mitigation:

1. AQ-2.12 Employ energy efficient design, including automated control systems for heating/air conditioning and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements, lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting in buildings, increased insulation beyond Title 24 requirements, and light-colored roof material to reflect heat.
2. The applicant shall comply with all applicable San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations.
3. The project shall comply with the California Green Building Code Standards (CBC), requirements regulating energy efficiency.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Geology and Soils - Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X		
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
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?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Response:

a) **Several geologic hazards have a low potential to occur within the Turlock General Plan study area. The greatest seismic hazard identified in the Turlock General Plan EIR is posed by ground shaking from earthquakes originating outside of the area. While no specific liquefaction hazard is located within the Turlock General Plan study area, the potential for liquefaction is recognized throughout the San Joaquin Valley. The risk to people and structures was identified as a less than significant impact addressed through compliance with the California Building Codes. There are no known active surface fault ruptures located within or adjacent to the WISP area. The property is flat and is not located adjacent to areas subject to landslides. In addition, the City enforces the provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones Act that limits development in areas identified as having special seismic hazards. (General Plan pgs. 10-9 through 10-14, General Plan EIR pgs. 3.10-13 through 3.10-16, WISP EIR pgs. 1-25 through 1-26)**

b) and c) **The General Plan EIR notes that because the City of Turlock is relatively flat and has no natural waterways, the risk of soil erosion due to water is relatively low. Erosion hazards are highest during construction. Chapter 7-4 of the Turlock Municipal Code requires all construction activities to include engineering practices for erosion control. Furthermore, future development projects are required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit requirements. Project applicants are required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) and comply with the City's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permit (MS4) to minimize the discharge of pollutants during and post-construction. Compliance with existing policies and programs will reduce this impact to less than significant levels. (General Plan pgs. 10-9 through 10-14, General Plan EIR pgs. 3.10-13 through 3.10-16, WISP EIR pgs. 1-25 through 1-26)**



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

d) Less than one percent of the soils located in the General Plan study area are considered to have moderate potential for expansion. The Turlock Municipal Code requires building permit applications to include a preliminary soil management report for new development projects to determine appropriate permitting requirements, if necessary. (*General Plan* pgs. 10-9 through 10-14, *General Plan EIR* pgs. 3.10-13 through 3.10-16, *WISP EIR* pgs. 1-25 through 1-26)

e) The nature of the proposed truck parking lot does not require septic installation or alternative waste water disposal systems. Therefore, there will be no impact.

f) The proposed truck parking lot is an infill project proposed to be constructed on an underdeveloped 6.79-acre parcel zoned for industrial use and located in an area surrounded by a mix of industrial, light industrial, and agricultural uses. As a result of many years of extensive agricultural production, virtually all of the land in the City of Turlock has been previously altered from its native state. The Central California Information Center has no data on file pertaining to paleontological resources in the Study Area; while a paleontological resource or unique geologic feature is unlikely, in the event a previously unknown resource is encountered, construction shall be suspended and a professional consulted for evaluation.

(*General Plan* pgs. 7-28, *General Plan EIR* pgs. 3.8-13 through 3.8-15 and 3.10-16, *WISP EIR* pgs. 1-24)

Sources: *California Uniform Building Code*; *City of Turlock, Standard Specifications, Grading Practices*; *City of Turlock Municipal Code, Title 8, (Building Regulations)*; *City of Turlock, General Plan, Safety Element, 2012*; *Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017)*; *Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006)*; *Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)*

Mitigation:

1. GP Policy 10.2-h; GSS-3.1, GSS-3.2, GSS-3.3, GSS-4.1 (WISP MEIR) The project shall comply with the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting requirements by providing a grading and erosion control plan, including but not limited to the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
2. GSS-2.1 WISP MEIR Comply with the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) and California Uniform Building Code (CUBC) requirements for Seismic Zone 3, which stipulates building structural material and reinforcement.
3. GSS-2.2 Comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 19100 et seq (Earthquake Protection Law), which requires that buildings be designed to resist stresses produced by natural forces caused earthquakes and wind.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Response:

a), b) The proposed truck parking lot is an infill project proposed to be constructed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for industrial use. Once constructed the project will be relatively passive in nature. Construction-related production of GHGs would be temporary and are summarized below.

Based on the CalEEMod 2022.1.1.45 air quality impact analysis run on August 19, 2026, the project is located in an urbanized area surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential uses with wind speeds 3.1 m/s, and 29 days precipitation frequency. When the construction emissions and operational emissions were calculated in the CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45 models, it was found that emissions would not exceed the established Air Quality Thresholds of Significance for both Construction and Operational Emissions for ROG (10 tons per year), NO_x (10 tpy), PM₁₀ (15 tpy) & PM_{2.5} (15 tpy) emissions. The construction emissions and operational emissions calculated in the CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45 models, will not exceeded 5 tons per year for each of the established thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀ & PM_{2.5}.

Overall Construction Emissions

CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45

2026: ROG 0.06395 tpy, NO_x 0.57050 tpy, CO 0.61312 tpy, SO₂ 0.00100 tpy, PM₁₀ 0.20660 tpy and PM_{2.5} 0.10844 tpy.

2027: ROG 0.19663 tpy, NO_x 1.10484 tpy, CO 1.54125 tpy, SO₂ 0.00273 tpy, PM₁₀ 0.04588 tpy and PM_{2.5} 0.03808 tpy.

Overall Operational Emissions

CalEEMOD 2022.1.1.45

2027: ROG 0.13456 tpy, NO_x 0.25275 tpy, CO 0.87101 tpy, SO₂ 0.00211 tpy, PM₁₀ 0.16603 tpy and PM_{2.5} 0.04668 tpy.

CalEEMod quantifies sulfur oxide emissions as sulfur dioxide (SO₂); therefore, SO₂ emissions are used as a surrogate for comparison with the SJVAPCD SO_x significance threshold.

In addition, the letter received from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, dated June 8, 2026, stated that based on the information provided to the District, project-specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the following SJVAPCD significance thresholds: 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of sulfur (SO_x), 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM₁₀), or 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM_{2.5}). Therefore, the District concluded that the Project would have a less-than-significant impact on air quality relative to these annual criteria pollutant emissions significance thresholds.

To ensure compliance with District standards the mitigation measures identified below will be incorporated as conditions of approval for the project.



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Sources: *City of Turlock 2012 General Plan, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases chapter; AB 32 Scoping Plan; 2014 Stanislaus Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated June 8, 2026; MDP 2026-06 1231 S Kilroy Rd CalEEMod Air Quality Analysis report dated August 19, 2026 available upon request.*

Mitigation:

GP Policy 2.9-c, 6.1-h, 8.1-b, 8.1-f, 8.1-j, 8.1-l, 8.2-a, 8.2-d, 8.2-f, 8.2-m; WISP 6.8-a The applicant shall comply with all applicable San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations.

Project Operations Emissions:

- **AQ-2.11:** Follow guidelines included in the California Air Resources Board (CARB) October 2000 publication, Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles.

Energy Efficiency

- **AQ-2.12:** Employ energy efficient design, including automated control systems for heating/air conditioning and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements, lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting in buildings, increased insulation beyond Title 24 requirements, and light colored roof material to reflect heat. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-22).



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Project Construction Emissions

- AQ-2.15 Comply with the SJVAPCD Compliance Assistance Bulletin for Fugitive Dust Control at construction sites. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-34)
- AQ-2.16 Project development applicants shall be responsible for ensuring that all adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-35)
- AQ-2.17 Construction activity plans shall include and/or provide for a dust management plan to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-36)
- AQ-2.18 Soils stabilization is required at all construction sites after normal working hours and on weekends and holidays, as well as on inactive construction areas during phased construction. Methods include short-term water spraying, and long-term dust suppressants and vegetative cover. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-37)
- AQ-2.19 Construction equipment shall be equipped with particulate filters and/or catalysts, or proof shall be provided as to why it is infeasible. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-38)
- AQ-2.20 Diesel engines shall be shut off while not in use to reduce emissions from idling. Minimize idling time of all other equipment to 10 minutes maximum. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-39)
- AQ-2.21 Sandbags, or other erosion control measures, shall be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from construction sites with a slope greater than one percent (1%). (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-40)
- AQ-2.22 Wheels on all trucks and other equipment shall be washed prior to leaving the construction site. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-41)
- AQ-2.23 Wind breaks shall be installed at windward sides of construction areas. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-42)
- AQ-2.24 Suspend excavation and grading activities when winds exceed 20 mph. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-43)
- AQ-2.25 Limit areas subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activities at any one time. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-44)
- AQ-2.26 Limit and expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-45)
- AQ-2.27 Use alternative fuel construction equipment, where feasible. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-46)
- AQ-2.28 Construction activities shall be curtailed during periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations. This may include ceasing of construction activity during the peak-hour of vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways, including SR 99. (Westside Industrial Specific Plan Resources Policy R-P-47)
- AQ-2.29 Follow guidelines included in the California Air Resources Board (CARB) October 2000 publication, Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles.
- AQ-2.30 Construction equipment shall be equipped with catalysts/particulate traps to reduce particulate and NOx emissions. These catalysts/traps require the use of ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (15 ppm). Currently, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has verified a limited number of these devices for installation in several diesel engine families to reduce particulate emissions. At the time bids are made, contractors shall show that the construction equipment used is equipped with particulate filters and/or catalysts, or prove why it is infeasible.



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **GHG-1** Where feasible, project construction shall use equipment powered by electricity. Equipment may be powered by electrical generators or may be connected to existing power lines in the project construction area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. 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?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
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?				X
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				X
f) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Response:

- a), b) and c) The project is a semi-truck and trailer parking lot with a minor repair shop and an open wash bay proposed to be constructed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use, located west of State Highway 99 and south of West Main Street. The project site is located in an urbanized area surrounded by a mix of industrial and agricultural uses. The use of the semi-truck parking lot and repair shop does not involve an industrial process or commercial operation that would create the risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances through the transport or accidental use of hazardous materials. Furthermore, the project is not located within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of an existing or proposed school. Chatom Elementary School, located on Clayton Road, is located approximately 3 miles from the project site. John B. Allard School, located on North Kilroy Road, is approximately 1 mile from the northern boundary of the property, and Cunningham Elementary, located on West Linwood Avenue, is approximately 1.5 miles from the proposed project.
- d) The project is not located on a site included in a list of hazardous materials sites list compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5, and it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The General Plan EIR does not identify any active cleanup sites located on or near the project site. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.11-2 through 3.11-7*)
- e) The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and is not located within the planning area boundary of the Turlock Municipal Airport or the Turlock Airpark. The Turlock Air Park has been removed from the Stanislaus County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan updated on October 6, 2016. The Turlock Municipal Airport is actually located outside of Turlock City limits and not near the project site.
- f) The proposed project will not impair the implementation of an adopted emergency response/evacuation plan. Any traffic that may be generated by the proposed project is consistent with the projections contained within the Turlock General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR found that anticipated growth, and the resulting traffic levels, would not impede emergency evacuation routes or otherwise prevent public safety agencies from responding in an emergency. The project includes the installation of improvements along S. Kilroy Road to facilitate access and egress in case of emergency. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.11-22 through 3.11.25, WISP EIR pg. 9-15*)
- g) There are no designated wildland fire areas within or adjoining the project site. Furthermore, only 3.7% of the project site is composed of structures. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. (*General Plan EIR pg. 3.11-23*)

Sources: City of Turlock, *Emergency Response Plan*, 2004; Stanislaus County Airport Land Use Commission Plan, 1978, amended May 20, 2004, updated October 6, 2016; Stanislaus County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2010; City of Turlock, *General Plan, Safety Element*, 2012; City of Turlock, *Municipal Code, Title 8, (Building Regulations)*, *Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP)* (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); *Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR)* (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); *Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum)* (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)

Mitigation:

None

	Potentially	Less Than	Less Than	No Impact
--	-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Significant Impact	Significant Impact With Mitigation	Significant Impact	
10. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		X		
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
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?		X		
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site;		X		
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			X	
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
Response: a) The proposed truck parking lot facility with a minor repair shop and open wash bay will be required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board's construction requirements to reduce the potential impact of pollution from water runoff at the time of construction and post-construction. Upon development, the project will be required to connect to City utility systems, including water and sewer. The project is also required to install a sand and oil interceptor prior to discharge to the sewer system which would provide treatment for sediment and oil generated by truck repair and washing activities. Wastewater from the truck wash bay and other areas would therefore be managed in accordance with applicable wastewater discharge requirements so that wash water does not enter the storm drain system or contaminate surface or groundwater. Development of the project area would not result in water quality or waste discharge violations. (General Plan EIR pgs. 3.12-22 through 3.12-26, WISP EIR pgs. 1-30 through 1-34)				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

b) The proposed project lies within the City of Turlock. The City has developed an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) that evaluates the long-range water needs of the City including water conservation and other measures that are necessary to reduce the impact of growth on groundwater supplies. The project has been reviewed by the City of Turlock Municipal Services, the water provider for the City of Turlock, and no concerns were raised regarding the ability of the City to provide adequate potable water to the project. (*General Plan EIR* pgs. 3.12-22 through 3.12-26, *WISP EIR* pgs. 1-30 through 1-34)

c) The project is a truck parking lot with a minor repair shop and an open wash bay proposed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river that can alter the existing drainage pattern; however, approximately 80% of the project site will be comprised of impervious surface. The City of Turlock requires that all development construct the necessary storm water collection systems to convey runoff to detention basins within the project area. Detention basins help settle sediment out of stormwater before it is discharged. Grading plans for construction of the project will be reviewed to ensure compliance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board's regulations and the City's NPDES discharge permit. Grading and improvement plans for the project are required and will be reviewed by the Engineering Division to ensure that storm water runoff from the project area is adequately conveyed to the storm water collection system that will be implemented with the project. (*General Plan EIR* pg. 3.12-27, *WISP EIR* pgs. 1-30 through 1-34)

d) The project site is not located in a flood area. The project does not involve property acquisition, management, construction or improvements within a 100-year floodplain (Zones A or V) identified by FEMA maps, and does not involve a "critical action" (e.g., emergency facilities, facility for mobility impaired persons, etc.) within a 500-year floodplain (Zone B). The entire City of Turlock is located in Flood Zone "X", according to FEMA. The City of Turlock's Community Number is 060392; Panel Numbers are: 0570E, 0600E, 0800E, 0825E. Revised update September 26, 2008.

The project site is located outside the Dam Inundation Area for New Don Pedro Dam and for New Exchequer Dam (the two inundation areas located closest to the City of Turlock Municipal Boundary). (*General Plan EIR* pg. 3.12-14)

e) The proposed infill project is a truck parking lot with a minor repair shop on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use and surrounded by a mix of industrial, light industrial and agricultural uses. Once constructed, runoff from the developed site could result in increased potential water contamination from urban pollutants that are commonly found in surface parking lots and ornamental landscape planters. In order to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level, the proposed project will be subject to post-construction BMPs per the City's NPDES permit to address increases in impervious surfaces, methods to decrease incremental increase in off-site stormwater flows, and methods for decreasing pollutant loading in off-site discharges. (*General Plan EIR* pg. 3.12-27, *WISP EIR* pgs. 1-29 through 1-34)

Sources: Federal Emergency Management Agency Floodplain regulations; City of Turlock, Storm Drain Master Plan, 1987; Turlock General Plan EIR, 2012; Turlock General Plan, 2012 ; City of Turlock, Water Master Plan Update, 2009; City of Turlock, Storm Water Master Plan, 2013; City of Turlock Urban Water Management Plan, 2011; City of Turlock Sewer System Master Plan, 2013; City of Turlock, Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 2, Water Conservation Landscape Ordinance; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Mitigation:

1. The project shall connect to the City's Master Water and Sewer Systems.
2. GP 3.3-o, 3.3-ae, 6.4-f HWQ-1.2 The project shall comply with the Regional Water Control Board's regulations and standards to maintain and improve groundwater and surface water quality. The applicant shall conform to the requirements of the Construction Storm Water General Permit and the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit, including both Best Management Practices and Low Impact Development (post-construction) requirements.
3. HWQ-3.3 Site grading shall be designed to create positive drainage throughout the site and to collect the storm water for the storm water drainage system. If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United State Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a USACOE permit or any other federal permit is required for this project due to the disturbance of water of the United States then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to the initiation of project activities. If the USCACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional water of the State are present in the proposed project are, the proposed project will require a Waste Discharge Requirements permit to be issued by the Central Valley Water Board.
4. HWQ-4.4 The discharge of oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, or any other petroleum derivative, or any toxic chemical or hazardous waste is prohibited.
5. HWQ-4.5 Materials and equipment shall be stored so as to ensure that spills or leaks cannot enter storm drains, or the drainage ditches or detention basins.
6. HWQ-4.6 A spill prevention and cleanup plan shall be implemented.
7. GP 3.3-ae The builder and/or developer shall utilize cost-effective urban runoff controls, including Best Management Practices (BMP's), to limit urban pollutants from entering the drainage ditches. A General Construction permit shall be obtained from the State Water Resources Control Board, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented as part of this permit.
8. HWQ-2.5 Encourage potable water conservation in site landscaping and streetscape landscaping.
9. HWQ-3.2 On-site storm water detention shall be provided on any site larger than two acres, and shall be designed for future connection to the City's storm water drainage system.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. Land Use Planning – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?				X
<u>Response:</u>				
a) The project site is located at the developed edge of the City and is surrounded by a mix of developed non-residential land uses. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community.				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

b) The proposed truck parking lot with a minor repair shop and open wash bay is proposed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use. The proposed project will not require a change in the land use or zoning designation of the property. The development of the site is consistent with the City's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan designation. (TMC §9-3-402, General Plan pg. 2-35 and 2-36, WISP pgs. 3-11 through and 3-14, WISP EIR pgs. 1-34, 1-35)

Sources: Turlock General Plan, 2012 & Adopted Housing Element, Resolution 2026-110; City of Turlock General Plan EIR, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); Turlock Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 3; US Fish and Wildlife Service – Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, 1998

Mitigation:

None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. 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?				X
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?				X
<u>Response:</u> a), b) Any development that may ultimately occur in the City does result in the utilization of natural resources (water, natural gas, construction materials, etc.); however, these resources will not be depleted by this project. The only known mineral resources within the City of Turlock are sand and gravel from the Modesto and Riverbank formations. The project will involve only minor excavation of the site. (General Plan pg. 7-28)				
<u>Sources:</u> City of Turlock, General Plan, Conservation Element, 2012				
<u>Mitigation:</u> None required.				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. 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?		X		
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?		X		
c) For a project located 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?				X
Response: a), b) The truck parking lot with a minor repair shop and open wash bay project is proposed on 6.79-acre parcel surrounded by industrial, light industrial and agricultural uses. The project will increase existing ambient noise levels associated with development of an undeveloped or underdeveloped property. The General Plan and City Noise Ordinance (TMC 5-28-100ART) establish noise standards that must be met for all new development. During the construction phase, the project is subject to the City's noise ordinance which prohibits construction on weekdays from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. and from 8:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. on weekends and holidays. Once constructed, the truck parking lot and repair shop is not anticipated to generate ambient noise levels and ground borne vibration or noise levels in excess of the standards established in the General Plan or City Noise Ordinance. Turlock's Noise Ordinance (TMC 5-28-100ART) standards and enforcement mechanisms would apply. (General Plan EIR pgs. 3.6-16 through 3.6-19, TMC §5-28-100ART, WISP EIR pgs. 12-1 through 12-13)				
c) The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Two private airstrips are located adjacent to the Turlock City Limits. A private airstrip serving a local pilot is located at 2707 East Zeering Road (APN 073-004-004), approximately 5.0 miles north and east of the project site. The property is located over 2.8 miles northwest of the Turlock Air Park, a private air strip which has been removed from the Stanislaus County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan adopted on October 6, 2016. The Stanislaus County Zoning Ordinance has established a 1,000-foot radius around the perimeter of a private strip as a clear area not suitable for most types of development. The project site is located outside of the 1,000-foot radius. Furthermore, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has established regulations for flight operations near built-up areas. Therefore, the project will not be impacted by noise from the operations of any public or private airport.				
Sources: City of Turlock, General Plan, Noise Element, 2012; City of Turlock, Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 2, Noise Regulations; Stanislaus County Airport Land Use Commission Plan, as Amended May 20, 2004, updated October 6, 2016; Merced County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, June 12, 2012; Turlock General Plan, Circulation Element, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Mitigation:

1. GP 9.4-I, TMC§5-28ART; WISP 6.14-a, 6.14-b Compliance with the City of Turlock's Noise Ordinance (TMC5-28-100ART) which addresses a wide range of noise-generating activities, establishes standards, and provides a basis for enforcement.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. 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)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Response:

- a) The proposed truck parking lot with a minor repair shop project and open wash bay is to be constructed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use. The proposed infill project would not directly or indirectly cause unplanned population growth in the area beyond what is planned in the WISP and the Turlock General Plan. This commercial/light-industrial use is consistent with the uses anticipated for this area in the WISP and the General Plan EIR and will not cause any impacts to population and housing that have not been anticipated and addressed in these documents.
- b) The 6.79-acre property is zoned for Industrial use and currently has an 1,800 square foot residence onsite. The residence will remain onsite. Phase 2 of the proposed project will include conversion of the existing residence into a second office. The truck parking facility with a minor repair shop will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, and would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project site is surrounded by existing urban and agricultural uses and all roads and infrastructure are available.

Sources: City of Turlock, General Plan, 2012 & Adopted Housing Element, Resolution 2026-110; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)

Mitigation:

None



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. Public Services – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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:				
a) Fire Protection?			X	
b) Police Protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	
Response: a) The truck parking lot with a minor repair shop is an infill project proposed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use, and it is surrounded by a mix of industrial, light industrial and agricultural uses. The Turlock Fire Department provides fire and emergency response within the City limits and operates four fire stations located to maximize efficiency and help reduce response times. The Fire Department reviews all development applications to determine the adequacy of fire protection for the proposed development. The Fire Department has commented on this project and has not indicated that the development could not be adequately served or would create an impact on the ability of the Department to serve the City as a whole. The project will not have a significant impact on fire response times and will not otherwise create a substantially greater need for fire protection services than already exists. The Turlock Municipal Code and the State Fire Code establish standards of service for all new development in the City. Those standards and regulations are applicable to the project. <i>(General Plan EIR pgs. 3.14-14 through 3.14-19, WISP EIR pgs. 14-8 through 14-16)</i>				
b) Development of the semi-truck and trailer parking lot with a minor repair shop will not result in any unique circumstances that cannot be handled with the existing level of police resources. The Turlock Police Department was routed the project and did not indicate that the development of the parking lot could not be adequately served. No new or expanded police facilities will need to be constructed as a result of this project. Therefore, it is anticipated the impacts from the development of the property on police services will be less-than-significant. The developer will be required to pay Capital Facilities Fees upon development, a portion of which is used to fund Police Service capital improvements. <i>(General Plan EIR pgs. 3.14-14 through 3.14-19, WISP EIR pgs. 14-1 through 14-18)</i>				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

c) The proposed truck parking lot with a minor repair shop and open wash bay project will not have any residential dwelling units and will not generate any direct demand for school facilities. The project will create jobs that will balance overall increases in population generated by other factors. The project will not directly increase Turlock's population and would not result in substantial impacts to school facilities. Under the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the satisfaction by the developer of his statutory fee under California Government Code Section 65995 is deemed "full and complete mitigation" of school impacts. Therefore, mitigation of impacts upon school facilities shall be accomplished by the payment of the fees set forth established by the Turlock Unified School District. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.14-8 through 3.14-14, WISP EIR pgs. 13-5 through 13-6*)

d) Demand for park and recreational facilities are generally the direct result of residential development. No residential dwelling units are proposed as part of the semi-truck and trailer parking lot project. Development of the project will not result in a significant increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.14-14 through 3.14-19, WISP EIR pgs. 14-1 through 14-18*)

e) Development of the truck parking lot facility with a minor repair shop, a nonresidential use, will not increase the use of or need for new public facilities. The City has prepared and adopted a Capital Facility Program that identifies the public service needs of roads, police, fire, and general government that will be required through build-out of the General Plan area. General Plan policies will ensure that facilities and needs are closely aligned and impacts are minimized. This program includes the collection of Capital Facility Fees from all new development. Development fees are also collected from all new development for recreational lands and facilities. Conditions of development will require payment of these fees and charges, where appropriate and allowed by law. (*General Plan EIR pg. 3.14-14 through 3.14-19, WISP EIR pgs. 14-1 through 14-18*)

Sources: Stanislaus County, *Public Facilities Plan*; City of Turlock, *Capital Facility Fees Program*, City of Turlock *Capital Improvement Program (CIP)*; Turlock Unified School District, *School Facilities Needs Analysis*; City of Turlock, *General Plan, Parks and Recreational Open Space and Safety Elements, 2012*; *Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP)* (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); *Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR)* (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); *Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum)* (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)

Mitigation:

1. PFS-6.1 All new development is required to meet the fire protection standards established by the City. Typical standards include, but are not limited to: sprinklers in buildings 5,000 square feet and larger; on-site hydrants; adequate emergency access to buildings; and hazardous materials plans.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. Recreation				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Response: a) and b) Demand for park and recreational facilities are generally the direct result of residential development. No residential dwelling units are proposed as part of this semi-truck and trailer parking lot project with a minor repair shop. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The development of the parking lot will not result in a significant increase in use of existing neighborhood or regional parks. However, development fees are collected from all new development to provide additional park lands and facilities. (General Plan EIR pgs. 3.13-10 through 3.13-15)				
Sources: City of Turlock General Plan 2012: City of Turlock Parks Master Plan, 2003; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)				
Mitigation: None				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. Transportation– Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Response:

a), b) The truck parking lot facility with a minor repair shop and open wash bay is an infill project proposed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use, surrounded by a mix of industrial, light industrial and agricultural uses. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The project would utilize existing roadway access and would not require modifications to the existing circulation network or bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities.

The proposed project anticipates 50-60 semi-trucks and/or trailers per day with typically a minimum of 500 miles to over 2,000 miles per trip for an average of 1,250 miles traveled per trip. Although the project would generate truck vehicle trips, these trips would be accommodated by the existing transportation system, and the project would not interfere with the implementation of adopted circulation plans and policies. The type of number of trips anticipated for this project are consistent with typical industrial uses that have been planned for and addressed within the WISP and the General Plan; therefore, the project will not have a significant impact.

The City has adopted a Capital Facility Program with traffic improvements planned for build out of the General Plan. The City Engineer has reviewed the proposed traffic circulation pattern for the area and evaluated its potential impact on the operation of the local roadways serving the site, and has determined current roadway improvements can adequately accommodate vehicular traffic generated by the project. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.3-23 through 3.3-33, WISP EIR pgs. 15-1 through 15-22*)

c) The semi-truck and trailer parking lot and minor repair shop project is proposed as an infill project on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for Industrial use. The project site is accessed using the existing roadway system. All required frontage improvements must meet current City standards. The proposed project will not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment).

d) Installation of public rights-of way and associated improvements will be required as a condition of approval for this project. The Turlock Fire Department reviews all development proposals for adequate emergency access. The project will either meet or exceed the Fire Department needs for emergency vehicle access throughout the project site.

Sources: *City of Turlock, Capital Improvement Program (CIP); City of Turlock, General Plan, 2012; StanCOG, Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, 2014; Stanislaus Assn. of Governments, Congestion Mgmt. Plan, 1992; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); California Green Building Code, ITE Trip Generation 10th Edition Volume 2.*

Mitigation:

None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

18. 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			X	
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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	
Response: a) The Turlock General Plan EIR found that there are no known Native American cultural resources within the City of Turlock. The properties are not listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. In compliance with AB52, notices with the project description were sent to the North Valley Yokuts Tribe on May 28, 2026, and subsequently on August 11, 2026, with the revised description. The Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Tribe sent a letter to the City of Turlock on April 19, 2017, formally asking the City to remove them from future project notifications. The City of Turlock has not received comments or a request for further consultation from the North Valley Yokuts Tribe. (General Plan EIR pgs. 3.8-13 through 3.8-15)				
Sources: Turlock General Plan, Conservation Element, 2012; City of Turlock General Plan EIR, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017); Cultural Resources Records Search, 2008				
Mitigation: None				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the project:				



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
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?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Response:

- a) The truck parking lot and minor repair shop with an open wash bay project is proposed as an infill project on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for industrial use. The project site is not currently connected to City water or sewer systems. The project would require connections to existing City water and wastewater infrastructure in order to serve the proposed development. The required water and sewer connections would consist of extensions to existing utility infrastructure serving the surrounding area. The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. The type of wastewater anticipated by the project is readily handled by the current waste water system, and the project will not result in the need to construct a new water or wastewater treatment facility. The existing water and wastewater facilities which serve the City of Turlock are sufficient to serve this use. The project would also include onsite stormwater drainage improvements to accommodate runoff from the development, including a stormwater retention basin and extension of an existing storm drain main line on S. Kilroy Road. The project site has access to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications and will not require or result in the construction of new or expanded facilities. Although the project would require new utility connections, it would not require the construction or expansion of major water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. (*General Plan EIR pgs. 3.15-11 through 3.15-15*)



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

b) and c) The project site is within the boundaries of the City of Turlock's Storm Water Master Plan and Urban Water Management Plan. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use and growth assumptions that were used to update the City's Urban Water Management Plan. The semi-truck and trailer parking lot is an infill project proposed on a 6.79-acre parcel zoned for industrial use. The developer is proposing to construct a stormwater retention basin at the rear of the property to comply with the City's MS4 requirements. The owner or successor in interest will be required to provide any other on-site infrastructure as determined necessary by the City Engineer. No additional improvements are needed to either sewer lines or treatment facilities to serve the proposed project, as the project will connect to existing lines. A standard condition of development in the City of Turlock is the payment of the adopted water connection fees which reflect the pro rata share of any necessary improvement to the existing City water system for each new water user.

If applicable, the owner, or successor in interest, must pay standard connection fees to address their proportional impact to the water system. The project would result in a relatively small increase in water demand and would not require new water supply sources. The City's water supply planning accounts for normal, dry, and multiple dry-year conditions and reasonably foreseeable future development. Impacts from the proposed parking lot will be less than significant and no mitigation beyond compliance with existing laws is required. The development is consistent with what has been anticipated in the General Plan and planned for in the Storm Water, Water, and Wastewater Master Plans and will not require the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing storm drainage facilities. The Municipal Services Division did not indicate that it lacked adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the project. Accordingly, there is no determination by the Municipal Services Division that the project would exceed available wastewater treatment capacity or the provider's existing commitments. (*General Plan EIR* pgs. 3.12-22 through 3.12-29)

d) and e) Solid waste will be of a domestic nature and will comply with all federal, State and local statutes. Upon completion of the semi-truck and trailer parking lot project, the property owner(s), or successor(s) in interest shall contract with the City of Turlock's designated waste hauler, Turlock Scavenger, for solid waste disposal. Turlock Scavenger has an adopted waste diversion/recycling program which has resulted in waste diversion exceeding state-mandated California Integrated Waste Management Board timeframes under Public Resources Code 41000 *et seq.* The project is required to install a trash enclosure that will accommodate recycled materials. Sufficient capacity remains for the additional solid waste needs to support this project. (*General Plan EIR* pgs. 3.15-11 through 3.15-15)

Sources: *City of Turlock, Capital Improvement Program (CIP); City of Turlock, General Plan, 2012; City of Turlock, Water Master Plan Update, 2009; City of Turlock, Waste Water Master Plan, 1991; City of Turlock, Storm Water Master Plan, 2013; City of Turlock Urban Water Management Plan, 2011; City of Turlock Sewer System Master Plan, 2013, June 1995; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)*

Mitigation:

None

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

20. 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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
Response: a) The proposed project will not impair the adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. The project does not propose uses or improvements that would substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation activities. Frontage improvements along South Kilroy Road would be designed to maintain adequate roadway access, and on-site circulation would provide access for emergency vehicles. The project would generate traffic that is consistent with the projections contained within the Turlock General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR found that anticipated growth, and the resulting traffic levels, would not impede emergency evacuation routes or otherwise prevent public safety agencies from responding in an emergency. (General Plan pg. 10-18 through 10-19, General Plan EIR pgs. 3.11-22 through 3.11-25)				
b), c), and d) There are no wildlands or steep slopes in the City of Turlock, making the risk of wildland fire low; likewise, the Turlock General Plan notes the City topography as flat urbanized or agricultural land with a low fire risk. At the time of the General Plan adoption, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) designated the City of Turlock as a Low Risk Area (LRA). Since then, Cal Fire has identified Turlock not within a designated Cal Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ), as Turlock is not in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) but rather in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA). The proposed project will not require installation or maintenance of infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in impacts to the environment. There are no rivers, lakes or streams located within the City of Turlock that would expose people of structures to significant risks of flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. (General Plan 10-18, General Plan EIR pgs. 3.10-5, 3.11-22 through 3.11-25)				
Sources: City of Turlock, Emergency Operation Plan, 2017; Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2010-2015; Stanislaus County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, updated 2016 City of Turlock, General Plan, Safety Element, 2012; Westside Industrial Specific Plan (WISP) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006, Amended June 12, 2007, Second Amendment November 28, 2017); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR (WISP MEIR) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2006-259) (November 14, 2006); Westside Industrial Specific Plan MEIR Addendum (WISP EIR Addendum) (Turlock City Council Resolution No. 2007-148) (July 12, 2007 and September 2017)				
Mitigation: None				
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than	No Impact



CITY OF TURLOCK INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

	Impact	Impact With Mitigation	Significant Impact	
21. 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?			X	
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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
The proposed semi-truck and trailer parking lot is an infill project within the City surrounded by industrial, light industrial and agricultural uses. As discussed in Section 1, no scenic vistas, scenic resources, or the visual character of the area will be substantially impacted and the project will not result in excessive light or glare. No evidence of significant historic or cultural resources were identified on or near the project site. As a result of many years of agricultural production virtually all of the land in the General Plan area has been altered. The project site is not known to have any association with an important example of California's history or prehistory. Construction-phase procedures will be implemented in the event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered consistent with the Mitigation Measures contained in Sections 4 & 5. As discussed in Section 4, there are no rivers, lakes or streams located within the City of Turlock; therefore, the project would have no impact on riparian habitats or species. The context for assessing air quality impacts is the immediate project vicinity with respects to emissions generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project. The environmental analysis provided in Section 3 concludes that operational and construct emissions would not exceed the air quality thresholds established by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The SJVAPCD letter dated June 8, 2026, stated that the project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the District thresholds. Furthermore, Mitigation Measures identified in Sections 3 & 8 would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Mitigation measures for any potentially significant project-level impacts have been included in this document and will reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels. Based on the analysis above, the City finds that impacts related to environmental effects that could cause adverse effects on human beings would be less than significant.				