

INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

LEAD AGENCY: San Joaquin County Community Development Department

PROJECT APPLICANT: Peter Westbrook

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): PA-1900031 and PA-1900037

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant has submitted the above-referenced applications for a General Plan Map Amendment and a Zone Reclassification. The applicant proposes to amend the General Plan designation from C/C (Community Commercial) to R/M (Medium Density Residential) and the zoning designation from C-C (Community Commercial) to R-M (Medium Density Residential), with future plans to construct a maximum of four (4) residences. The project site consists of two (2) vacant lots totaling 0.48 gross acres.

The project site is located on the southeast corner of East Mokelumne Street and North Orange Street, within the urban community of Woodbridge.

ASSESSORS PARCEL NO.: 015-450-27

GROSS ACRES: 0.48

GENERAL PLAN: C/C

ZONING: C-C

POTENTIAL POPULATION, NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS, OR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF USE(S):
If the applications are approved, a maximum of four (4) dwellings could be constructed.

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

- NORTH:** Residential, Elks Lodge
- SOUTH:** Residential, U.S. Post Office
- EAST:** Residential, Commercial
- WEST:** Residential

REFERENCES AND SOURCES FOR DETERMINING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

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

Yes

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

City: Lodi

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

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

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

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ISSUES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>I. AESTHETICS.</u>					
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publically accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-c) The site of the proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification application, is located on the southeast corner of E. Mokelumne Street and N. Orange Street in Woodbridge. Pursuant to San Joaquin County General Plan 2035 Natural and Cultural Resources Element Figure NCR-1 (page 3.4-13), E. Mokelumne Street and N. Orange Street in Woodbridge are not designated Scenic Routes. Therefore the project will not impact a scenic vista or zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.
- d) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification application. If the application is approved, the applicant will develop the site with a maximum of four (4) residences, which may result in the creation of a new source of light. However, pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1025.6, the illumination level of any outdoor lighting, with the exception of public street lighting, is to be at a level that does not cause glare above 1.0 footcandles on an adjacent lot or street. These provisions will ensure that impacts from lighting will be less than significant.

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

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The subject property is zoned Community Commercial (C-C) and is not identified or designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or as Farmland of Statewide Importance on maps provided by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The Department of Conservation categorizes the site as Urban and Built-up Land. Land with this designation is intended for use as residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes. Therefore, the proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, will not convert important farmland to non-agricultural use.
- b) The subject property is zoned Community Commercial (C-C) and is not zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with an agricultural use and is not under a Williamson Act contract.

- c-d) The subject property is not located in an area of forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production as defined by Public Resources Code and Government Code therefore, the project will have no impact on corresponding zoning or conversion of such land.

- e) The subject property is not classified as Farmland or forest land therefore the project will have no impact on the conversion of such lands.

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

III. AIR QUALITY.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification application. For any future development, the applicant will be required to meet the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) rules and regulations for emissions and dust control in order to mitigate for any impacts future development may have on air quality. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) was established by the State of California in an effort to control and minimize air pollution. Development projects may be subject to certain rules and regulations and may require permits. The project applicant will be responsible for contacting SJVAPCD in the future for information on regulations and permits that may be necessary for development.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Database lists *Pogonichthys macrolepidotus* (Sacramento splittail) and *Lepidurus packardii* (vernal pool tadpole shrimp) as rare, endangered, or threatened species or habitat located on or near the site for the proposed project. Referrals have been sent to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG), the agency responsible for verifying the correct implementation of the *San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan* (SJMSCP), which provides compensation for the conversion of Open Space to non-Open Space uses which affect the plant, fish and wildlife species covered by the Plan. Pursuant to the Final EIR/EIS for SJMSCP, dated November 15, 2000, and certified by SJCOG on December 7, 2000, implementation of the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a level of less-than-significant.

SJCOG responded in a letter dated March 20, 2019, that, as the applicant is requesting a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification with no ground disturbance, only future development on the project site will be subject to participation in the SJMSCP. Therefore, this application is not expected to have any impact on sensitive species but future development will be subject to the SJMSCP in order to reduce impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level.

- b-c) The subject property has no riparian habitat or wetlands located within its boundaries, therefore the proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, nor any future development on the property, will have an impact on riparian habitat or wetlands.
- d-f) This application, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, is not expected to have any impact on resident or migratory species or conflict with preservation or conservation policies, but future development will be subject to the SJMSCP in order to reduce impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

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

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The project site is located in the Urban, unincorporated community of Woodbridge, with the nearest waterway being the Mokelumne River located 700 feet to the east of the site. The site consists of two (2) parcels that are currently vacant, however, the site is surrounded by development such as streets, sidewalks, and public water and sewer infrastructure. There are no historical or historically significant resources on the project site. The site has been previously disturbed, therefore, the proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, or future development will not be disturbing ground that has previously yielded archeological resources.
- c) The proposed project, a General Plan map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, does not propose any development, therefore no ground will be disturbed. In the event human remains are encountered during any future development of the site, California state law requires that there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county has determined manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation (California Health and Safety Code – Section 7050.5). Following the California Health and Safety Code will ensure that any future development of the project site will have a less than significant chance of disturbing any human remains.

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

VI. ENERGY.

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The project will have no impact on energy resources nor will it conflict with a state or local plan because the project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification application. No development is proposed with this application. Any future development of the project site will be subject to the California Energy Code (also titled The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings) The California Energy Code was created by the California Building Standards Commission in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The code's purpose is to advance the state's energy policy, develop renewable energy sources and prepare for energy emergencies. The code includes energy conservation standards applicable to most buildings throughout California. These requirements will be applicable to any future development at the project site ensuring that any impact to the environment due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy will be less than significant and preventing any conflict with state or local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

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

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, does not propose any development within the scope of the application. Therefore, the project will not have any impact on geology and soils. Any future development of the project site will have to comply with the California Building Code (CBC) which includes provisions for soils reports for grading and foundations as well as design criteria for seismic loading and other geologic hazards based on fault and seismic hazard mapping. All recommendations from a soils report must be incorporated into the construction plans. Similarly, any grading for future development will be done under permit and will be required to comply with the grading provisions of the California Building Code.
- c-d) The proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, does not propose any development within the scope of the application, therefore will not affect geology and soils. Any future development of the project site will be required to submit a soils report for grading and foundations and all recommendations from a soils report must

be incorporated into the construction plans.

- e) The proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, does not propose any development within the scope of the application. Any future development on the site will be served by the Woodbridge Sanitary District public sewer system and will not require an onsite septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal system for the disposal of wastewater.
- f) The proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, does not propose any development within the scope of the application therefore the project will not impact paleontological resources or geologic features. The parcels are currently vacant, however, the project site was previously developed with a residence, therefore the site has been previously disturbed. Any future development of the project site will not be uncovering undisturbed ground that may yield unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

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

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

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

Impact Discussion:

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

Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MTCO_{2e}/yr).

The SJVAPCD has adopted the *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* and the *District Policy – Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*.¹¹ The guidance and policy rely on the use of performance-based standards, otherwise known as Best Performance Standards (BPS) to assess significance of project specific greenhouse gas emissions on global climate change during the environmental review process, as required by CEQA. To be determined to have a less-than-significant individual and cumulative impact with regard to GHG emissions, projects must include BPS sufficient to reduce GHG emissions by 29 percent when compared to Business As Usual (BAU) GHG emissions. Per the SJVAPCD, BAU is defined as projected emissions for the 2002-2004 baseline period. Projects which do not achieve a 29 percent reduction from BAU levels with BPS alone are required to quantify additional project-specific reductions demonstrating a combined reduction of 29 percent. Potential mitigation measures may include, but not limited to: on-site renewable energy (e.g. solar photovoltaic systems), electric vehicle charging stations, the use of alternative-fueled vehicles, exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards, the installation of energy-efficient lighting and control systems, the installation of energy-efficient mechanical systems, the installation of drought-tolerant landscaping, efficient irrigation systems, and the use of low-flow plumbing fixtures.

It should be noted that neither the SJVAPCD nor the County provide project-level thresholds for construction-related GHG emissions. Construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are, therefore, not typically expected to generate a significant contribution to global climate change. As such, the analysis herein is limited to discussion of long-term operational GHG emissions.

¹¹ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA*. December 17, 2009. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. *District Policy Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*. December 17, 2009.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-c) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that does not propose any development within the scope of the application. If the application is approved, the parcels will be rezoned Residential Medium Density. Any future development of the parcels will be residential and will not be the site of an industrial or commercial use that might include the use and/or storage of hazardous materials/waste.
- d) The project site is not included on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database map, compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5.
- e) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. The nearest airport is the Lodi Airport. The project site is located approximately 3.5 miles to the south of the airport's main runway.
- f) The proposed project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, does not propose any development in the scope of the application. If the application is approved, the maximum number of residences that can be constructed on the site is four (4). Adequate access can be provided for future development via Mokelumne Street and

Orange Street to provide for safe evacuation and adequate access for emergency equipment.

- g) The project location is in the urban, unincorporated community of Woodbridge, CA, which is not identified as a Community at Risk from Wildfire by Cal Fire's "Fire Risk Assessment Program". Communities at Risk from Wildfire are those places within 1.5 miles of areas of High or Very High wildfire threat as determined from CDF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Therefore, the impact of wildfires on the project, or on future development at the project site, are expected to be less than significant.

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

X. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that does not propose any development within the scope of the application. If the application is approved, the parcels will be rezoned Residential Medium Density. Any future development of the parcels will be residential and will receive water service through a public water system therefore, no impact on groundwater is anticipated.
- c) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that does not propose any development within the scope of the application. For any future development of the project site, any necessary drainage improvements will be required as conditions of the construction and grading will be performed under permit from the Building Department.
- d-e) The project site is not in a tsunami or seiche zone. The site is located in an 'x(500)' flood designation area, which is defined as areas of 0.2% annual chance (500-year) flood. Therefore, there is little risk of release of pollutants due to inundation. The project itself, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, if approved, will not result in an increase to surface, channel or stream volumes, or alterations to drainage patterns or streams, nor will it result in

any erosion of or sedimentation to a channel, river or body of water. If approved, any new development will have to comply with Development Title Section 9-1605 regarding flood hazards.

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

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that proposes reclassifying a commercial parcel to a residential parcel. The project site is located in a developed section of the unincorporated community of Woodbridge, along a corridor of residentially developed properties. The proposed residential General Plan designation and zone will allow future development of additional residential properties that will suit the residential neighborhood. No component of any permitted future development will result in a physically divided established community.
- b) This project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that proposes reclassifying a commercial parcel to a residential parcel. The project parcel, currently vacant, is located in a residentially-developed area. To the north, west, and south are residentially-developed properties. To the west of the parcel is Lower Sacramento Road, which is the main street of Woodbridge.

In order for the General Plan Map Amendment to be approved, the proposed changes must be shown to be consistent with the General Plan and the Development Title. Pursuant to the 2035 General Plan, the proposed General Plan designation, Medium Density Residential (R/M), should provide a transition from lower density, single family areas and more intensely developed residential and commercial areas (p. 3.1-32). The subject parcel is located on the western edge of the commercial core of the community of Woodbridge. The area to the west of the parcel is zoned R-M (Medium Density Residential). The area to the northwest of the parcel is zoned R-L (Low Density Residential). The areas to the east and south of the parcel are zoned C-C (Community Commercial). Therefore, the requested General Plan designation is consistent with the locational criteria in the General Plan.

In order to approve tentative maps and zone reclassifications, the General Plan requires that minimum standards be met for water, wastewater, and stormwater drainage system improvements (pgs. 3.2-37, 39, 41). The applicant has submitted a will serve letter for water and stormwater drainage from the San Joaquin County Public Works Department, and a letter from the Woodbridge Sanitary District (WSD) stating that WSD has the sewer and treatment capacities to accept the applicant's proposed development and can issue a "Will Serve Permit" upon submittal of construction design plans. Therefore, the standards for services can be met.

The General Plan sets a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet in the Medium Density Residential (R/M) designation (p. 3.1-32). The project site consists of two (2) legal lots of 6,969 square feet each therefore, this standard can also be met.

The proposed changes must also be shown to be consistent with the Development Title. The Development Title, in Section 9-812.4, states that prior to approving an application for a Zone Reclassification, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors shall determine that the proposed zone is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable Master Plans, and any applicable Specific Plan, and that the proposed zone district is reasonable and beneficial at the time. The proposed applications are consistent with the General Plan and Development Title because the proposed Medium Density Residential (R-M) zone is an implementing zone of the Medium Density Residential (R/M) General Plan land use designation. If the General Plan designation is changed to R/M, then the zone change to R-M will be consistent with the General Plan.

Finally, the proposed applications are reasonable and beneficial at this time because public water, sewer, and storm drain services are available at the site. Public services are a requirement for the General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification applications. Additionally, approving the zone reclassification will likely result in development of

a small multi-family housing project which is consistent with the proposed R-M zoning and with the surrounding residential uses.

Therefore, the proposed applications are consistent with the General Plan and Development Title and no land use plan, policy, or regulation need be adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect which could, in turn, cause a significant environmental impact.

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

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) The project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a resource recovery site because the site does not contain minerals of significance or known mineral resources. The project site in Woodbridge has been designated as an MRZ-1 mineral resource zone. The 2035 General Plan Volume II, Chapter 10-Mineral Resources, Table 10-7, defines MRZ-1 as "Areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence." Therefore, the project, a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification, will have less than a significant impact on the availability of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites within the region.

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

XIII. NOISE.

Would the project result in:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-c) This project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that proposes reclassifying a commercial parcel to a residential parcel. The project does not propose any ground disturbance or construction, therefore the project will not result in an increase in noise levels and will have no impact on noise.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Impact Discussion:

- a) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification that proposes reclassifying a commercial parcel to a residential parcel. If the applications are approved, the density of dwellings permitted by the General Plan would permit a maximum of four (4) dwelling units on the project site. Therefore, the project's impact on unplanned population growth is expected to be less than significant.
- b) The project site is currently vacant, therefore the project will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing.

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

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

Impact Discussion:

a) The existing fire protection is provided by the Woodbridge Fire District, existing law enforcement is provided by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office, and the schools are in the existing Lodi Unified School District. The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification. If the applications are approved, the density of dwellings permitted by the General Plan would permit a maximum of four (4) dwelling units on the project site. This is substantially the same residential development potential assumed if the General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification are approved. Therefore, the General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification would result in a less than significant impact on public services and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

XVI. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

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

Impact Discussion:

a-b) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification. If the applications are approved, the density of dwellings permitted by the General Plan would permit a maximum of four (4) dwelling units on the project site. However, the proposed applications do not involve development therefore, the project will have no impact on recreation services.

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION.

Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) This proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification. A project referral was sent to the Department of Public Works on July 5, 2019, and the Department responded that the project is anticipated to have a less-than-significant impact on transportation.

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

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

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

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

Impact Discussion:

a) The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Woodbridge, with the nearest waterway being the Mokelumne River located 700 feet to the east of the site. The site consists of two (2) parcels that are currently vacant, however the San Joaquin County 1960 Land Use Map depicts a residence on the site therefore, the site has been previously disturbed. Additionally, the site is surrounded by development such as streets, sidewalks, and public water and sewer infrastructure.

A referral was sent July 5, 2019 to the California Valley Miwok Tribe, the North Valley Yokuts Tribe, and the United Auburn Indian Community. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) responded with a request for a consult and a request for copies of any archeological studies and environmental documents prepared for the proposed project. In the course of the consult, the UAIC provided information materials to be made available to the project applicant with the understanding that any future ground disturbance to the project site is subject to the protection measures and protocols for inadvertent discoveries of archeological resources, as outlined in *“Respect on the Project for Native American Culture”*, *“Tribal Cultural Resource Avoidance Mitigation Measures”*, and *“Inadvertent Discoveries Mitigation Measures – No Tribal Monitor”*. These materials will be provided to the project applicant by the lead agency with application approval documents. Following this protocol is expected to mitigate any possible disruption to Tribal Cultural Resources to less than significant.

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

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification and the project site is currently vacant. If the applications are approved, the density of dwellings permitted by the General Plan would permit a maximum of four (4) dwelling units on the project site. The project referral was sent July 5, 2019 to Pacific Gas & Electric, AT&T, the Department of Public Works, and the Mokelumne Acres Maintenance District. No responses were received from these utility entities therefore, it appears the project will not result in the relocation of any major utility service.
- b) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification and the project site is currently vacant. If the applications are approved, the density of dwellings permitted by the General Plan would permit a maximum of four (4) dwelling units on the project site. The applicant has provided a will serve letter from the Department of Public Works dated May 17, 2019, confirming that the Mokelumne Acres Maintenance District will serve the subject parcel with water.
- c) The applicant has provided a letter dated May 20, 2019, from the Woodbridge Sanitary District (WSD) confirming that the WSD has the sewer and treatment capacities to accept proposed development on the site and that they can issue a "will serve permit" upon submittal of construction design plans.
- d-e) The proposed project is a General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification. If the applications are approved, the density of dwellings permitted by the General Plan would permit a maximum of four (4) dwelling units on the project site. As proposed, the project is not anticipated to generate solid waste in excess of State and local standards.

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

XX. WILDFIRE.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The project location is in the community of Woodbridge, CA, which is not identified as a Community at Risk from Wildfire by Cal Fire’s “Fire Risk Assessment Program”. Communities at Risk from Wildfire are those places within 1.5 miles of areas of High or Very High wildfire threat as determined from CDF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Therefore, the impact of wildfires on the project are expected to be less than significant.

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

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

Impact Discussion:

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

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

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