

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: Sargent Estates, LLC

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): PA-1900129 (UP)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A Use Permit application to establish a commercial stable for a maximum of thirty (30) horses on three (3) parcels totaling 198.45 acres. The project proposes to utilize the following existing structures:

4,500 square foot barn for storage
32,500 square foot indoor arena for training
10,250 square foot stable for horse care
2,826 square foot training pen
2,040 square foot storage shed
1,800 square foot workshop
3,000 square foot barn for storage
800 square foot shed for storage
Six (6) 60 square foot pasture shelters as shade structures.

The project will also utilize an existing open arena and paths throughout the parcel, as well as existing pasture for grazing area. (Use Type: Stable – Commercial)

The project site is located at the northeast corner of E. Sargent Road and N. Tully Road, east of Lodi.

ASSESSORS PARCEL NO(S): 053-070-06, -07, -& -08

ACRES: 198.45 acres

GENERAL PLAN: A/G (General Agriculture) & OS/RC (Resource Conservation)

ZONING: AG-40 (General Agriculture, 40-acre minimum)

POTENTIAL POPULATION, NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS, OR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF USE(S):

A commercial stable facility totaling 58,078 square feet; one single family residence, second unit dwelling, and accessory structures on each parcel

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

NORTH: Agricultural with scattered residences, Bear Creek
SOUTH: Agricultural with scattered residences, Middle Paddy Creek
EAST: Agricultural with scattered residences, Paddy Creek
WEST: Agricultural with scattered residences, Paddy Creek

REFERENCES AND SOURCES FOR DETERMINING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

Many of these original source materials have been collected from other public agencies or from previously prepared EIR's and other technical studies. Additional standard sources which should be specifically cited below include on-site visits by staff; staff knowledge or experience; and independent environmental studies submitted to the County as part of the project application. Copies of these reports can be found by contacting the Community Development Department.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

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

No

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

Nature of concern(s):

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

Agency name(s):

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

City:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project will have no impact on aesthetics. The proposed project site is located at north east corner of Sargent Road and Tully Road within unincorporated San Joaquin County, south west of the community of Lockeford. The project will convert existing agricultural structures to the commercial stable; the structures are similar in nature to agricultural structures found throughout San Joaquin County. Additionally, the site is not located along a scenic route or roadway as defined in the 2035 General Plan. The project site will be required to install parking lot and security lighting pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1015.5(g), however, lighting shall be designed to confine rays to the premises; no spillover beyond the property lines is permitted, as a result, the required lighting will have adversely affect day or nighttime views.

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:

The proposed project will have no impact on agriculture or forestry resources. The project site includes areas designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of statewide Importance, however, the proposed stable site is not located within any of these designations. Additionally, the project includes the conversion of existing structures to establish the commercial stable facility. The existing structures were built with permits as agricultural buildings. No new structures are proposed.

The proposed project site is subject to Williamson Act Contract No. WA-70-C1-0112, however pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1810.3(b)(1)(X), the Stable – Commercial use type is permitted on contracted lands. The proposed use is an agricultural use, and will utilize only existing structures, which will be converted to a commercial stable facility. The existing zoning (AG-40[General Agriculture, 40-acre minimum]) will remain, and the proposed use is permitted with an

approved Use Permit.

Williamson Act Principles of Compatibility:

1. The use will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject contracted parcel or parcels or on other contracted lands in agricultural preserves.
 - **This Principle of Compatibility can be made because the commercial stable will not displace any agricultural operations. The proposed project will convert existing structures to be utilized as a commercial stable. The existing agricultural buildings were permitted on property under contract and are consistent with the A/G (General Agriculture) General Plan Designation. Therefore, the proposed project development area for the commercial stable will not compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the parcel as the parcels total 198.45 in size combined. Furthermore, pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1810.3(1)(X), a commercial stable is a compatible use on contracted land. If the project is approved, the Zoning and the General Plan land use designation of the subject parcel will remain the same, therefore the proposed project will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject contracted parcel or other contracted lands in agricultural preserves.**
2. The use will not significantly displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel or parcels or on other contracted lands in agricultural preserves. Uses that significantly displace agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel or parcels may be deemed compatible if they relate directly to the production of commercial agricultural products on the subject contracted parcel or parcels or neighboring lands, including activities such as harvesting, processing, or shipping.
 - **This Principle of Compatibility can be made because the proposed commercial stable operation will not displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel or on other contracted lands in agricultural preserves. The proposed project will convert existing agricultural structures to be used as the commercial stable, and all pasture areas are currently utilized as pasture for private horse raising practices. The surrounding land uses are agricultural with scattered residences. The addition of the proposed commercial stable will not change the existing uses on the project site nor on the surrounding parcels.**
3. The use will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural or open-space use. In evaluating compatibility a board or council shall consider the impacts on noncontracted lands in the agricultural preserve or preserves.
 - **This Principle of Compatibility can be made because the proposed use, a family operated commercial stable, will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural or open-space use, or negatively impact adjacent noncontracted lands in an agricultural preserve. Because the parcels are 198.45 acres in size combined, the proposed commercial stable operation will not displace or impair current agricultural operations or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on other contracted 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

The project is a Use Permit to establish a commercial stable operation for a maximum of thirty (30) horses. The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has been established by the State in an effort to control and minimize air pollution. This project was referred to the SJVAPCD for review on July 19, 2019. At the time of development, the applicant will be required to meet the requirements for emissions and dust control as established by SJVAPCD. As a result, any impacts to air quality will be reduced to less-than-significant.

The project proposes to have access driveways and parking to surfaced in asphalt concrete. The project is expected to have a maximum of fifteen (15) customers per day. As a result of the proposed surfacing, dust generated by the movement of vehicles on to and off of the property is expected to be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Database lists *Buteo swainsoni* (Swainson's Hawk), *Agelaius tricolor* (tri-colored blackbird), *Ambystoma californiense* (California Tiger Salamander), and *Desmocerus californicus dimorphus* (valley elderberry longhorn beetle) as rare, endangered, or threatened species or habitat located on or near the site for the proposed project. SJCOG responded in a letter dated October 29, 2018, that the project site is subject to the SJMSCP. The applicant has confirmed participation San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), which will address any potential impacts to rare, endangered or threatened species, or habitat located on or near the site. Pursuant to the Final EIR/EIS for the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), dated November 15, 2000, and certified by the San Joaquin Council of Governments on December 7, 2000, implementation of the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a less than significant level. Additionally, participation in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) will reduce the project's impact on resident or migratory wildlife corridors to less than significant.

The project site is located along Paddy Creek, and the riparian areas along Paddy Creek have a General Plan Designation of OS/RC (Resource Conservation). The proposed project will utilize existing structures that will be converted for use as a commercial stable. No new development is proposed, and the existing structures are located outside of the

OS/RC area. The stable will utilize an existing open arena that is located within the riparian area, as well as existing riding paths, however no additional modifications are proposed to these existing features. As a result, the project will have a less than significant impact on riparian habitat. No wetlands are located on the project site.

The project site is not expected to interfere with local policies protecting biological resources because the applicant will be required to comply with the County's policy regarding Native Oak Trees, Heritage Oak Trees, or Historical Trees. If any such trees exist on the property, the project will be subject to the Development Title ordinance requirements to protect and/or provide for replacement of the trees. In this way, any impact to protected biological resources will be reduced to less than significant.

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

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

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

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

VI. ENERGY.

Would the project:

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

Impact Discussion:

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

The Soil Survey of San Joaquin County classifies the soil on the parcel as *Bruella sandy loam, hard substratum, 0 to 2 percent slopes*; *Exeter sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes*; *Hicksville loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, occasionally flooded*; *San Joaquin loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes, eroded*; *San Joaquin loam, thick surface, 0 to 2 percent slopes*; and *San Joaquin complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes*.

Bruella sandy loam's permeability is moderately slow and water capacity is moderate. This unit is suited to homesite development. *Bruella sandy loam* has a storie index rating of 60 and a land capability of II_s irrigated and IV_s nonirrigated.

Exeter sandy loam's permeability is moderate and water capacity is low. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, and vineyard crops. *Exeter sandy loam* has a storie index rating of 32 and a land capability of III_s irrigated and IV_s

nonirrigated.

Hicksville loam's permeability is moderately slow and water capacity is high. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, and vineyard crops. *Hicksville loam* has a storie index rating of 58 and a land capability of IIw irrigated and IVw nonirrigated.

San Joaquin loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes, eroded's permeability is very slow and water capacity is low. This unit is suited to irrigated vineyard crops. *San Joaquin loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes, eroded*, has a storie index rating of 20 and a land capability of IVe irrigated and nonirrigated.

San Joaquin loam thick surface, 0 to 2 percent slopes's permeability is very slow and water capacity is moderate. This unit is suited to irrigated pasture. *San Joaquin loam, thick surface, 0 to 2 percent slopes*, has a storie index rating of 32 and a land capability of IIIs irrigated and IVs nonirrigated.

San Joaquin complex's permeability is very slow and water capacity is low. This unit is suited to irrigated pasture. *San Joaquin complex* has a storie index rating of 28 and a land capability of IVs irrigated and nonirrigated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

Would the project:

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

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

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

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

Impact Discussion:

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

Implementation of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to increases of GHG emissions. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and, to a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) associated with area sources, mobile sources or vehicles, utilities (electricity and natural gas), water usage, wastewater generation, and the generation of solid waste. The primary source of GHG emissions for the project would be mobile source emissions. The common unit of measurement for GHG is expressed in terms of annual metric tons of CO₂ equivalents (MTCO₂e/yr).

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

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

~~~~~

<sup>11</sup> 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<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

## **IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

Would the project:

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                          |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?                                                                                                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?                                                                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?                                                                                                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?                                                                                                                                                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project is for the establishment of a commercial stable, which will convert existing agricultural structures. Hazardous materials such as engine motor oil, antifreeze coolant, propane, nitrogen gas, and diesel fuel may be used and stored on site. The San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department (EHD) requires the owner/operator to report to the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) before any hazardous materials/waste can be stored or used onsite. The existing regulatory framework for the transport and use of any hazardous materials will ensure any impact is less than significant.

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

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

interfere with, County-adopted emergency response plans.

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

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;                                                                                                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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:**

The proposed project's impact on hydrology and water is expected to be less than significant. The project will be served by the existing onsite well and septic system. The existing services were constructed under permit, and Construction of an individual domestic water well will be under permit and inspection by the Environmental Health Department. The sewage disposal system must comply with the onsite wastewater treatment systems standards of San Joaquin County. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on these resources will be less than significant.

The San Joaquin County Department of Public Works will require the applicant pay a Water Supply Facilities Impact Mitigation Fee. The Water Impact Mitigation Fee Program was established to finance San Joaquin County's share of the construction cost for the New Melones Water Conveyance Project, which is intended to mitigate the impact of ground and surface water depletion resulting from new development within the fee area. The fee area includes the unincorporated area of the County within the SEWD and Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District and the area within one-half mile north of the SEWD boundary along Eight Mile Road, between Rio Blanco Road and Alpine Road. The proposed project's impact on ground and surface water will be mitigated with the required Water Supply Facilities Impact Mitigation



Fee which will reduce any impact the project has on ground and surface water to less than significant.

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

Development Title Section 9-1135.2 requires all development projects to provide drainage facilities within and downstream from the development project. Storm water runoff shall be conveyed into a terminal drain or may be retained in a retention basin. The Department of Public Works requires that drainage facilities be provided in accordance with the San Joaquin County Development Standards. The proposed project plans call for storm water to be retained in an on-site retention pond. The Department of Public Works will determine the feasibility of the proposed retention pond.

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

|                                      |                                                             |                                    |              |                                 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

# **XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.**

Would the project:

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

## **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project is for the establishment of a commercial stable, which will convert existing agricultural structures. The project is not a growth-inducing action nor is it in conflict with any existing or planned uses. The Stables - Commercial use type is a conditionally permitted in the AG-40 (General Agriculture, 40-Acre minimum) zone subject to an approved Use Permit application.

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

|                                      |                                                             |                                    |              |                                 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

## XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

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

### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of a resource recovery site because the site does not contain minerals of significance or known mineral resources. San Joaquin County applies a mineral resource zone (MRZ) designation to land that meets the significant mineral deposits definition by the State Division of Mines and Geology. The proposed project is not in a designated MRZ zone. Therefore, the proposed project applications will have less than a significant impact on the availability of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites within San Joaquin County.

| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

### **XIII. NOISE.**

Would the project result in:

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

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

#### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will not generate a substantial increase to ambient noise levels or excessive groundborne vibration and noise in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project is a commercial stable facility, which will utilize existing agricultural structures that will be converted for commercial use. These structures are located on a 198.45 acre project site, and are located approximately 1,450 feet southwest of the nearest residence. The stable is anticipating a maximum of five (5) customers on site per day, and will also host clinics up to once per month with a maximum of ten (10) attendees. As a result of the limited scope of the operation and distance from residences, the proposed project is anticipated to have no impact on noise levels.

|                                      |                                                             |                                    |              |                                 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

#### XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

Would the project:

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐
☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

#### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will not induce unplanned population growth, or displace an existing people or housing. The proposed project will establish a commercial stable, which will serve the existing developed agricultural community throughout San Joaquin County. The stable proposes no new development.

| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>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:**

The proposed project will establish a commercial stable facility, and will convert existing agricultural structures. The project scope is limited, resulting in the boarding of a maximum of thirty (30) horses. As a result, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on government facilities and services. The existing structures will be converted for commercial use, subject to building permits and the applicable building code and fire code requirements. No increase in population is anticipated as a result of the proposed project, and as a result, a less than significant impact is anticipated on schools, parks, and other facilities.

| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

## **XVI. RECREATION.**

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will establish a commercial stable facility for a maximum of thirty (30) horses. The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks, as it will not increase residents or homes within the vicinity. The project is anticipated to have no impact on existing recreational facilities, and will not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed project will additionally provide private recreational services for the community above and beyond those already provided through existing neighborhood and regional parks. Due to the limited scope of the proposed project, impacts to recreation opportunities are anticipated to be less than significant



|                                      |                                                             |                                    |              |                                 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access?                                                                                                                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will establish a commercial stable for a maximum of thirty (30) horses. The project was referred to the Department of Public Works on July 19, 2019; the Department of Public Works reviewed the project, and determined that the proposed project was expected to have a less-than-significant impact on traffic and transit. The project will utilize existing public roadways (Sargent Road, Tully Road) and existing driveways, which were constructed with applicable encroachment permits. Pursuant to Development Title Section 9-1015(h)(1), the proposed stable must be served by a driveway no less than twenty (20) feet in width to comply with fire access requirements; additionally the driveway must be improved to, at minimum, utilize an all-weather surface, which meets the requirements for fire access. As a result, the proposed project will provide adequate emergency access.

|                                      |                                                             |                                    |              |                                 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

# **XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

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

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

## **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will establish a commercial stable for a maximum of thirty (30) horses. At the time development, if Human burials are found to be of Native American origin, the developer shall follow the procedures pursuant to Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5(e) of the California State Code of Regulations. A referral was sent to Katherine Perez of the North Valley Yokuts Tribe for review. If human remains are encountered, all work shall halt in the vicinity and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the finds. If Human burials are found to be of Native American origin, steps shall be taken pursuant to Section 15064.5(e) of Guidelines for California Environmental Quality Act.

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>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:**

The proposed project will establish a commercial stable facility, and will convert existing agricultural structures. The Stables - Commercial use type may be conditionally permitted in the AG-40 (General Agriculture, 40-acre minimum) zone. There are no public services available in this area for water, sewer, or storm water drainage. Parcels zoned as agricultural may use a well for water, a septic tank for sewer, and retain all drainage on-site. No new development is proposed at this time. The existing development utilizes existing private facilities. The Environmental Health Department and the Department of Public Works will determine the size of these systems and ensure they comply with all applicable statutes and regulations.

|  | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### **Impact Discussion:**

The proposed project will establish a commercial stable facility, and will convert existing agricultural structures. Pursuant to the San Joaquin Fire Severity Zone map, the project site is not located in or near a moderate, high, or very high fire zone designation. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wildfire hazards

| Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant with<br>Mitigation<br>Incorporated | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact | No<br>Impact | Analyzed<br>In The<br>Prior EIR |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|

## XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☐
☒
☐

### Impact Discussion:

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

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])**



