

## 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:** Lennar Homes of California

**Project Title/File Number(s):** PA-2100089 (SU)

**Project Description:** A Major Subdivision application which proposes the development of a 28.01-acre (R-MH) Medium-High Density Residential parcel to be divided into 254 residential lots and 54 common area parcels that will be owned and maintained by a community home owner's association. The major subdivision will include the construction of 136 duet style homes (single-family attached duplexes), eight (8) half-duets (single-family detached homes), and 110 single family homes with reciprocal use easements. The characteristics/amenities of the homes will include two-story construction. There are three access points, or entrances, into this proposed community, two from Estes Road and the other from Arturo Boulevard. All entrances are private streets with sidewalks that connect to a central private loop road with homes fronting on the interior of the loop, and alleys radiating outward from the loop road to the edges of the property. There is no parking on the private alleys, but street parking is allowed on the loop road. There will be a total of 683 parking spaces at various locations throughout on the project including 530 parking spaces on the lot, 134 undesignated street parking spaces, and 18 guest-parking stalls. There will be a homeowner's association for the maintenance of common area lots (e.g., private streets, landscaping, guest parking areas).

The project site is located at the southwest corner of N. Arturo Blvd. and N. Central Pkwy., immediately east of N. Estes Way, Mountain House. (APN/Address: 256-040-01 / 350 N. Estes Way, Mountain House) (Supervisory District: 5)

**Assessor's Parcel No.:** 256-040-01

**Acres:** 28.01

**General Plan:** R/MH (High Density Residential)

**Zoning:** R-MH (High Density Residential)

**Potential Population, Number of Dwelling Units, or Square Footage of Use(s):**

254 homes to include 136 duet style homes (single-family attached duplexes), eight (8) half-duets (single-family detached homes), and 110 single family homes.

**Surrounding Land Uses:**

**North:** Residential

**South:** Mountain House Creek Corridor and Community Park

**East:** Vacant

**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.

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 on May 5, 2021; staff knowledge or experience; and independent environmental studies submitted to the County as part of the project application (TJKM Signal Warrant Traffic analysis dated April 29, 2021), TJKM VMT Analysis dated May 26, 2021, and Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc Environmental Noise Analysis May 12, 2021). 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? Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)

☒ Yes ☐ No

Agency name(s):

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

City: City of Tracy


## 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 checked="" 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 9/8/21

## 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
<b><u>I. Aesthetics.</u></b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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–d) The proposed Major Subdivision application would facilitate the development of a 28.01-acre R-MH (Medium-High Density Residential) parcel and will not affect the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The proposed visual and residential land use improvements for the project site are subject to Design Review and existing community approvals to ensure the aesthetics, character, and quality envisioned for the community are maintained. Also, no significant new light and glare impacts would result from the project. Therefore, any impacts on the existing visual character or surrounding residential development will be less than significant.

The proposed visual characteristics of the proposed single-family residences would remain the same as required under Mountain House Development Title Section 9-830.5M. Therefore, the proposed major subdivision request will have no impact on existing aesthetics or degrade the existing visual character of the Mountain House Community.

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

### **Impact Discussion:**

- a-e) The proposed Major Subdivision application will not affect agricultural uses, agricultural zoning within or adjacent to Mountain House nor will it effect existing Williamson Act contracts. There are no Williamson Act contracts within the project area. Therefore, the proposed application request(s) will have no impact on agriculture and forestry resources.

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-e) The air quality impacts of the proposed project have been assessed as part of the Mountain House Villages E and G Project Expanded Initial Study, SCH 2003042093("Expanded Initial Study"). That evaluation assumed that 312 Residential, Medium-High Density units would be constructed at the project site, rather than the 254 residential units that are proposed for the project. The expanded Initial Study found that there would be no impacts or a less-than-significant impacts on air quality attributable to the development of Neighborhoods E and G.

There are no significant air quality effects not previously examined in the Master EIR, therefore, no new air quality mitigation measures are required. There are no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the Master EIR was certified, nor no new available information which was not known and could not have been known at the time the Master EIR was certified such that major revisions of the Master EIR would be required.

A referral was sent to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and a response letter dated July 9, 2021 was received. The District concluded that the proposed project is subject to District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) and an Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application is required prior to applying for project-level approval from a public agency. The applicant (Shea Homes LLC) has indicated that they will comply with District 9510 and mitigate the project's impact on air quality through product design elements or by payment of applicable off-site mitigation fees.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<b><u>IV. Biological Resources.</u></b>					
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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a-f) The project site is subject to the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) and the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) has determined that the project was mitigated under the previous major subdivision for Neighborhood G in Mountain House.
- b) The project site is not located in a riparian habitat as there is no river, stream or other waterway on the site, therefore, impacts will be less than significant.
- c) The project will not have an effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, because the project is not within an identified protected wetland. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.
- f) The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because the project applicant will participate in the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP).



Implementation of the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a level of less-than-significant.

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

## 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-d) The development approval for the Major Subdivision application will include conditions of approval and mitigation measures to avoid potential impacts to cultural resources. 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).

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

## **VI. Energy.**

Would the project:

a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

## **Impact Discussion:**

a-b) The California Energy Code (also titled The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings) was created by the California Building Standards Commission in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The code's purpose is to advance the state's energy policy, develop renewable energy sources and prepare for energy emergencies. 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 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
<b><u>VII. Geology And Soils.</u></b>					
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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a-e) 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. A geotechnical report was completed March 12, 2021 and all recommendations from the geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the construction plans and included in the conditions of approval. Therefore, impacts to seismic-related (or other) landslide hazards 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
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------

# **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:**

a-b) The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has published the "Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts", that would be used to analyze air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts associated with the project. With the rules and regulations of the SJVAPCD added to the Conditions of Approval for the project, the impact of the project for greenhouse gas emissions 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
<b><u>IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.</u></b>					
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:**

- a-h) The proposed Major Subdivision application would not result in, create or induce hazards and associated risks to the public. Construction activities for the project typically involve the use of toxic or hazardous materials such as paint, fuels, and solvents. Construction activities would be subject to federal, state, and local laws and requirements designed to minimize and avoid potential health and safety risks associated with hazardous materials. No significant impacts are anticipated related to the transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials during construction activities are anticipated.

The nearest airport is the Byron Airport, located approximately 5 miles northwest of the project site. The proposed structures will not exceed 50 feet in height. Project referrals have been sent to Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, Contra Costa County ALUC, SJCOG ALUC, and Byron Airport. Any comments or conditions of approval received from the agencies will be included in the final conditions of approval to ensure any impacts are 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
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------

## **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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Impact Discussion:**

- a-j) The proposed Major Subdivision impacts on hydrology and water are expected to be less than significant. The project will be served by a public water system and a public sewer system. The applicant has provided a will serve letter from the Mountain House Community Services District (MHCS D) confirming that MHCS D will provide sewer, storm drainage and water services to the project site. The project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit program. Also, the residential development would be required to implement additional water quality Best Management Practices (BMP's). These BMP's would be determined on a case-by-case basis and approved by the MHCS D. Therefore, project impacts related to hydrology and water quality 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
<b><u>XI. Land Use and Planning.</u></b>					

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-b) The proposed project is subject to the 2035 San Joaquin County General Plan, Mountain House Master Plan, and Specific Plan I document. The current Master Plan designation is R/MH (Medium-High Density Residential) and the zoning is R-MH (Medium-High Density Residential). The proposed development project would do the following:

- 1) Provide for the development of a 28.01-acre R-MH parcel that would be divided into 254 residential lots, which would range in size 1,925 square feet to 6,282 square feet (average lot size of 2,461 square feet).
- 2) Provide for the construction of 136 single family attached ("duet") homes and three detached single family homes with the following characteristics/amenities: a) two-story construction, with homes ranging in size from approximately 1,612 square feet to 2,152 square of living area with three to four bedrooms; b) two-car garage per home; c) private back yard and side yard per home; d) homes constructed in the Craftsman, Cottage, Traditional, Mission, Farmhouse, and Italianate architectural themes (to facilitate diversity in colors, materials, roof lines and street frontage); and e) homes fronting onto the loop road and onto alleys within the project, and onto public streets generally on the perimeter of the project;
- 3) Provide internal circulation featuring: a) a loop street and alleys, with no parking along them and with a width of 22 feet between curbs; b) sidewalks on both sides of the loop street, and a sidewalk on one side of the alleys; and c) two access points to public streets: one to Ramsey Drive, just west of Central Parkway; and one to Phelps Drive, just east of Bancroft Drive;
- 4) Provide guest parking scattered throughout the project including 530 parking spaces on the lot, 134 undesignated street parking spaces, and 18 guest-parking stalls;
- 5) Provide a homeowner's association for the maintenance of common area lots (e.g., private streets, landscaping, guest parking areas; and be developed at a density of 12 dwelling units per acre.

Land use conflicts would not occur because the surrounding area will be developed with residential uses. The project will have no effect on physically dividing urban or rural communities because it would be constructed in an area that has been planned via the Master Plan for the residential use proposed. The project would comply with the adopted San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan ("SJMSCP") and all required SJMSCP fees associated with the project have been paid. All avoidance measures have been satisfied.



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

## Impact Discussion:

- a, b) The residential development project application 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. Therefore, the residential development project will have less than a significant impact on the availability of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites within San Joaquin County and the Mountain House community.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<b><u>XIII. Noise.</u></b>					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Impact Discussion:**

- a-f) The development project may have equipment utilized in the grading of the site that will temporarily increase the area's ambient noise levels. Underlying projects when approved will be required to comply with Development Title Section 9-1025.9 (c) (3) which states that:

**Noise sources associated with construction are exempt from the provisions of the Noise Ordinance provided such activities do not take place before 6:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. on any day.**

As such, noise generation from the proposed underlying projects will be reduced to less than significant with this added condition.

Development Title Section 9-1025.9 lists the Residential use type as a noise sensitive land use. Development Title Section 9-1025.9(d) states that the Review Authority shall require the preparation of an acoustical study in instances where it has been determined that a project may expose existing or proposed noise sensitive land uses to noise levels exceeding the noise standards specified in Table 9-1025.9.

An Environmental Noise Analysis was prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc on May 12, 2021 and it was determined that the exterior noise levels at the backyards of residences around the perimeter of the site, along the northern and eastern boundaries, which would be adjacent to N. Arturo Road and N Central Parkway, respectively would exceed the 65 dBA Ldn threshold for San Joaquin County. If approved the following conditions shall apply:

**NOISE WALL: A six-foot sound wall along the northern boundary, at the backyards of residences adjacent to N Arturo Rd (Lots 74 through 105), and a six-foot sound wall along the eastern property line of the site , at the backyards of the residences adjacent to N Central Parkway (Lots 111 through 144) shall be included in the improvement plans. (Development Title Section 9-1150.10)**

Interior noise levels within new residential units are required to be maintained at or below 45 dBA Ldn. Attaining the necessary noise reduction from exterior to interior spaces is readily achievable with proper wall construction techniques, the selections of proper windows and doors, and the incorporation of forced-air mechanical ventilation systems. The mentioned noise insulation features would adequately reduce interior noise levels in all units to 45 dBA Ldn or less, satisfying the interior noise thresholds of 45 dBA for San Joaquin County. The above recommendations will be incorporated into the final design of the proposed residences. Therefore, any exposure to noise sources or excessive noise levels will be reduced to less than significant with the above conditions for a noise wall and incorporation of sound rated construction materials.

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

#### **XIV. Population and Housing.**

Would the project:

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

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

#### **Impact Discussion:**

- a-c) 254 residential units are anticipated as part of the Major Subdivision application and will serve letters have been provided to the Community Development Department to serve the 254 residential units. Mountain House was planned with a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial development land uses and to be a "self-contained community, thus to minimize growth-inducing impacts. Because the capacity of the onsite water and wastewater plants would serve no more than the projected onsite population as specified in the existing community approvals this would eliminate this potential growth-inducing impact.

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 proposed project is for a 254 family residential project and this is substantially the same residential development potential assumed under the existing approved Specific Plan I document Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact on public services and no additional 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?

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

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:**

a-b) There is an existing Central Community park located south of the proposed residential project site. No significant impacts on existing neighborhood, community, and regional parks or other recreational parks or other recreational facilities, either at the Mountain House Community or off-site, is expected such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur as result of the residential development project.

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-f) Master Plan Chapter Nine, Transportation and Circulation addresses the expected traffic volumes and anticipates the need for and timing of circulation improvements required to serve the community and project area through buildout. The proposed project is within the scope of the existing Transportation Demand Management approval for the Mountain House Community; and the conditions of approval will include all applicable mitigation measures and policies of the Master Plan and Specific Plan I documents. As such, through the collection of local and regional traffic impact fees, the project would generate funds to be collected by the County Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee (TIMF) and MHTIF to pay for future roadway and transportation program responsibilities of the project. Therefore, the proposed residential project is not in conflict with any adopted policies or plans and will have a less than significant impact on existing traffic and roadway levels of service.

A Signal Warrant Traffic analysis was conducted by TJMK, dated April 29, 2021 (attached) for the proposed project. Based on the analyses contained in the report it was determined that under existing plus project conditions, planned traffic signals are not warranted at the study intersections including N. Central Parkway and East Main Street and concluded that the proposed development is consistent with the long-range plans for Mountain House and should have adequate traffic, parking and pedestrian features. Therefore, the proposed project and proposed final circulation and roadway layout for the project will have a less than significant impact on existing roadway levels of service.

Based on the San Joaquin County Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis Screening Tool, the project size including 254 residential units is too large to be screened-out based on project size. Therefore, a VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) analysis dated May 26, 2021 (attached) was conducted by TJMK for the proposed project. Based on the analyses contained in the report, the Mountain House Neighborhood G project is located in Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) #2716 of the model. Currently, TAZ #2716 has 0 households with 0 population coded in the base year model. The project will add a total of 255 housing units with a population of 660. The residents to household ratio of 2.6 was determined using the ratio of surrounding TAZs in the area that do have households and population coded.

Table 1: Land Use Changes for Base Year

TAZ	Households	Population	Single Family Dwelling Units
2716	+255	+660	+255

A base year plus project model run was conducted with the land use changes added. The results are summarized in table 2.

Table 2: Home Based VMT Per Capita Comparison

TAZ	Base Year Average Daily VMT per Resident (per SJCOG Model)	Regional Average (per SJCOG Model)	15% Below Regional Average (per SJCOG Model)	Base Year <u>Plus</u> Project Average Daily VMT per Resident (per Model run)
2716	0*	26.6	22.6	17.6

\*The Base Year average VMT per capita is 0 because there are no households in the TAZ before the project is built.

The existing base year per capita VMT is 0 due to no households nor population being coded in the existing TAZ #2716. Adding 255 housing units and 660 residents increased the per capita residential VMT in the TAZ from 0 to 17.6, an increase of 17.6. Although there is an increase in residential VMT per capita once the project is added in the TAZ, 17.6 is lower than the 15% threshold of the county average, which is 22.6. The project is thus found to have a less than significant impact on VMT for the base year.

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

### **XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.**

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

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

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

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

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

### **Impact Discussion:**

a) The development approval for the Major Subdivision application will include conditions of approval and mitigation measures to avoid potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. A referral was sent to the California Native Heritage Commission, the California Valley Miwok Tribe, the Buena Vista Rancheria, the California Tribal TANF Partnership, and the United Auburn Indian Community. The United Auburn Indian Community responded in a letter dated June 25, 2021 which stated that the project site is located outside of their consultation area and that they do not have any objection to the commencement of the project. Additionally, the Buena Vista Rancheria responded in a letter dated July 8, 2021 stating that they do not have any objection to the commencement of the project.

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).



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

### **XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.**

Would the project:

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

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

### **Impact Discussion:**

- a-e) The project site will be served by the Mountain House Community Services District for sewer, water and terminal storm drainage. The utility infrastructure consisting, of a water distribution system, a sanitary sewer drain system, have been constructed for the development of Neighborhood G. The utilities would be extended to the proposed project site. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts on utilities and service systems and no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<b><u>XX. Wildfire.</u></b>					
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:**

a-d) The project is outside of high fire hazard severity zones and will not be impacted by wildfires.

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:**

a-c) The proposed project will have no impact on a number of areas: Aesthetics, Agriculture, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Water Quality.

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.

