

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: Mike Dormer, c/o Sharrah Dunlap Sawyer, Inc.

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): PA-2300157

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An Administrative Use Permit to construct a 3-story, 29,400 square foot, 64-room hotel. The project will include 68 parking stalls and will occupy approximately 1.5 acres. The project site is currently 2 legal lots which will be merged to accommodate the project. The project site is within the service boundary of CSA-31 (Community Service Area) for water, sewer, and storm drainage. Access to the landlocked project site is proposed from N. Thornton Road via a proposed private 30' access easement. (Use Type: Transient Lodging – Hotel and Motel)

The project site is located on the east side of N. Thornton Road, 290 feet north of State Route 12, Flag City, Lodi.

ASSESSORS PARCEL NO(S): 025-190-22; 025-190-30

ACRES: 2.25 acres

GENERAL PLAN: C/FS

ZONING: C-FS

POTENTIAL POPULATION, NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS, OR SQUARE FOOTAGE OF USE(S):
29,400 square foot hotel occupying approximately 1.5 acres.

SURROUNDING LAND USES:

- NORTH:** Commercial – Freeway Services zone;
- SOUTH:** Commercial – Freeway Services zone; State Route 12; Flag City Complex
- EAST:** Agricultural with scattered residences
- WEST:** Commercial – Freeway Services zone; Interstate 5

REFERENCES AND SOURCES FOR DETERMINING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

Many of these original source materials have been collected from other public agencies or from previously prepared EIR's and other technical studies. Additional standard sources which should be specifically cited below include on-site visits by staff (note date); 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.?

Yes

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): Enter concern(s).

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

Yes No

Agency name(s): Enter agency name(s).

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

Yes No

City: Enter city name(s).

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.

Alicia Goulart

Signature

10/3/2023

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.

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

I. AESTHETICS.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 publicly accessible vantage points). 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) San Joaquin County is set within the greater Central Valley, composed of large expanses of generally flat, agricultural lands and urban development, and framed by the foothills of the Diablo Range to the west and the foothills of the Sierra Nevada to the east. According to the County's General Plan, scenic resources within the County include waterways, hilltops, and oak groves (County of San Joaquin 2035).

The project is a proposal hotel. The project site is located on N. Thornton Road, 290 feet north of State Highway 12, one-half mile from Interstate 5, and north of the Flag City Complex which is developed with trucking services, fast-food restaurants, hotels, and an RV Park. To the north of the property, the developed area is a truck stop and truck parking. To the east, the area is relatively flat, with agricultural uses and scattered residences. Because the site is at the edge of existing development, and because any scenic vista would be north of this area, the project's impact on a scenic vista is expected to be less-than-significant.

- b) There are two officially designated state scenic highways in San Joaquin County: I-580 and I-5 (County of San Joaquin 2035). I-580 is located approximately 40.0 miles southwest of the project site. Due to distance, the project site is not visible from I-580. I-5 is located approximately 0.25 miles west of the project site. The project will convert an agricultural field to an industrial use however, the site is not visible from I-5 and therefore is not expected to impact scenic resources.

In addition, the County has designated 26 roadways within the County as local scenic routes (County of San Joaquin 2035). The project site is located on N. Thornton Road, the section of which is not a designated scenic route. The nearest locally designated scenic route is a section of Eight Mile Road, located approximately 4.5 miles south of the project site, which, due to distance, does not have a view of the project site. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact associated with scenic resources within a state- or locally- designated scenic route.

- c) The project site is located north of State Route 12 and the Flag City Complex. Flag City is a development of truck services and camping, with hotels and eating establishments and other related services and the proposed project will not conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations. The area is generally flat and there are no particular vantage points. The site is adjacent to agricultural uses to the east and truck services to the north and west. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact associated with the existing visual quality or character of the site or its surroundings.
- d) The existing lighting and glare conditions in the project area are typical of an area with 24-hour services. New lighting for the project would include outdoor building lighting and parking lot lighting. Parking lot lighting standards stipulate

that all lighting be designed to confine direct rays to the premises, with no spillover beyond the property line except onto public thoroughfares, provided that such light does not cause a hazard to motorists (Development Title Section 9-403.050). Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact from new sources of light or glare on day or nighttime views in the area.

	Less Than			
Potentially	Significant with	Less Than		Analyzed
Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No	In The
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact	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 a nonagricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Impact Discussion:

- a) The project is a proposed hotel on parcels zoned Commercial – Freeway Services. The parcels are not classified as Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland on maps provided by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The parcels have the classification of Vacant or Disturbed Land (V). Therefore, the impact of the project's conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of State Importance to a nonagricultural use will be less than significant.
- b) The parcels are not under a Williamson Act contract nor are they zoned for agriculture, therefore they would be ineligible to be put under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, nor will it conflict with a Williamson Act contract.
- c-d) There are no forest resources or zoning for forestlands or timberland, as defined by Public Resources Code and

Government Code, located on or near the project site, therefore, the project will have no impact on corresponding zoning or conversion of such land.

e) See answer a).

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

III. AIR QUALITY.

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

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

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The project is a proposed 29,400-square-foot hotel. The project site is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin which lies within the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (APCD). APCD is the local agency established by the State to regulate air quality sources and minimize air pollution. The project was referred to APCD for review on August 4, 2023. APCD issued a response dated September 25, 2023, that the District did not have comments on the project that would result in the need for additional assessments at this time.

The project is subject to APCD's District Rule 9510, Indirect Source Review, intended to encourage developers to incorporate clean air measures and reduce emissions of NOx and PM10 from new development projects in order to reach the State's requirements for future ambient air-pollution standards on schedule. District Rule 9510 will require the applicant to submit an Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application at a later date.

With adherence to the District's rules and regulations, the project's impact on air quality is expected to be less than significant.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

a-f) The California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Database lists *Buteo Swainsoni* (Swainson's hawk), *Thamnophis gigas* (giant garter snake), *Emys marmorata* (western pond turtle), *laterallus jamaicensis* (California black rail), Coastal and Valley freshwater marsh, *Lepidurus packardii* (vernal pool tadpole shrimp), *Hibiscus lasiocarpus* (rose-mallow), and *Scutallaria lateriflora* (blue skullcap) as rare, endangered, or threatened species or habitat located within a two-mile radius of the site for the proposed project. Referrals have been sent to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG), the agency responsible for verifying the correct implementation of the *San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan* (SJMSCP), which provides compensation for the conversion of Open Space to non-Open Space uses which affect the plant, fish and wildlife species covered by the Plan. Pursuant to the Final EIR/EIS for SJMSCP, dated November 15, 2000, and certified by SJCOG on December 7, 2000, implementation of the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a level of less-than-significant.

SJCOG responded to this project referral in a letter dated August 4, 2023, that the project is subject to the SJMSCP. The applicant has confirmed that he will participate in SJMSCP. With the applicant's participation, the proposed project is consistent with the SJMSCP and any impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project will be reduced to a level of less-than-significant.

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

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-c) The proposed project is a 29,400 square foot hotel. The site is vacant and has not been previously developed.

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

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

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

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

VI. ENERGY.

Would the project:

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

Impact Discussion:

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

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

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

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

The project site is located in an area that is relatively flat and does not contain any slopes that could result in landslides. Therefore, impacts associated with landslides are expected to be less than significant.

- b) The project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will require a grading permit in conjunction with a building permit. Therefore, the grading will be done under permit and inspection by the San Joaquin County Community Development Department's Building Division, following all requirements to lessen any impacts from the grading. As a result, impacts to soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be less than significant.
- c) As part of the project design process, a soils report will be required for grading and foundations and all recommendations from a soils report must be incorporated into the construction plans. As a result of these grading recommendations, which are required by the California Building Code (CBC), the project would not be susceptible to the effects of any potential lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction. Compliance with the CBC and the engineering recommendations in the site-specific soils report would ensure structural integrity in the event that seismic-related issues are experienced at the project site. Therefore, impacts associated with unstable geologic units are expected to be less than significant.
- d) The Soil Survey of San Joaquin County classifies the project site soil with a low expansive value. As a result, the effects of expansive soil on the project buildings are expected to be less than significant.
- e) The project site is within the service boundary of CSA 31 and will be served the CSA 31 sanitary sewer system. Therefore, a septic system is not required and, as a result, impacts to soils from wastewater are expected to be less than significant.
- f) The project area has not been determined to contain significant historic or prehistoric archeological artifacts that could be disturbed by project construction, therefore, damage to unique paleontological resources or sites or geologic features is expected to be less than significant.

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.

Would the project:

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

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

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

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

Impact Discussion:

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

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

As noted previously, the proposed project will be subject to the rules and regulations of the SJVAPCD. The SJVAPCD has adopted the *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA* and the *District Policy – Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*.¹ The guidance and policy rely on the use of performance-based standards, otherwise known as Best Performance Standards (BPS) to assess significance of project specific greenhouse gas emissions on global climate change during the environmental review process, as required by CEQA. To be determined to have a less-than-significant individual and cumulative impact with regard to GHG emissions, projects must include BPS sufficient to reduce GHG emissions by 29 percent when compared to Business As Usual (BAU) GHG emissions. Per the SJVAPCD, BAU is defined as projected emissions for the 2002-2004 baseline period. Projects which do not achieve a 29 percent reduction from BAU levels with BPS alone are required to quantify additional project-specific reductions demonstrating a combined reduction of 29 percent. Potential mitigation measures may include, but not limited to: on-site renewable energy (e.g. solar photovoltaic systems), electric vehicle charging stations, the use of alternative-fueled vehicles, exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards, the installation of energy-efficient lighting and control systems, the installation of energy-efficient mechanical systems, the installation of drought-tolerant landscaping, efficient irrigation systems, and the use of low-flow plumbing fixtures.

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

¹ San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. *Guidance for Valley Land-use Agencies in Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for New Projects under CEQA*. December 17, 2009. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. *District Policy Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency*. December 17, 2009.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-c) Pursuant to the Hazardous Materials Disclosure Survey submitted with the application, there will not be any storage of hazardous materials on site. Regulations related to the storage of hazardous materials require the owner/operator to report the use or storage of these hazardous materials to the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) and must comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the storage of hazardous materials. In this way, impacts related to the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant.
- d) The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database map, compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and, therefore, will not result in creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- e) The project site is located within the Kingdon Airpark area of influence (AIA) Zone 8 and is approximately 2 miles northwest of the airport runway. Pursuant to the San Joaquin County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Amended 2018), the current noise exposure contour and the future noise exposure contour are approximately 1.5 miles away

from the project site. Additionally, although Kingdon Airpark does not have any formal noise abatement procedures, it has taken steps to encourage pilots to avoid noise-sensitive land uses by using the following procedure: climb runway heading to 800 feet above ground level (AGL), then left turn to 270 degrees before normal departure procedures. This noise abatement procedure is posted on a sign at the end of the runway. Additionally, the airport has specified run-up areas, located at the southern end of the airport, in an effort to minimize their impact on nearby land uses. Therefore, due to the project site's distance from the airport noise contours and the airpark's recommendations to pilots in order to abate noise, the project's risk of exposing people residing or working in the project area to safety hazards or excessive noise is less than significant.

- f) The County of San Joaquin Emergency Operations Plan is an all-hazards document describing the County's incident management structure, compliance with relevant legal statutes, other relevant guidelines, whole community engagement, continuity of government focus, and critical components of the incident management structure. According to the Emergency Operations Plan, major transportation route I-5, would be a possible evacuation route in the event of an emergency. The Project would not affect this route, and moreover, the Project would not affect the County's ability to implement its Emergency Operations Plan in the event of an emergency. Notwithstanding, the Project would not impede access to any public route that might be needed as an evacuation route. As a result, the Project's impact on emergency response or evacuation activities is expected to be less than significant.
- g) The project location is not identified as a Community at Risk from Wildfire by Cal Fire's "Fire Risk Assessment Program". Communities at Risk from Wildfire are those places within 1.5 miles of areas of High or Very High wildfire threat as determined from CDF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Therefore, the impact of wildfires on the project are expected to be less than significant.

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

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) The project, a proposed 29,400 square foot hotel, is located within the boundary of County Service Area 31 (CSA 31) and will receive water, sanitary sewer, and storm water drainage from CSA 31. For stormwater discharges associated with construction activity in the State of California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has adopted the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit) to avoid and minimize water quality impacts attributable to such activities. The Construction General Permit applies to all projects in which construction activity disturbs 1 acre or more of soil. Because land disturbance for this project would exceed one acre, the project applicant will be required to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit issued by the SWRCB prior to the start of construction. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include and specify water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to prevent pollutants from contacting stormwater and keep all products of erosion from moving off site into receiving waters. Routine inspection of all BMPs is required under the provisions of the Construction General Permit, and the SWPPP must be prepared and implemented by qualified individuals as defined by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

Therefore, impacts associated with water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, and surface water or groundwater quality are expected to be less than significant.

- b) The proposed project, a 29,400 square foot hotel, will receive storm water drainage through County Service Area 31. Stormwater is collected in a retention pond located 1,100 feet west of the site and allowed to percolate into the ground. Therefore, although development of the site will create impervious areas equal to the size of the parcel, with the stormwater system returning stormwater to the ground, the project's interference with groundwater recharging is expected to be less than significant.
- c) The construction of the proposed project would result in grading and soil-disturbing activities and the installation of new impervious surfaces. A grading permit will be required which requires plans and grading calculations, including a statement of the estimated quantities of excavation and fill, prepared by a Registered Design Professional. The grading plan must show the existing grade and finished grade in contour intervals of sufficient clarity to indicate the nature and extent of the work and show in detail that it complies with the requirements of the California Building Code (CBC). The plans must also show the existing grade on adjoining properties in sufficient detail to identify how grade changes will conform to the requirements of the CDC. A drainage plan must be submitted for review and approval, prior to release of a building permit. In this way, any impacts to the existing drainage pattern of the site will be less than significant.
- d) The flood zone information contained on the San Joaquin County Flood Information viewer is provided using the Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map data received from the US Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Pursuant to this information, the area containing the project site is in a zone with 0.2% annual chance (500-year) flood; or area of 1% annual chance (100-year) flood. with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile. If required, development of this project will require compliance with Development Title Section 9-703 addressing flood hazards and requirements therein. With the requirements for building above the flood depth, the risk of release of pollutants due to inundation of the project site is expected to be less than significant.

The project site is not located in a tsunami nor a seiche zone.

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

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

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

Would the project:

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

Impact Discussion:

- a) The proposed project is a 29,400 square foot hotel. The project does not include construction of any feature that would impair mobility within an existing community, nor does it include removal of a means of access between a community and outlying area. The project site is not used as a connection between established communities. Instead, connectivity with the area surrounding the project is facilitated via local roadways. Therefore, the project will not result in dividing an established community.
- b) The project proposes a 29,400 square foot hotel which is a permitted use in the Commercial – Freeway Services zone with an approved Administrative Use Permit. The use permit will be conditioned so the project will be consistent with all land use policies and regulations of the County Development Code and 2035 General Plan; therefore, the project's impact on the environment due to land use conflict is expected to be less than significant.

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

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

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

Impact Discussion:

- a-b) Pursuant to the San Joaquin County General Plan Background Report, Chapter 10 - Natural Resources, the primary extractive resource in San Joaquin County is sand and gravel, with the principal areas of sand and gravel extraction located in the southwestern part of the county and along the Mokelumne, Calaveras, and Stanislaus rivers in the eastern portion of the county. The project site is located in the northwest portion of the county and pursuant to the California Geological Survey (CGS), the project site is in an unclassified area. However, the surrounding area has either been developed or used for agriculture without any mineral resource discoveries. Therefore, the project's impact on the loss of important minerals is expected to be less than significant.

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

XIII. NOISE.

Would the project result in:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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-b) The project site is located on N. Thornton Road, just north of State Route 12 and the Flag City Complex, approximately 1,900 feet east of Interstate 5. The site is directly impacted by the noise contour of W. State Route 12. Additionally, the project area is developed with trucking and other noise-producing industrial uses. The project will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise level and groundborne vibration levels associated with project construction activities to include grading and use of heavy machinery and equipment. The operation of the hotel will not increase the area's existing ambient noise level. Therefore, noise impacts from the proposed project and impacts on vibrations are expected to be less than significant.
- c) The project site is located within the Kingdon Airpark area of influence (AIA) Zone 8 and is approximately 2 miles northwest of the airport runway. Pursuant to the San Joaquin County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (Amended 2018), the current noise exposure contour and the future noise exposure contour are approximately 1.5 miles away from the project site. Additionally, although Kingdon Airpark does not have any formal noise abatement procedures, it has taken steps to encourage pilots to avoid noise-sensitive land uses by using the following procedure: climb runway heading to 800 feet above ground level (AGL), then left turn to 270 degrees before normal departure procedures. This noise abatement procedure is posted on a sign at the end of the runway. Additionally, the airport has specified run-up areas, located at the southern end of the airport, in an effort to minimize their impact on nearby land uses. Therefore, due to the project site's distance from the airport noise contours and the airpark's recommendations to pilots in order to abate noise, the project's potential for exposing future workers at the project site to excess noise levels and impacts resulting from airport noise levels to people residing or working in the project area are expected to be less than significant.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

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

Impact Discussion:

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

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

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

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

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

Impact Discussion:

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

Police protection services are provided to the project area by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office employs over 800 sworn and support personnel. The project site is located within the Lodi Unified School District. With 50 schools and 2,500 employees, the school district spans 350 square miles and provides learning opportunities to over 28,000 students in Lodi, Stockton, and surrounding county areas. There are no public recreation facilities near the project site.

The public service agencies listed above were provided with the project proposal and invited to respond with any project concerns or conditions. None of these public agencies responded with conditions or concerns. Therefore, the project is not expected to have a significant impact on the ability of these service providers to maintain current levels of service and the project's impact on these services is expected to be less than significant.

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

XVI. RECREATION.

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

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

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

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

Impact Discussion:

a-b) The project is not expected to result in a large number of employees nor is there any residential development as part of the project. Therefore, the project is not expected to result in an increase in demand for neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, because the project will not generate any new residential units and the project, a 29,400 square foot hotel, is not expected to result in an increased demand for recreational facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impact on recreation facilities.

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

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) The project site is located on N. Thornton Road, just north of State Route 12 and the Flag City Complex, approximately 1,900 feet from Interstate 5. The main access to the project site is proposed from N. Thornton Road, a county-maintained road, and will utilize an existing access easement to reach the project site. Regional access to the site is provided by Interstate 5, a north-south roadway. State Route 12 provides a west-east nexus to the project site.

The project was referred to the Department of Public Works on August 4, 2023. The Department responded with conditions for the applicant to improve the driveway approach in accordance with the requirements of San Joaquin County Improvement Standards Drawing No. R-13 providing return radii for truck-trailer egress designed to prevent encroachment onto opposing lanes of traffic. Required frontage (roadway) improvements to Thornton Road must be constructed in conformance with the standards for one-half of an 84-foot wide right-of-way Minor Arterial road. Improvement plans, specifications and engineer's estimate prepared by a registered civil engineer must be submitted for review and are subject to plan check and field inspection fees and must be approved by the County of San Joaquin Department of Public Works prior to issuance of a building permit.

In the project vicinity, due to the rural nature of the area, most of the roadways lack sidewalks and crosswalks. Bicycle facilities do not currently exist in the project vicinity. There is no transit service within the project vicinity.

To conclude, with the required roadway frontage improvements, impacts from the project on the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities is expected to be less than significant.

- b) The project proposes a 29,400 square foot hotel. Using the San Joaquin County VMT Analysis Screening Tool, it was determined that this project will generate less than 110 automobile trips per day. Pursuant to the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, as published by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in December 2018, a project that is expected to generate less than 110 automobile trips per day is considered a small project which may generally "be assumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact" with regards to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)." Therefore, the project is expected to be consistent with the CEQA Guidelines related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT).
- c) The Department of Public Works will require the applicant to improve the driveway approach in accordance with the requirements of San Joaquin County Improvement Standards Drawing No. R-13 providing return radii for truck-trailer egress designed to prevent encroachment onto opposing lanes of traffic. With these improvements, the project's impact on transportation hazards is expected to be less than significant.
- d) The project site would be accessed from N. Thornton Road. A driveway and circulation route that meets the San Joaquin County Fire Chiefs' Association guidelines for providing fire apparatus access as required by the California Fire Code (CFC) is required. Therefore, site access will provide adequate space for fire trucks and emergency vehicles to enter and turn around, and the project's impact on emergency access is expected to be less than significant.

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

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

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

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

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

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

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

Impact Discussion:

- a)
- i) The project site is undeveloped, therefore no buildings are listed on the State Office of Historic Preservation California Register or the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the project will not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined by CEQA.
 - ii) The project proposes a 29,400 square foot hotel. A written project notification was sent August 4, 2023, to all listed tribes on the Native American Heritage Commission’s list for San Joaquin County. The Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians responded in a letter date September 5, 2023, that the tribe requested consultation to discuss the project. A telephone meeting was held September 27, 2023, resulting in a request by the tribe to include mitigation measures for inadvertent discoveries of tribal cultural resources. If potential tribal cultural resources are discovered in the course of construction activities, work is to cease in the immediate vicinity and a qualified cultural resources specialist will assess the significance of the find and make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary. These recommendations will be documented in the project record.

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

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a) The project is proposing a 29,400 square foot hotel. The project site is located within the service boundary of County Service Area 31 (CSA 31). The Department of Public Works issued a will serve letter dated August 2, 2023, stating that CSA 31 will conditionally serve the site with water, sewer, and storm water drainage provided the conditions listed in the letter are met by the applicant. Therefore, the project will not require relocation of existing facilities or require new facilities which could cause significant environmental effect.
- b) The project site is located within the service boundary of County Service Area 31 (CSA 31). CSA 31 has agreed to provide water to the site and issued a conditional will serve letter stating that CSA 31 has the capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, CSA 31 has the capacity to serve the proposed project and will have a sufficient supply of water to the site.
- c) The project site is located within the service boundary of County Service Area 31 (CSA 31) and CSA 31 has issued a conditional will serve letter stating that CSA 31 has the sewer capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, CSA 31 has the capacity to serve the proposed project in addition to the provider's existing commitments.
- d-e) California's SB 1383 was passed in 2016 to mandate a 75% reduction by 2025 of organic materials being landfilled. The purpose of the legislation is to slow climate change by diverting organic materials from landfills, thereby reducing gaseous emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas.

San Joaquin County SB 1383 Organic Waste Diversion Ordinance was passed in February of 2022 and became effective on March 15, 2022. Commercial waste collection in the unincorporated area of the County is a free-market system and is not governed by collection agreements with the County. County ordinance mandates that business must comply with

SB 1383 mandates by 1) subscribing to a SB 1383 compliant waste collection system through a licensed collector; 2) qualifying for a waiver, or; 3) utilizing acceptable alternative compliance methods.

The project proposes a 24,900 square foot hotel. The project will have to comply with local reduction statutes and local standards in order to comply with all regulations related to solid waste.

XX. WILDFIRE.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Impact Discussion:

- a-d) The project location is located east of the City of Lodi, CA, at Interstate 5 and State Route 12. It is not identified as a Community at Risk from Wildfire by Cal Fire's "Fire Risk Assessment Program". Communities at Risk from Wildfire are those places within 1.5 miles of areas of High or Very High wildfire threat as determined from CDF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Therefore, the impact of wildfires on the project are expected to be less than significant.

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

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

Impact Discussion:

a-c) Review of this project has not indicated any features which might significantly impact the environmental quality of the site and/or surrounding area. Mitigation measures have been identified in areas where a potentially significant impact has been identified and these measures, included as conditions of approval, will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

ATTACHMENT: SITE PLAN

