



SAN JOAQUIN
COUNTY
Community Development Department

Community Development Department

Planning · Building · Code Enforcement · Fire Prevention

Jennifer Jolley, Director

Eric Merlo, Assistant Director

Tim Burns, Code Enforcement Chief

Corinne King, Deputy Director of Planning

Jeff Niemeyer, Deputy Director of Building Inspection

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

TO: ☒ Office of Planning & Research
P. O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

FROM: San Joaquin County
Community Development Department
1810 East Hazelton Avenue
Stockton, CA 95205

☒ County Clerk, County of San Joaquin

PROJECT TITLE: Administrative Use Permit No. PA-2500386

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is on the north side of E. French Camp Road, 1,100 feet east of S. El Dorado Street, French Camp, San Joaquin County. (APN/Address: 193-070-03, 193-090-03 / 147 E. French Camp Rd., French Camp) (Supervisorial District: 3)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An Administrative Use Permit application for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The parcel will utilize proposed onsite well and septic systems, and a proposed retention pond for storm water drainage.

The Property is zoned I-L (Limited Industrial) and the General Plan designation is I/L (Limited Industrial).

PROPONENT: Golden State Truck Terminal LLC / Wong Engineering Inc

This is a Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project as described. San Joaquin County has determined that through the Initial Study that contains proposed mitigation measures all potentially significant effects on the environment can be reduced to a less than significant level. The Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study can be viewed on the Community Development Department website at www.sjgov.org/commdev.underActivePlanningApplications.

Date: July 20, 2026

Contact Person:

Jessica Leal Phone: (209) 468-3140 Fax: (209) 468-3163 Email: jleal@sjgov.org

Filed Doc #: 39-07222026-220

Wed Jul 22 10:21:44 PDT 2026

Page: 1 of 33 Fee: \$0.00

Steve J. Bestolarides
San Joaquin County Clerk

By Deputy: aambriz



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: Zachary Wong

PROJECT TITLE/FILE NUMBER(S): Administrative Use Permit No. PA-2500386

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

The project site is located on north side of East French Camp Road, 1,100 feet southeast of South El Dorado Street, Stockton.

Assessor's Parcel No(s): 193-070-03 & 193-090-03

Acres: 28.65-acres

General Plan: I/L (Limited Industrial)

Zoning: I-L (Limited Industrial)

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

A 3,960 square foot office for a previously approved truck parking facility.

Surrounding Land Uses:

North: French Camp Slough, City of Stockton

South: Livestock auction yard, manufacturing facility, and industrial and residential parcels

East: Agricultural, City of Stockton, corporation yard, and scattered residences

West: Union Pacific Railroad, industrial with truck parking and repair facilities, commercial parcels, Interstate 5, San Joaquin General Hospital

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 (June 26, 2026), 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?

1. PA-2500368 (A) - Initial Study

☐ Yes ☒ No

Nature of concern(s):

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

Agency name(s):

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

City: Stockton, Lathrop

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ 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.

Jessica Leal
Associate Planner



7/14/26
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

ISSUES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>I. Aesthetics.</u>					
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-c) The project site is located on the north side of East French Camp Road, which is a county-maintained road. The project is not located along a designated scenic route pursuant to 2035 General Plan Figure 12-2. The surrounding area is a mixture of industrial with scattered residential uses. The proposed structure is similar in appearance to industrial structures in the vicinity, and the proposed structures will be required to meet all setback and height requirements outlined in Development Title Table 9-202.030. Therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on visual character, public views, or scenic vistas and would be visually consistent with surrounding development.
- d) Any future development would be required to follow the San Joaquin Development Title requirements contained in Chapter 9-403 Lighting and Illumination, and as a result, the proposed project is not anticipated to create any new source of substantial light or glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. As a result, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on aesthetics.

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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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))? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-e) The project site is currently zoned I-L (Limited Industrial) and therefore is not categorized as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site is not under Williamson Act contract. Additionally, the project site is surrounded by parcels with similar uses and the proposed use may be conditionally permitted in the I-L zone with an approved Administrative Use Permit. Therefore, the project will not be converting prime farmland, nor will it conflict with the current zoning or Williamson Act contract.

There are no forest resources or zoning for forestlands or timberlands, as defined by Public Resources Code and government Code, located on or near the project site. There are no proposals to make changes to the existing environment resulting in the conversion of farmland to a non-agriculture use. As a result, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant 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
<u>III. Air Quality.</u>					
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-d) The project site is in the San Joaquin County Valley Air Basin, which is regulated by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The SJVAPCD has been established by the State of California to control and minimize air pollution and is the lead air quality regulatory agency for the San Joaquin County. The applicant will be required to meet existing requirements for emissions and dust control as established by SJVAPCD. The project was referred to the SJVAPCD for review on April 24, 2026. No response was received; however the project will be subject to the rules and regulations of SJVAPCD.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>IV. Biological Resources.</u>					
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-f) A referral was sent to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) on April 24, 2026, for review. The San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) has determined that the project is subject to the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) for any future development that results in ground disturbance. Participation in the SJMSCP 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. If Administrative Use Permit is approved, any future ground disturbance at the site would be subject to the SJMSCP as a Condition of Approval. As a result, the anticipated impact to Biological Resources is less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>V. Cultural Resources.</u>					
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-c) There are no known historical or archaeological resources on the site. Additionally, there are no known human remains located on the site. If unique archaeological resources are discovered on the site during project construction, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. If any historical resources are discovered on site, the developer shall follow the procedures in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5

In the event human remains are discovered at any point 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 the manner and cause of death. Recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains shall have been made to the person responsible for the excavation (California Health and Safety Code - Section 7050.5).

Furthermore, a referral was sent to the Northern Valley Yokut Tribe on April 24, 2026, for review. The Northern Valley Yokut Tribe responded to the referral, stating that they are aware of a documented burial site near the project site, however, the boundaries were never determined. They recommend that there be testing by an archeological firm and/or utilizing the Tribe to provide Tribal Monitoring Services during ground disturbance. At the time development, if Human burials are found to be of Native American origin, the developer shall follow the procedures pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. As a result, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on cultural resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>VI. Energy.</u>					
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:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- 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.

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 any project related construction ensuring that any impact to the environment due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy will be less than significant and prevent any conflict with state or local plans for energy efficiency and renewable energy.

VII. Geology And Soils.

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil and create direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a) According to the California Department of Conservation's California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application, the project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone. However, like other areas located in seismically active Northern California, the project area is susceptible to strong ground shaking during an earthquake, and the site would not be affected by ground shaking more than any other area in the region. The project site is relatively flat, and all building permit submittals for the project will be reviewed by the Building Division for compliance with the

California Building Code, which includes seismic requirements, and is not anticipated to directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects related to seismic-related ground failure or landslides. Therefore, any related impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

- b-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 loss of topsoil, soil erosion, 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 proposed project is located on property with high probability of expansive soil; however, the Building Department will review the required soils report and will not issue a Building Permit if it is found the development of the site could lead to the risk of a loss of life because of the expansiveness of the soil. As a result, it can be anticipated that any risk to life from potential future development would be considered less than significant.
- e) The project proposes a new on-site septic system and related leach lines to the site for wastewater disposal. The proposed system will require a permit and approval by the San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department and will have to meet the county's standards. Additionally, the project requires a soil suitability and nitrate study that incorporates the proposed staff and customer use. This study will be submitted to the Environmental Health Department, indicating that the area is suitable for septic system usage. The studies must be approved by the Environmental Health Department prior to issuance of building permits pursuant to Development Title, Section 9-604.010(d). Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact related to adequately supporting a wastewater system.
- f) The project area has not been determined to contain significant historic or prehistoric archeological artifacts that could be disturbed by potential future site development. The project site also does not contain any known unique geologic features. Therefore, damage to unique paleontological resources, 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?

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

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

☐
☐
☒
☐
☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- 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 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 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 Agency¹. 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.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.</u>					
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-d) According to the Hazardous Materials Disclosure Survey submitted with the application, the project is not anticipated to involve the use or storage of hazardous materials on-site. Additionally, 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 as noted above, does not include the use or storage of hazardous materials on-site. However, future construction activities for the project site may involve the use of toxic or hazardous materials such as paint, fuels, and solvents. These 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. The project's propensity for releasing toxins into the environment is also expected to be less than significant.

- e) The project site is within two miles of the Stockton Metropolitan Airport. However, according to the Department of Transportation *National Transportation Noise Map*¹, at the distance the project site is located from the airport, the potential noise exposure (45.0-49.9 A-weighted decibels) is no more intense than that generated from Interstate 5 (45.0-49.9 A-weighted decibels) to the west of the site. The map uses a 24-hour equivalent sound level to measure noise. The results are A-weighted noise levels, which represent the average transportation noise exposure over a full day at designated locations. Therefore, the impact that results from airport noise levels on the people in the project area is expected to be less than significant.
- f-g) The projects development is confined to a private parcel of land and not in the roadway. Additionally, the project does not require the modification of the geometric design of the road. Therefore, the project will not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Furthermore, the project location is in the Urban Community of French Camp just outside the City of Stockton and 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 DF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Therefore, the impact of wildland fires on the project site, including people or structures, is expected to be less than significant.

¹ United States Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2020. *National Transportation Noise Map*. <https://maps.dot.gov/BTS/NationalTransportationNoiseMap/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>X. Hydrology and Water Quality.</u>					
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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:	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-b, e) The proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, nor substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. The project will be served by a proposed onsite well and septic systems, and retention pond, all of which are required to be constructed under proper permits. All future development of the site would be subject to the rules and requirements of the Environmental Health Department related to water quality, and subject to the rules and requirements of the Department of Public Works related to storm drainage and groundwater. As a result, impacts to water quality, groundwater, and storm drainage and any related implementation or management plans are expected to be less than significant.

- c) The project sites northern property line fronts the French Camp Slough. The proposed project will not substantially alter existing drainage patterns of the site or surrounding area. Erosion or siltation impacts are not expected to be substantial, as the site will be paved and landscaped in accordance with applicable building codes. The rate and amount of surface runoff will be managed through on-site drainage improvements, required as conditions of project approval. These improvements will be designed in accordance with San Joaquin County Development Standards. Stormwater runoff will be retained on-site in a proposed retention pond. This system will be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works to ensure it does not exceed system capacity or generate substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The project will not impede or redirect flood flows, as the site is not located near a floodway, and the proposed grading and drainage plans are designed to prevent such impacts. Therefore, the project and any future potential development is expected to have a less than significant impact on the drainage pattern of the site.
- d) The project site is not currently located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency Designated Flood Hazard Area. The project site is not located within a tsunami or seiche zone. A referral was sent to the Department of Public Works, Flood Control Division on April 24, 2026, for comments. No comments have been received; however, any future development of the site will have to comply with Development Title Section 9-703 regarding flood hazard requirements. As a result, impacts related to flooding are anticipated 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
<u>XI. Land Use and Planning.</u>					
Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-b) The project is located within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Stockton, an area already developed with industrial, residential, and public uses. The project is contained entirely on one parcel and will not physically divide the already established community. The nearest residence is located approximately 575 feet southwest of the proposed project site. The adjacent parcels to the east are zoned I-L (Limited Industrial) are developed with truck paring and repair facilities. The parcels to the south is zoned I-L (Limited Industrial) and are developed with a manufacturing facility and livestock auction yard. The parcels to the east are zoned AU-20 (Agriculture Urban-Reserve, 20-acre minimum) consisting of vacant parcels and a developed corporation yard.

The proposed use is permitted in the I-L (Limited Industrial) zone with an approved Administrative Use Permit. The zoning and underlying General Plan designation of I/L (Limited Industrial) will remain the same if the project is approved. The surrounding land use consists of low-intensity, non-residential uses. Furthermore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the surrounding parcels with the implementation of the recommended conditions of approval and will not exert premature development pressure on adjacent properties. Therefore, the proposed project is not considered growth-inducing. Moreover, it will not conflict with existing or planned land uses, nor will it establish a significant precedent for future development. The project is consistent with all applicable County adopted plans, including Master plans, Specific Plans, and Special Purpose Plans. As such, it is expected to result in a less than significant impact with respect to land use and planning.

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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-b) San Joaquin County applies a mineral resource zone (MRZ) designation to land that meets the significant mineral deposits definition by the State Division of Mines and Geology. The project site is located within a MRZ-1 mineral resource zone; however, there currently is no mining activity in the area, and the surrounding area is developed with industrial, agricultural, and residential uses. the proposed project will not be in conflict with any existing or planned uses or set a significant land use precedent, nor will it be in conflict with any Master Plans, Specific Plans, or Special Purpose Plans, or any other applicable plan adopted by the County. Therefore, impacts related to land use conflicts are anticipated 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
<u>XIII. Noise.</u>					
Would the project result in:					
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-b) The project does not involve any activities that would generate excessive ground-borne vibrations or elevated noise levels. While grading and paving equipment, and construction will temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the area, these effects are expected to be short-term. According to Development Title Section 9-404.060, construction is permitted on weekdays between 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Limiting construction to these hours will minimize noise-related impacts, reducing them to less than significant levels.

Additionally, the project site is within the I/L (Limited Industrial) General Plan Designation and I-L (Limited Industrial) zoning and surrounded by other industrial uses and areas of vacant agricultural parcels. Although, the closest residence is 575 feet away, the conditions for the project will include setback and screening requirements along all property lines where the truck parking will be located. Therefore, the project is expected to result in less than significant impacts related to ground-borne vibrations or ground-borne noise.

- c) The project site is within two miles of the Stockton Metropolitan Airport. However, according to the Department of Transportation *National Transportation Noise Map*¹, at the distance the project site is located from the airport, the potential noise exposure (45.0-49.9 A-weighted decibels) is no more intense than that generated from Interstate 5 (45.0-49.9 A-weighted decibels) to the west of the site. The map uses a 24-hour equivalent sound level to measure noise. The results are A-weighted noise levels, which represent the average transportation noise exposure over a full day at designated locations. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact on the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

¹ United States Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2020. *National Transportation Noise Map*. <https://maps.dot.gov/BTS/NationalTransportationNoiseMap/>

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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-b) The proposed project will not affect the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the local population. It does not include any residential development within the project boundaries and is intended to serve the existing residential community in the area. As such, the project is not expected to induce substantial unplanned population growth. Furthermore, the project will not displace any existing residents or alter the supply of existing or proposed housing in the vicinity. Therefore, the project's impact on population and housing is considered 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a) The project site is within the French Camp McKinley Fire District for fire protection, is served by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office for police protection and is within the Manteca Unified School District. A referral was sent to the applicable agencies on April 24, 2026, and no responses were received pertaining to concerns about response times or the need for new facilities. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantial adverse physical impacts to existing service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection or police protection.

Furthermore, the proposed project would not require the addition of schools or park area and would not have a substantial impact on public services. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less than significant impact on existing public services and would not create a need for new public services.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>XVI. Recreation.</u>					
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:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-b) The proposed project is not expected to substantially increase the use of existing neighborhoods or regional parks, as it does not involve the development of housing or an increase in the local population. Additionally, the project does not include the construction of new recreational facilities, nor does it require the expansion of existing ones that could result in adverse physical effects on the environment. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have any significant impact on recreational facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Impact Prior EIR
<u>XVII. Transportation.</u>					
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a) There are no proposed or planned transit, roadways, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities within the project area. Therefore, a less than significant impact will occur when it comes to conflicts with programs plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system.
- b) The project site is located on East French Camp Road, which is classified as a minor arterial road. Minor arterials provide service for trips of moderate length and offer connectivity to the higher arterial system¹. Minor arterials provide a connection between interstate, other freeways and expressways, and principal arterial roadways. For VMT forecasting, the San Joaquin County Transportation Analysis Guidelines (September 2020, page 5) states that VMT is only relevant for daily automobile travel. As this project is a truck parking facility and due to the proximity to Interstate 5 and existing industrial facilities, it is expected to have an insignificant impact on VMT. This project synergizes well with other truck facilities in the area and provides direct access to Interstate 5 and other major distribution centers in the area, decreasing the need for trucks to travel further to find adequate parking and resting facilities. Thus, the project will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b).
- c) The project site has direct access from French Camp Road, which is a relatively flat road. No changes are being made to the layout of French Camp Road for the sake of this project. However, if future development is proposed, the applicant would be required to meet design standards for driveways, egress, and ingress as required by the Development Title, the San Joaquin County Development Standards, and the Public Works Department. Therefore, potential impacts from hazards related to geometric design features or incompatible uses are less than significant.
- e) The project site is within the French Camp McKinley Fire District for fire protection and is served by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Office for police protection. A referral was sent to the applicable agencies on April 24, 2026, and no responses were received pertaining to concerns regarding inadequate emergency access. As a result, the project and any future development is anticipated to have adequate emergency access.

¹United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. February 2023. *Highway Functional Classification: Concepts, Criteria, and Procedures*. Section 3.1.4 (Minor Arterials, pg. 16).

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:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

a) On April 24, 2026, referrals were sent to United Auburn Indian Community, California Valley Miwok Tribe, California Tribal TANF Partnership, North Valley Yokuts Tribe, and Buena Vista Rancheria for review. The Northern Valley Yokuts Tribe responded to the referral, stating that they are aware of a documented burial site near the project site, however, the boundaries were never determined. They recommend that there be testing by an archeological firm and/or utilizing the Tribe to provide Tribal Monitoring Services during ground disturbance. At the time development, if human burials found to be of Native American origin are encountered at the time of development, all work shall halt in the vicinity and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. At the same time, a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find. The developer shall follow the procedures pursuant to the procedures in State 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
<u>XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.</u>					
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-e) The project proposes new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond for storm water drainage. The proposed well and septic systems must be installed under a permit from the San Joaquin County's Environmental Health Department and will be subject to their rules and regulations. Furthermore, as an ordinance requirement, all storm drainage on site must follow all San Joaquin County's Department of Public Works rules and requirements pertaining to storm drainage. As a result, impacts related to utility and service systems 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
<u>XX. Wildfire.</u>					
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-d) The project site is located in a industrial area in the Urban Community of French Camp just outside the City of Stockton and 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 GDF-FRAP fuels and hazard data. Additionally, the project site and surrounding area are generally flat, with no significant slopes, drainage features, or unstable soil conditions that would affect wildfire behavior or create risks related to flooding, landslides, post-fire slope instability, or runoff. Local wind conditions are typical for the region and are not expected to exacerbate wildfire hazards. Therefore, no impacts associated with wildfire are anticipated.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Analyzed In The Prior EIR
<u>XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.</u>					
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impact Discussion:

An Administrative Use Permit for the addition of a 3,960 square foot office for an approved truck parking facility. The project proposes a new on-site well and septic systems, and a new retention pond.

- a-c) The proposed application does not have the potential to degrade the environment or eliminate a plant or animal community or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. Nor will the project result in significant cumulative impacts or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Although the project may result in localized environmental impacts, these impacts are limited in scope and duration and are not expected to contribute significantly to cumulative environmental degradation in the area. The project is consistent with land use and zoning plans, and similar uses have been established nearby.

The project does not involve activities that pose a substantial risk to public health or safety. Although the project does not propose any new development, if future development is proposed, construction and operational activities will be subject to existing regulatory standards related to air quality, noise, and traffic safety. With adherence to applicable regulations and implementation of best management practices, the project is not expected to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Review of this project has not indicated any features which might significantly impact the environmental quality of the site and/or surrounding area even on a cumulative basis. Mitigation measures have been identified in areas where a potentially significant impact has been identified and these measures, including a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which must be followed as a Condition of Approval, will reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.



Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Plan – PA-2500368 (A) June 30, 2026

Impact	Mitigation Measure/ Condition	Type of Review		Agency for Monitoring and Reporting Compliance	Action Indicating Compliance or Review	Verification of Compliance or Annual Review of Conditions		
		Monitoring	Reporting			By	Date	Remarks
IV. Biological Resources	Participation in the SJMSCP	X		San Joaquin County Council of Governments	The developer shall apply to the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) for coverage under the San Joaquin-County Multi-Species Open Space and Habitat Conservation Plan (SJMSCP). The project site shall be inspected by the SJMSCP biologist, who will recommend which incidental Take Minimization Measures set forth in the SJMSCP should be applied to the project and implemented. The project applicant shall pay the required SJMSCP fee, if any, and be responsible for the implementation of the specified incidental Take Minimization Measures.			
XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources		X		Northern Valley Yokuts Tribe	It is recommended that there be testing by an archeological firm and/or the Tribe to provide Tribal Monitoring Services during ground disturbance.			