## Initial Study Checklist

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the most current Appendix "G" Environmental Checklist Form, contained in the CEQA Guidelines.

### 1. Aesthetics — Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

**a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

The majority of the Proposed Project Site is fallow ground. A portion of the Proposed Project site is developed with two (2) existing detached single-family dwelling units, a barn, a detached garage and accessory structures. The Proposed Project site is in a rural – urban transition area within the City of Ripon General Plan 2040 Area.

The adjacent areas of the project site itself are not considered a scenic vista nor are there any scenic highways in the vicinity of the site. The Project site is situated on relatively flat land, adjacent to single-family residential and rural residential land uses. There are no scenic vistas visible from the vicinity of the Proposed Project site. Furthermore, the City’s General Plan 2040 does not identify any locally
designated scenic vistas or view corridors in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact.**

**b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a State scenic highway?**

The Proposed Project is not located on a State designated highway. Based on a review of the California Department of Transportation website (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm), the nearest State scenic highway is Interstate 5, which is a major north-south Interstate Highway System, stretching from the Mexican border to the Canadian border. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have **No Impact** to a State scenic highway.

**c. Would the project, 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?**

The visual character of the area surrounding the site is characterized predominantly by single and two-story detached single-family residential development to the east, south and west. Two (2) existing orchards are located to the north and northeast. As noted previously, the majority of the site is vacant. The Proposed Project includes the development of a residential subdivision, which will alter the existing visual character of the site. The Proposed Project site is designated for urban land uses. According to the City of Ripon General Plan 2040, development projects can be expected to be proposed in accordance with the General Plan 2040 and other development regulations in the City. The Proposed Project is required to adhere to the City’s General Plan 2040, Municipal Code, and Architectural Design Guidelines. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact.**

**d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

New sources of light and glare will be created as a result of the Proposed Project through installation of street lighting, outdoor home light, etc. However, such lighting will be installed in accordance with the City standards and the Municipal Code. In addition, lighting for the Proposed Project will be compatible with the surrounding area as the Proposed Project is primarily surrounded by single-family neighborhood uses. Prior to project construction, the Applicant will be required to submit a lighting plan for City staff review to ensure that the Proposed Project is in compliance with all City Standards. As such, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Mitigation Measures:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: WOULD THE PROJECT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, as updated) prepared by the California Department 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion is an analysis for criteria (a), and (e):

**a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, 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 non-agricultural use?**
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e. Would the project 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?

According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map for San Joaquin County (2016), the project site is an area designated as Farmland of Local Importance. According to the General Plan 2040 Environmental Impact Report (EIR), buildout of the General Plan 2040 would involve the development of approximately 4,200 acres of land and their conversion from predominantly agricultural to urban uses. This would be a Significant Impact. The General Plan 2040 contains policies which would avoid unnecessary or premature conversion of agricultural lands and other resources but would not reduce or avoid impacts on agricultural lands. The Proposed Project includes the conversion of an area designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the California Department of Conservation to an urban use (single-family dwelling units).

As discussed in the Project Description, the project site has a General Plan 2040 Land Use Designation of HLR (High Low Density Residential) and is therefore planned for urban development. The General Plan 2040 Open Space and Conservation Element (Chapter Five) provides a goal and policy framework for the preservation and conservation of agricultural resources. General Plan 2040 agricultural goals and policies applicable to the Proposed Project are identified as follows:

Policy D1: Discourage premature conversion of agricultural lands to reduce the intrusion of urban development into agricultural areas. Strategies include deterring development of properties subject to Williamson Act contracts, for which a notice of non-renewal has not been filed.

Policy D4: The City shall require a Notice of Intent with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a copy of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan filed with the City prior to approval of improvement plans for any project greater than one acre.

Policy D10: Tentative map applications shall be required to identify native trees greater than six inches in diameter and to include a plan, which maximizes their preservation. The plan should address siting of development to avoid tree removal as well as construction controls needed to avoid damage to remaining trees.

Policy D12: The City of Ripon will continue to participate in the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP).

Policy D13: Project applicants who elect not to participate in the SJMSCP shall be required to prepare biological analysis and provide alternative mitigation sufficient to reduce significant effects to less than significant.
Policy D15

Prohibit the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses, unless the property is contiguous to existing or approved urban uses and such conversion is consistent with patterns of urban development.

The Proposed Project is adjacent to the City Limits and urban development on three (3) sides (east, south and west). The land use to the north is agricultural and zoned Ag-40 (Agricultural) by San Joaquin County (unincorporated area). The Proposed Project is required to adhere to the above Policies of the General Plan 2040, including participation in the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan. Ultimately, the agricultural impacts associated with the General Plan 2040 were determined to be significant and unavoidable, and as such, a Statement of overriding consideration was adopted by the City. The General Plan 2040 anticipated the development of areas outside of City limits, including the project site. The Proposed Project includes a Development Agreement to memorialize the Tentative Map life, impact fees, project requirements (i.e. Conditions of Approval), extension of City services to the subdivision and language regarding agricultural land mitigation requirements for the project. As such, Mitigation Measure AG-1 has been included in this Initial Study which requires the applicant to either enter into an agreement with the Central Valley Farm Trust for the permanent protection of farmland or other form of agricultural land mitigation as approved by the City Council of the City of Ripon. This will ensure that the farmland converted as a result of the Proposed Project is replaced and protected. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

The following discussion is an analysis for criteria (b), (c) and (d):

b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c. Would the project 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 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? 

d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The Proposed Project site is currently zoned Agriculture-Urban Reserve (AU-20) and General Agricultural (AG-40) and Agricultural/Urban Reserve in the San Joaquin County General Plan 2040. The Proposed Project Site has a City of Ripon General Plan 2040 Land Use Designation of High-Low Density Residential (HLD). The Proposed Project site is located with the City of Ripon’s Primary Sphere of Influence. The project site is located within a rural-urban transition area of the County-City and is designated to be annexed into the City within 0-10 years. The Proposed Project is located adjacent to single-family residences and City of Ripon City Limits to the east, south, and west. The Proposed Project is not located in a Williamson Act parcel.

The Proposed Project site is not designated as, or located near, land designated for forest, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.
**Mitigation Measures:**
The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce the conversion of farmland to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1, impacts would be less than significant.

*Mitigation Measure AG-1*
The Applicant shall enter into an agreement with the Central Valley Farm Trust for the permanent protection of farmland or other form of agricultural land mitigation as approved by the City Council of the City of Ripon. Proof of an agreement shall be transmitted to the City of Ripon prior to recordation of the final map.
3. AIR QUALITY -- WOULD THE PROJECT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SETTING:

REGULATORY SETTING
The Proposed Project is located in San Joaquin County which is a portion of the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). Air quality management under the Federal and State Clean Air Acts is the responsibility of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD).

The Federal and State governments have adopted ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for the primary air pollutants of concern, known as “criteria” air pollutants. Air quality is managed by the SJVAPCD to attain these standards. Primary standards are established to protect the public health; secondary standards are established to protect the public welfare. The attainment statuses of the SJVAB for San Joaquin County with respect to the applicable AAQS are shown in the following table.

The SJVAB is considered non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), because the AAQS for the pollutants are sometimes exceeded. The SJVAB is Attainment/Unclassified for carbon monoxide, but select areas, not including the City of Ripon, are required to abide by adopted carbon monoxide maintenance plans.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) through the Air Toxics Program is responsible for the identification and control of exposure to air toxics, and notification of people that are subject to significant
air toxic exposure. A principal air toxic is diesel particulate matter, which is a component of diesel engine exhaust.

The SJVAPCD has adopted regulations establishing control over air pollutant emissions associated with land development and related activities. These regulations include:

Regulation VIII (Fugitive Dust Rules)
Rule 4101 (Visible Emissions)

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY FEDERAL AND STATE
AAQS ATTAINMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Designation / Classification</th>
<th>Federal Standards(^a)</th>
<th>State Standards(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, 1-hour</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Federal standard(^c)</td>
<td>Nonattainment / Severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, 8-hour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment / Extreme(^c)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment(^c)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment(^d)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment / Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment / Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment / Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment / Unclassified</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (particulate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No designation/Classification</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Federal standard</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Federal standard</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility-Reducing Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Federal standard</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Federal standard</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)See 40 CFR Part 81
\(^b\)See CCR Title 17 Sections 60200-60210
\(^c\)On September 25, 2008, EPA redesignated the San Joaquin Valley to Attainment for the PM10 National AAQS and approved the PM10 Maintenance Plan
\(^d\)The SJV is designated nonattainment for the 1997 PM2.5 NAAQS. EPA designated the SJV as nonattainment for the 2006 PM2.5 on November 13, 2009 (effective December 14, 2009).
\(^e\)Though the SJV was initially classified as serious nonattainment for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard, EPA approved reclassification of the SJV to extreme nonattainment in the Federal Register on May 2010 (effective June 4, 2010).
\(^f\)Effective June 15, 2005, the EPA revoked the Federal 1-hour ozone standard, including associated designations and classifications. EPA has previously classified the SJV as extreme nonattainment for this standard. EPA approved the 2004 Extreme Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan on March 8, 2010 (effective April 7, 2010). Many applicable requirements for extreme 1-hour ozone nonattainment areas continue to apply to the SJVAB.

The SJVAPCD has adopted a CEQA impact analysis guideline titled Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI). The GAMAQI is utilized in the following air quality impact analysis where applicable. The GAMAQI establishes impact significance thresholds for the non-attainment pollutant
PM10 and precursors to the non-attainment pollutant ozone: reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>10 tons/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>10 tons/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>15 tons/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects that do not generate emissions in excess of these thresholds are considered to have less than significant air quality impacts. Furthermore, within the GAMAQI, the SJVAPCD has established and outlined a three-tiered approach to determining significance related to a project’s quantified ozone precursor emissions. Each tier or level requires a different degree of complexity of emissions calculation and modeling to determine air quality significance. The three-tiers established to date (from least significant to most significant) are: Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL), Cursory Analysis Level (CAL), and Full Analysis Level (FAL). In each of the tiers, the SJVAPCD has pre-calculated the emissions on a large number and types of projects to identify the level at which they have no possibility of exceeding the emissions thresholds. In accordance with Table 5-3(a) of GAMAQI, the Proposed Project is considered to be at a Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL), as it will not cross the SJVAPCD adopted threshold of 152 single-family (dwellings) units. Exceeding this limit would push the project into a separate tier as identified in the GAMAQI. Because the Proposed Project qualifies as SPAL, GAMAQI notes that it has no possibility of exceeding emission thresholds.

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

*a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The Proposed Project would result in air emissions during its construction phase and during its operational phase. Construction emissions would be generated by construction equipment used during the site preparation and infrastructure/home construction processes. Operational emissions would be generated primarily by resident vehicles and indirectly by use of electricity. As noted above, the City of Ripon is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and air quality management under Federal and State clean air acts is the responsibility of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

The City of Ripon is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The Air District has published comprehensive guidance on evaluating, determining the significance of, and mitigating air quality impacts of projects and plans. As noted in the above discussion, the air district’s guidance is contained in its *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (GAMAQI) and within the air district’s California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (“CEQA guidelines”). Because the Proposed Project is considered to be relatively small by GAMAQI standards, a forty-seven (47) single-family lot subdivision with one (1) remainder lot (total of forty-eight (48) lots), the analysis of air quality impacts focuses on whether the Proposed Project meets the air district screening criteria for projects having a less than significant impact.
As described in the GMAQI and in the Small Project Analysis Level, if a Proposed Project is below a threshold of 390 single-family residential units, the Proposed Project’s operational impacts for criteria pollutants would not be potentially significant and detailed air quality assessment is not needed. Also detailed are the screen criteria for new developments. For single-family residential uses, construction emissions are less than significant for any/all projects that contain less than 325 dwelling units. To ensure that the Proposed Project adheres to applicable Air District rules and regulations, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 has been included in this Initial Study, requiring the applicant to provide proof of compliance with all rules and regulations prior to the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

The following discussion is an analysis for criteria (b) and (c):

b. *Would the project 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. *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

The SJVAPCD has adopted a CEQA impact analysis guideline titled *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impact* (GAMAQI). The GAMAQI is utilized in the following air quality impact analysis where applicable. The GAMAQI establishes impact significant thresholds for the non-attainment pollutant PM10 and precursors to the non-attainment pollutant ozone: reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The following are thresholds established by SJVAPCD:

- CO: 100 tons/year
- ROG: 10 tons/year
- NOx: 10 tons/year
- PM10: 15 tons/year
- PM2.5: 15 tons/year
- SOx: 27 tons/year

Air quality impacts are evaluated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for proposed construction and operational emissions. CalEEMod is a Statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects.

**Construction Emissions**

Construction of the Proposed Project would generate temporary criteria pollutant emissions primarily due to the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Estimated emissions associated with the demolition of the existing single-family residence and accessory structure are included in the demolition phase of the project. Site preparation and grading typically generate the greatest amount of emissions due to the use of grading equipment and soil hauling. As shown in the table below, the
construction emissions will not exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of 100 tons/year of CO, 10 tons/year of ROG and NOx, 15 tons/year of PM10 and PM2.5 and 27 tons/year of SOx. Complete results from the CalEEMod and assumptions are included in Appendix A.

**Construction Emissions (Unmitigated)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant/Precurser</th>
<th>Construction Emissions (tpy)</th>
<th>SJVAPCD Significance Threshold (tpy)</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2.5828</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>3.3020</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>5.8200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>4.5500</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.4160</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>0.2715</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix A for CalEEMod worksheets.

tpy – tons per year

As shown above, the construction emissions associated with the project are projected to be less than the applicable thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Even for projects that would not generate construction emissions exceeding these thresholds, SJVAPCD requires implementation of Mitigation Measures, such as Regulation VIII Control Measures (soil stabilization, watering, dust mitigation, etc.). Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

**Operational Emissions**

As discussed above, the SJVAPCD screening level size regarding operational criteria pollutants for the land use category of “single-family” is 390 units. The Proposed Project is below the SJVAPCD screening size and will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

Long-term emissions associated with the project, as shown below, would include emissions from vehicle trips (mobile sources), natural gas, and electricity use (energy sources), and landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products and architectural coating associated with on-site development (area sources). Estimated emissions calculated for the Proposed Project are presented below.

**Operational Emissions (Unmitigated)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant/Precurser</th>
<th>Operational Emissions (tpy)</th>
<th>SJVAPCD Significance Threshold (tpy)</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2.0771</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>1.1291</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>3.1140</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>7.0100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.4973</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5</td>
<td>0.1430</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix A for CalEEMod worksheets.

tpy – tons per year
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As shown above, the Proposed Project air quality impacts as it relates to operational impacts are below the Air District’s Thresholds of Significance. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

Cumulative development projects in the project vicinity could have a cumulatively significant effect on air quality impacts associated with construction activity. However, construction-related activities are temporary in nature. In addition, as shown above, the project operational impacts are below the threshold of significance for the Air District. As a result, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. The Proposed Project involves an Annexation, Pre-zone, and Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide two parcels to forty-eight (48) single-family residential lots (includes 1 remainder lot). As noted previously, the project site is primarily surrounded by urban uses, specifically, single-family detached residences. As such, the Proposed Project will not be a significant source of odor during the construction phase or the operational phase and therefore, will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce the conversion of farmland to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1**

Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable rules and regulations of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The applicant shall submit proof of compliance with applicable SJVAPD rules and regulations prior to the issuance of a building permit. Applicable rules and regulations include but are not limited to a Dust Control Plan (Rule 8021) and Air Impact Assessment (Rule 9510).
### 4. Biological Resources -- Would the Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

The following discussion is an analysis for criteria (a), (d) and (f):

a. **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**
d. Would the project 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?

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?

A search of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (CDFW) Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was performed for the project site to determine the records of sensitive plant and wildlife species within the general vicinity of the area. The project site is a part of two (2) topographical quadrangles, the Avena and the Salida. The Avena quadrangle has seven (7) species of concern listed. The Salida quadrangle has twelve (12) species of concern listed. The CDFW CNDDDB does not provide specific information on specific sites, but instead lists species of concern for the general area of each specific topographical quadrangle. Even though the Proposed Project site is currently undeveloped and may lack essential habitat for special-status plants and wildlife species, the potential exists for migratory bird species to be present in the on-site trees. Birds and their nests are protected under California Fish and Wildlife Code (Sections 3503,3503.5,3513), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The project site is within the coverage area of the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Open Space and Habitat Conservation Plan (SJMSCP), a Habitat Conservation Plan adopted by the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG). The SJMSCP was developed to minimize and mitigate impacts to plant and wildlife habitat from conversion of 109,302 acres of open space to non-open space use to occur in San Joaquin County between 2001 and 2051. The SJMSCP also sets forth Incidental Take Minimization Measures (ITMMs) that are required to be implemented by projects to prevent impacts to special-status species that may be occupying a project site or nearby areas. Because there is potential habitat on the site, the project could have impacts to biological resources, but mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a level that would be less than significant. These mitigation measures will be imposed as Conditions of Approval for the Proposed Project. As such, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 has been included in this Initial Study, which requires the applicant to participate in the SJMSCP and provide the City proof of participation prior to the issuance of a grading permit. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Based on a review of the City of Ripon General Plan 2040 and EIR, the Proposed Project is not located within an area known to contain riparian habitat. The General Plan 2040 states that the primary area of riparian vegetation and habitat is associated with the Stanislaus River. The Stanislaus River is located along the City’s southern and eastern boundaries. The Proposed Project is not located within, or adjacent to, the Stanislaus River. The Proposed Project site is located 0.73 miles from the Stanislaus River. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.
c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The National Wetlands Inventory was reviewed to determine if any wetland and/or non-wetland water had been previously documented and mapped on or in the vicinity of the proposed survey area (United States Fish and Wildlife Service 2016). No habitat of quality to support native riparian plant/wildlife species is present on the project site. Additionally, federally protected wetlands or waters as defined by Section 4040 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) do not occur on the site. The Stanislaus River, a riverine wetland resource is located approximately 0.73 miles from the most southeasterly point of the Proposed Project site. The Proposed Project would not involve the direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means to the bed, bank, channel, or adjacent upland areas of the Stanislaus River. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

As noted previously, the Proposed Project is consistent with the City of Ripon General Plan 2040 and Zoning Ordinance. According to the General Plan 2040 Environmental Impact Report (EIR), scattered Valley Oaks of varied age and diameter occur individually or in small groups across the Planning Area. Per the Project Plans, there are three (3) trees that will be removed as part of the development of the Proposed Project. Two (2) trees are located within “Drive A”, a future road within the subdivision and the other is located on future Lot 47. As noted previously, the Proposed Project is consistent with the City of Ripon General Plan 2040 and Zoning Ordinance.

General Plan 2040 agricultural goals and policies applicable to the Proposed Project are identified as follows:

Policy D10: Tentative map applications shall be required to identify existing native trees greater than six inches in diameter and to include a plan, which maximizes their preservation. The plan should address siting of new development to avoid tree removal as well as construction controls needed to avoid damage to remaining trees.

As discussed above, the Topography Map included in the application illustrates trees located on the site, including those greater than six (6) inches in diameter. As stated above, three (3) trees will be removed as part of the development of the Proposed Project that are sized greater than six (6) inches. There are four (4) trees ranging from 18" to 30" that are to be preserved on Lot 48. As such, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is included in this Initial Study which requires the applicant to submit a Tree Management Plan for review and approval by the City prior to the commencement of grading activities. The Tree Management Plan shall include but not limited to the following information:
- Location, size, type and species of all existing trees on the project site;
- Tree removal plan (i.e. identifying trees that are to be removed as part of the proposed project). Tree removal plan shall include justification for removal of existing trees;
- Landscape Plan illustrating proposed planting plan for the proposed project; and
- Plan to avoid tree damage and removal of existing trees on the project site and are not identified in the tree removal plan.

The Tree Management Plan will ensure that the planting and removal of trees on the project site are identified prior to the commencement of grading activities. Additionally, pursuant to Section 16.148.060 (D) each single-family lot will be required to have a minimum of one (1) tree in their front and/or side yards. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**
The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce the conversion of farmland to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 and BIO-2, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1**
Prior to commencement of any grading activities, the project proponent shall seek coverage under the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan to mitigate for habitat impacts to covered special status species. Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on covered special-status species. Proof of coverage and participation in the Plan shall be submitted to the City prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2**
Prior to the commencement of grading activities, the project proponent shall submit a Tree Management Plan for review and approval by the City Planning Department. The Tree Management Plan shall include but not limited to the following information:

- Location, size, type and species of all existing trees on the project site;
- Tree removal plan (i.e. identifying trees that are to be removed as part of the proposed project). Tree removal plan shall include justification for removal of existing trees;
- Landscape Plan illustrating proposed planting plan for the proposed project; and
- Plan to avoid tree damage and removal of existing trees on the project site and are not identified in the tree removal plan.
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion is an analysis for criteria (a) and (b):

a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?*

b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?*

According to the General Plan 2040 EIR, there are no buildings located within the City which are on the National Register of Historic Places. No building or sites have been locally designated which may be eligible for local, State, or Federal designation as historically or architecturally significant. As part of the prior version of the City’s EIR, a search was conducted by the Central California Information Center (CCIC, 1997). The search indicated that a total of eight (8) cultural resource surveys had been conducted in the Planning Area revealing a total of eight (8) recorded resources; these included one (1) prehistoric and seven (7) recorded historic features such as railroad grades, irrigation works, and building foundations. The CCIC considers the Ripon area to have a moderate to high sensitivity for the discovery of unrecorded archaeological and/or historic sites. However, Policy C4 of the City’s General Plan 2040 States that the “City will advise applicants, in accordance with State law, if any cultural resources are discovered during project-related construction activities, all work is to stop and the City and a qualified professional are to be consulted to determine the importance and appropriate treatment of the find. If Native American remains are found, the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission are to be notified immediately for recommended procedures.”

Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

Paleontological resources are not expected to exist at the project site because the underlying soil type and age of the soils would generally preclude their presence. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.
c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

It is not anticipated that the Proposed Project will disturb any human remains. However, through development and construction of the Proposed Project, human remains may be identified, particularly during activities requiring ground disturbance (i.e. grading, trench digging, etc.). As such, the Proposed Project shall comply with Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines and Policy C4 of the City’s General Plan 2040. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact on the potential to disturb any human remains.

**Mitigation Measures:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
6. ENERGY -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

The following discussion is an analysis for criteria (a) and (b):

a.  *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

b.  *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

The Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, as specified in Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations (Title 24), was established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. Title 24 is updated approximately every three (3) years, and the 2016 Title 24 went into effect on January 1, 2017.

The California Green Buildings Standards Code (CALGreen) establishes mandatory green building standards for buildings in California. CALGreen was developed to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission from buildings, promote environmentally responsible and healthier places to live and work, reduce energy and water consumption, and respond to environmental directives. The most recent update to CALGreen went into effect January 1, 2017 and covers five (5) categories: planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material and resource efficiency, and indoor environmental quality.

In addition, the California Building Code 2019 update becomes effective on January 1, 2020 and requires that all new homes under three (3) stories high install solar panels and that solar systems be sized to net out the annual kilowatt-hour energy usage of the dwelling. The Proposed Project is assumed to begin construction in 2020 and will be required to adhere to new California Building Code regulations including the installation of rooftop solar systems. This mandate will further ensure that unnecessary wastefulness of energy resources is limited.

The anticipated construction schedule assumes that the project would be building over a period of approximately two (2) years. The Proposed Project would require site preparation, grading, paving,
architectural coating, and trenching. The majority of the site is vacant and requires the demolition of one (1) existing single-family structure/garage and accessory structure. Implementation of applicable General Plan 2040 policies and existing regulations and programs would also reduce energy waste from construction. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not consume energy in a manner that is wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- **W**OULD THE PROJECT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of top soil?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1944), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT ANALYSIS

a. Would the project 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?

Based on a review of the City’s General Plan 2040 EIR, the City is not located within an earthquake fault zone as designated by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act (California Geological Survey 2007). No active faults have been identified in the vicinity of the City of Ripon, and the nearest fault, the Tracy-Stockton Fault, is a buried (no surface expression), inactive, southwest trending fault located approximately 20 miles north of the Planning Area and project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

The potential for grading and earthmoving during project construction to result in erosion is a potentially significant impact. However, Policy D4 of the City’s General Plan 2040 States that the “City shall require submittal of a Notice of Intent with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a copy of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan filed with the City prior to approval of improvement plans for any project greater than one acre.” The Proposed Project consists of two (2) parcels totaling approximately 16.3-acres and will be required to adhere to Policy D4. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

c. Would the project 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?

As discussed above, the project site is relatively flat in topography and historically was used for agricultural purposes (pasture, farming, etc.). The project site does not contain any unique geologic feature and will not directly or indirectly impact a unique geologic feature. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.
d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1944), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

A review of the UC Davis Agriculture and Natural Resources Project (https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/) for the project site area shows the Proposed Site featuring Delhi, Tinnin, Honcut, and Veritas sandy loam. The Proposed Project is not located in an area known to contain expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2016). Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

e. Would the project 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?

As shown on the Project Plans, the Proposed Project will connect to City services, including wastewater. In addition, the existing single-family residence on Lot 48 (remainder lot) will be required to connect to the City’s sanitary sewer system. The Proposed Project will not utilize the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. As a result, the Proposed Project will have No Impact.

f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

According to the City’s General Plan 2040 Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the Central California Information Center (CCIC) considers the City of Ripon to be relatively sensitive for the discovery of archaeological and historical resources. Areas considered “sensitive” are areas often located near natural water courses, springs, or ponds, and on elevated ground. Although there does not appear to be any paleontological resources on the surface at the project site, the project may find or discover paleontological resources below ground during construction related activities, such as installation of underground utilities, excavation, etc. However, the City includes Goals and Policies in the General Plan 2040 that strive to protect archaeological and historical resources. The Proposed Project is required to adhere to these Goals and Policies. In addition, the project site is located 0.73 miles from the Stanislaus River, an area that is more likely to be considered sensitive. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- WOULD THE PROJECT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION:

Human-generated emissions greenhouse gases (GHGs) are understood to be an important cause of global climate change, which is a subject of increasing scientific, public concern, and government action. Atmospheric concentrations of GHGs trap heat in the earth’s atmosphere and lead to a variety of effects, including increasing temperature, changes in patterns and intensity of weather and various secondary effects resulting from those changes, including potential effects on public health and safety.

California AB 32 identifies global climate change as a “serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources and the environment of California.” As a result, global climate change is an issue that needs to be considered under CEQA.

GHGs include carbon dioxide (CO2), the most abundant GHG, as well as methane, nitrous oxide and other gases, each of which have GHG potential that is several times that of CO2. GHG emissions result from combustion of carbon-based fuels; major GHG sources in California include transportation (40.7%), electric power generation (20.5%), industrial (20.5%), agriculture and forestry (8.3%) and others (8.3%).

The State of California is actively engaged in developing and implementing strategies for reducing GHG emissions. State programs for GHG reduction include a regional cap-and-trade program, new industrial and emission control technologies, alternative energy generation technologies, advanced energy conservation in lighting, heating, cooling and ventilation, reduced-carbon fuels, hybrid and electric vehicles, and other methods of improving vehicle mileage reduction programs. Using these and other strategies, the State’s Global Climate Change Scoping Plan, adopted in December 2008, proposes to achieve a 29% reduction in projected business-as-usual emission levels for 2020.

The SJVAPCD adopted a Climate Change Action Plan in 2008 and issued guidance for development project compliance with the plan in 2009. The guidance adopted an approach that relies on the use of Best Performance Standards to reduce GHG emissions. Projects implementing Best Performance Standards would be determined to have a less than cumulatively significant impact. For projects not implementing
Best Performance Standards, demonstration of a 29% reduction in GHG emissions from business-as-usual conditions is required to determine that a project would have a less than cumulatively significant impact.

**REGULATORY SETTING**

California Air Resources Board (CARB) is responsible for the coordination and oversight of State and local air pollution control programs in California. California has numerous regulations aimed at reducing the State’s GHG emissions. These initiatives are summarized below:

**Assembly Bill 1943**

Assembly Bill (AB) 1943 (2002), California’s Advanced Clean Cars program (referred to as “Pavley”), requires CARB to develop and adopt regulations to achieve “the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of GHG emissions from motor vehicles.” On June 30, 2009, U.S. EPA granted the waiver of Clean Air Act preemption to California for its greenhouse gas emission standards for motor vehicles beginning with the 2009 model year. Pavley I took effect for model years starting in 2009 to 2016 and Pavley II, which is now referred to as “LEV (Low Emission Vehicle) III GHG” will cover 2017 to 2025. Fleet average emission standards would reach 22 percent reduction from 2009 levels by 2012 and 30 percent by 2016. The Advanced Clean Cars program coordinates the goals of the Low Emission Vehicles (LEV), Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEV), and Clean Fuels Outlet programs and would provide major reductions in GHG emissions. By 2025, when rules will be fully implemented, new automobiles will emit 34 percent fewer GHGs and 75 percent fewer smog-forming emissions from their model year 2016 levels.

**Executive Order S-3-05**

In 2005, the governor issued Executive Order (EO) S-3-05, establishing Statewide GHG emissions reduction targets. EO S-3-05 provides that by 2010, emissions shall be reduced to 2000 levels; by 2020, emissions shall be reduced to 1990 levels; and by 2050, emissions shall be reduced to 80 percent below 1990 levels (California Environmental Protection Agency [CalEPA]). In response to EO S-3-05, CalEPA created the Climate Action Team (CAT), which in March 2006 published the Climate Action Team Report (the “2006 CAT Report”) (CalEPA 2006). The 2006 CAT Report identified a recommended list of strategies that the State could pursue to reduce GHG emissions. These are strategies that could be implemented by various State agencies to ensure that the emission reduction targets in EO S-3-05 are met and can be met with existing authority of the State agencies. The strategies include the reduction of passenger and light duty truck emissions, the reduction of idling times for diesel trucks, an overhaul of shipping technology/infrastructure, increased use of alternative fuels, increased recycling, and landfill methane capture, etc. In April 2015 the governor issued EO B-30-15, calling for a new target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

**Assembly Bill 32**

California’s major initiative for reducing GHG emissions is outlined in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the “California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006,” signed into law in 2006. AB 32 codifies the Statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (essentially a 15 percent reduction below 2005 emission levels; the same requirement as under S-3-05), and requires CARB to prepare a Scoping Plan that outlines the main State strategies for reducing GHGs to meet the 2020 deadline. In addition, AB 32
requires CARB to adopt regulations to require reporting and verification of Statewide GHG emissions. California is on track to meet or exceed the current target of reducing GHG emission to 1990 levels by 2020, as established by AB 32.

**Senate Bill 97**

Senate Bill (SB) 97, signed in August 2007, acknowledges that climate change is an environmental issue that requires analysis in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. In March 2010, the California Resources Agency (Resources Agency) adopted amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions. The adopted guidelines give lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts.

**CARB Resolution 07-54**

CARB Resolution 07-54 establishes 25,000 MT of GHG emissions as the threshold for identifying the largest stationary emission sources in California for purposes of requiring the annual reporting of emissions. This threshold is just over 0.005 percent of California’s total inventory of GHG emissions for 2004.

**Senate Bill 375**

Senate Bill (SB) 375, signed into law in September 2008, builds on AB 32 by requiring CARB to develop regional GHG reduction targets to be achieved from the automobile and light truck sectors for 2020 and 2035; these regional targets will help achieve the goals of AB 32 and the Scoping Plan through changed land use patterns and improved transportation systems. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) adopted a Sustainable Community Strategies in July 2013 that meets greenhouse gas reduction targets. The *Plan Bay Area* is the SCS document for the Bay Area, which is an integrated long-range plan that discusses climate protection, housing, healthy and safe communities, open space and agricultural preservation, equitable access, economic vitality, and transportation system effectiveness within the San Francisco Bay Area. The document is updated every four years and most recently, the update, *Plan Bay Area 2040* was adopted on July 26, 2017.

**Executive Order S-13-08**

Executive Order S-13-08 indicates that “climate change in California during the next century is expected to shift precipitation patterns, accelerate sea level rise and increase temperatures, thereby posing a serious threat to California’s economy, to the health and welfare of its population and to its natural resources.” Pursuant to the requirements in the order, the 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy (California Natural Resources Agency 2009) was adopted, which is the “...first Statewide, multi-sector, region-specific, and information-based climate change adaptation strategy in the United States.” Objectives include analyzing risks of climate change in California, identifying and exploring strategies to adapt to climate change, and specifying a direction for future research.

**Senate Bill 2X**

In April 2011, the governor signed SB2X requiring California to generate 33 percent of its electricity from renewable energy by 2020.
Senate Bill 32
On September 8, 2016, the governor signed Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) into law, which requires the State to further reduce GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. SB 32 is an extension of AB 32. The other provisions of AB 32 remain unchanged. CARB adopted the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update on December 14, 2017 for achieving California’s 2030 greenhouse gas target.

IMPACT ANALYSIS
a. Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Although not originally intended to reduce GHGs, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24, Part 6: California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, was first adopted in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California’s energy consumption. Since then, Title 24 has been amended with recognition that energy efficient buildings require less electricity and reduce fuel consumption, which in turn decreases GHG emissions. The current Title 24 standards were adopted in response to the requirements of AB 32. Specifically, new development projects within California, after January 1, 2011, are subject to the mandatory planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resources efficiency, and environmental quality measures of the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11).

In addition, the California Building Code 2019 update becomes effective on January 1, 2020 and requires that all new homes under three (3) stories high install solar panels and that solar systems be sized to net out the annual kilowatt-hour energy usage of the dwelling. The Proposed Project is assumed to begin construction in 2020 and will require to adhere to new California Building Code regulations including the installation of rooftop solar systems.

As such, it is anticipated that the Proposed Project will not generate greenhouses gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Mitigation is not required for this topic.