### 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- WOULD THE PROJECT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential 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) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The subject property consists of two (2) parcels of land comprising of approximately 17.19 acres located in San Joaquin County and is adjacent to the City Limits of Ripon. The property is substantially surrounded by urban uses on the east, south and west (existing residential uses). The Proposed
Project includes Annexation, Pre-Zone, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Development Agreement to ultimately subdivide two (2) parcels into forty-eight (48) residential lots, which includes one (1) 2.34-acre remainder lot that contains an existing single-family residential unit and detached garage. The Proposed Project does not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

b. Would the project 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?

The Proposed Project includes demolition of structures that may have been built with hazardous materials (primarily asbestos and lead paint). Construction of the Proposed Project includes the demolition of three (3) existing structures on the project site: a single-family residential unit/garage, accessory structure and barn. The three (3) structures are spread out over two (2) parcels. The single-family residence/garage are located on the 12.43-acre property identified as having an Accessory Parcel Number (APN) of 261-210-080. According to the San Joaquin County Assessor website, the residence was constructed in 1933 and is a one (1) bedroom/one (1) full bath residence. The barn is located on the 3.05-acre property identified as having an APN of 261-210-09 (located adjacent to the existing single-family residence to remain) which will be demolished as part of the proposed project. Although the Assessor does not include the construction date of the barn, the main residence was constructed in 1987.

To protect construction workers and the environment, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is included which requires the developer prepare a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prior to the issuance of a demolition permit. The Phase 1 ESA will confirm if the buildings contain hazardous building materials such as asbestos or lead paint and provide recommendations for mitigation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 impacts will be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

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

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?

d. Would the project be located on a site 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?

As discussed above, the Proposed Project includes Annexation, Pre-Zone, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Development Agreement to subdivide two (2) parcels into forty-eight (48) residential lots, which includes one (1) 2.34-acre remainder lot that is improved with a single-family residential and detached garage. The project includes the development of forty-seven (47) single-family dwelling units and will not involve the handling or emission of hazardous materials. The project site is located 0.36 miles north of Ripona Elementary School. In addition, the project site is not listed as a hazardous site per
review of the Department of Toxic Substance Control Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List (Cortese List). Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

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 for people residing or working in the project area?

The project site is not located within a specific adopted airport land use plan. The project site is also not located within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport or any known private airstrips. The closest public airport is Stockton Metropolitan Airport, located 10.95 miles north of the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have No Impact.

f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

According to the City’s General Plan 2040, the City of Ripon has an Emergency Response Plan which is maintained and updated by the City’s Police Department (Policy H1). The Proposed Project will not impair or physically interfere with the Emergency Response Plan. In addition, the Proposed Project shall adhere to the Policies of the City’s General Plan 2040, including Policy D-3, which requires “that the construction of new roads and streets be adequate as to width and turning radius to simplify access by firefighting apparatus. Plans for new streets will be submitted for review and comment to the Ripon Consolidated Fire District.” Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

g. Would the project expose people or structures 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?

The project site is not located within or near any wildland areas nor would any proposed landscaping create hazardous conditions due to wildland fires. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have No Impact.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

The following mitigation measures would be required to reduce hazardous materials exposure to construction workers and/or the environment to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**

Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit to remove any structures on the project site, the applicant and/or project proponent, shall prepare and submit to the City a Phase I/Environmental Site Assessment
(ESA). The recommendations of the Phase I/ESA shall be incorporated into the Proposed Project, as deemed necessary by City staff.
### 10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</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) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management 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) and (c):

a. *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?*
c. Would the project 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 on- or offsite erosion or siltation;

   ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

   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?

The project site is 17.19 acres in size and the topography is relatively flat. The project site is located 0.73 miles north of the Stanislaus River, which flows in a westerly direction, towards the San Joaquin River.

The project site is not located in a flood hazard zone (i.e. a 100 or 500-year flood zone) as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map Number 06077C0801F and 06077C0665F. In addition, the project site is not located within a 200-year flood zone, as identified the 200-year Floodplain Map, dated April 28, 2016 prepared by Peterson Brustad, Inc. The construction of the site improvements (i.e. construction of parking areas and the buildings) will reduce absorption rates and increase surface water runoff. Final storm drainage designs will be required to comply with City Standards and will be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. Any increased runoff shall be mitigated as required by the Engineering Services Department. The perimeter of the development will also be required to be protected against surface runoff from adjacent properties in a manner acceptable to the Engineering Division.

The Proposed Project requires a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and compliance with Best Management Practices (BMPs) during the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project shall be designed to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) design parameters, as well as include a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent feasible.

Compliance with applicable City ordinances and General Plan 2040 requirements for construction activities would ensure that construction of the Proposed Project does not result in significant impacts to water quality and does not result in a violation of any water quality standards.

The Proposed Project will connect to existing storm drains in John Roos Avenue and Boesch Drive. The project would extend the existing 30" storm drain in John Roos Avenue to the corner of John Roos Avenue and Shasta Avenue and extend an 18" storm drain to the west in Shasta Avenue to serve the
subdivision. An existing 18" storm drain in Boesch Drive will serve the lots facing Boesch Drive, Ripon Road and Pleasant Bay Drive.

With the compliance of the Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements, BMPs, and the City's regulatory policies pertaining to stormwater runoff, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on water quality.

b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Potable water for the Proposed Project will be supplied by the City of Ripon. According to the General Plan 2040 Environmental impact Report (EIR), on-site water system improvements required by new development is the responsibility of the developers and subdivider who must design, install and pay for water facilities determined by the City Engineer as necessary to implement the Water Master Plan.

According to the City's Municipal Service Review (MSR), dated January 1, 2018, the City's potable water supply is from eight (8) operational wells. Two (2) are located on the west side of Highway 99 and six (6) on the east side. Expected growth in the City over the next 10 and 20 years will generate substantial increases in demand for domestic water. The City's General Plan 2040 and the Water Master Plan assume that future domestic water supplies will continue to be met from groundwater wells and, when necessary, South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) water. As previously noted, the project site is within the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI) and 10-year growth area. The Proposed Project will increase the water demand, as the project is required to connect to City services, including potable water. However, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Project will substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The Developer and/or Project Proponent is required to install the water system to serve the subdivision per City Standards and pay applicable Public Facility Fees for the expansion of the water system, as necessary. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact** on groundwater supplies.

d. Would the project be located in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, or risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The project site is not located within a 100- or 500-year year flood hazard area, a floodway or otherwise placed in an area that would interfere with flood flows. In addition, the project site is not located within a 200-year flood zone. The project site is located 0.73 miles north of the Stanislaus River, and 0.5 and 0.62 miles from the 100- and 500-year flood boundary, at their nearest points, respectively. The project site is located 0.62 miles from the 200-year flood boundary. Therefore, the project will have a have **Less Than Significant Impact**.

According to the City's General Plan 2040 EIR, the New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River is a structural method of flood prevention. Failure of one or more of the Stanislaus River dams could
result from structural failure or a major and catastrophic seismic event. The most extensive potential inundation would be related to failure of the New Melones Dam, which would result in complete inundation of the Ripon area. However, according to the City’s General Plan 2040 EIR, new development will be subject to potential flooding from failure of one or more of the Stanislaus River dams. Potential failure is considered an acceptable risk by the City and is addressed in adopted emergency response plans.

No enclosed surface water bodies, which might be subject to potential impacts from seiches, are located in the project site vicinity. Based on its location, inland from coastal areas, the project site would not be subject to tsunami effects. The project site is not located in an area susceptible to mudflows. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

e. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

The Proposed Project will connect to an existing City of Ripon water line and does not include the development of any new water wells. The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainability groundwater management plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Mitigation is not required for this topic.
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential 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) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

The Proposed Project site would not divide a community but rather contribute to the infrastructure buildout of the City of Ripon in accordance with the Ripon General plan. The Proposed Project is within the Primary Sphere of Influence of the City and has been planned for annexation into the City limits. The Proposed Project includes annexation of approximately 17.19 acres into the City of Ripon. The Proposed Project Area is surrounded by City limits to the East, West, and South. Further, the site has a General Plan 2040 Land Use Designation of High-Low Density Residential. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

b. Would the project 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?

The General Plan 2040 land use designation is listed as being “High-Low Density Residential” and is within the City’s Primary Sphere of Influence. The City’s Primary Sphere of Influence includes land that is proposed to be annexed into the City and developed within 0-10 years. As stated in the Project Description, the project site is located within the unincorporated area of San Joaquin County. The current Zoning for the property is Agriculture-Urban Reserve (AU-20) and General Agriculture (AG-40). The applicant is proposing to Pre-Zone the project site Single Family Residential Urban (R1U) which includes a mixture of Single-Family Residential (R1), Single-Family Residential – Large (R1-L), Single-Family Residential – Custom (R1-C), and Limited Multiple Family (R3). A Zoning Exhibit is included in this Initial Study as Figure 3. The annexation and Pre-Zoning of the project site is not considered a conflict with a land use plan or policy and the Zoning is consistent with the proposed development as it relates to development standards and use. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Mitigation is not required for this topic.
### 12. MINERAL RESOURCES -- **WILL 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>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</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 the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?*

**b.** *Would the project 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?*

According to the General Plan 2040 Environmental Impact Report, potential mineral resources have been identified by the California Department of Conservation, which classified the flood plain area of the Stanislaus River as a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ). The Proposed Project site is located 0.73 miles from the Stanislaus River and not located within the Stanislaus River Floodplain area. The project site is located outside of any area designed by the California Department of Conservation - State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) as containing known mineral resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have **No Impact.**

### MITIGATION MEASURES:

Mitigation is not required for this topic.
13. **NOISE -- WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentialy 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) 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 in other applicable local, State, or Federal standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

*a. Would the project result in the 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 in other applicable local, State, or Federal standards?*

According to the General Plan 2040 Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Three (3) components make up sound: source, path, and receiver. All three (3) components must be present for sound to exist. Sound, traveling in the form of waves from a source, exerts a sound pressure level (referred to as sound level) which is measured in decibels (dB), with zero dB corresponding roughly to the threshold of human hearing, and 120 to 140 dB corresponding to the threshold of pain. The perception of sound and noise is determined by its effects on receptors. Examples of sensitive noise receptors are facilities or areas, including residential areas, hospitals, and schools, where excessive noise levels would be considered an annoyance. The "A-weighted" noise scale (measured in A-weighted decibels (dBA)) was developed because it corresponds closer to people's subjective judgment of sound levels.

Noise sources are classified in two (2) forms: (1) point sources, such as stationary equipment or individual vehicles; and (2) line sources, such as a roadway with a large number of cars. Sound generated by a point source typically attenuates at a rate of 6 dBA for each doubling of distance from the source to the receptor at acoustically soft sites such as vacant land. Sound levels can also be attenuated by placement of barriers such as solid walls or berms between the source and receptor.
Community reaction to noise is assessed on a scale that averages varying noise exposures over time and quantifies the results in terms of a single value. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is an average A-weighted scale measured over a 24-hour period and adjusted to account for increased sensitivity to noise levels during evening and nighttime hours. A CNEL noise measurement is obtained from adding five (5) decibels to sound levels occurring during the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and ten (10) decibels to sound occurring during the nighttime from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The major sources of noise in Ripon are roadway traffic, railroad noise, and industrial activities. The quietest areas of Ripon are those removed from major transportation-related noise sources and local industrial or other stationary noise sources.

Various types of equipment would be used for construction of the Proposed Project. Noise impacts resulting from construction activities would depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors. Construction noise impacts primarily result when construction activities occur during noise-sensitive time of day (early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), when the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise-sensitive land uses, or when construction lasts over extended periods of time. The loudest expected phase of construction is grading and earthwork, which would likely include the use of dozers, backhoes, and graders. The Proposed Project is bounded by single-family homes on the east, south and west. In addition, the existing single-family home on the property (Lot 48) is to remain. According to the City’s General Plan 2040 EIR, these areas are considered sensitive receptors. However, the City’s General Plan 2040 Policy J7 States: “to minimize the duration of heavy equipment operations in the vicinity of residential uses or other sensitive noise receptors, especially during evening and early morning hours”. As such, the construction of the Proposed Project will be required to avoid the evening and early morning hours. Furthermore, Section 16.16.030(Q) States: “unless otherwise waived by the City Council, construction activities generating noise above 70dB at the property line on any lot shall not occur before 7:00 a.m. or after 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and before 10:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Sunday.” Use of construction equipment is a short-term source of impact on these noise-sensitive uses. The project will be required to adhere to the City’s General Plan 2040 Policies and Municipal Code as it relates to regulating noise during the construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

b. Would the project result in the Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Ground-borne vibrations occur when a vibration source causes soil particles to move or vibrate. Sources of ground-borne vibrations include natural events (earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides, etc.) and human created events (explosions, operation of heavy machinery and heavy trucks, etc.). Development of the Proposed Project will result in the exposure of nearby residents to ground-borne vibration and noise levels, primarily due to the activity of construction equipment. However, the project is required to adhere to the construction times defined in Section 16.16.030(Q), as stated above. Upon project construction, residential developments typically do not
generate ground-borne vibration or noise levels. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

c. For a project located 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?

The Proposed Project is not located within an adopted airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or any known public use airports. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have No Impact.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Mitigation is not required for this topic.
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- 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>a) Induce substantial 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</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 induce substantial population in one area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

b. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

As discussed in the Project Description above, the project site has a General Plan Land Use Designation of High-Low Density Residential which, as described in the City’s General Plan 2040, allows for single-family detached and attached homes, secondary residential units, limited multi-family residential units and similar and comparable uses with a maximum residential density of seven (7) dwelling units per gross acre (du/ac). The Proposed Project ultimately consists of the development of forty-seven (47) single-family residential lots for a density of 2.88 du/ac. Per the City 2015-2023 Housing Element of its General Plan 2040, the average household size is 2.92 persons per household. As such, the Proposed Project is likely to result in a population increase of approximately 138 new residents. In addition, the proposed project includes annexation of a remainder lot (Lot 48) which is improved with a single-family residential home. Based on the average household size, the annexation will include approximately 141 new residents into the City of Ripon. Based on the Department of Finance Population Estimates for 2019, the City of Ripon’s approximate population (2019) was 16,613 residents. Therefore, an increase of 141 residents as a result of the Proposed Project to the City’s overall population does not represent a substantial inducement of population growth. The Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

The Proposed Project consists of the development of forty-seven (47) new single-family residential dwellings and will not result in the displacement of existing housing or numbers of people located on
the Project Site. There are two single-family dwellings located on the site. There is one single-family residence that is in disrepair that will demolished as a part of the Proposed Project. The other single-family dwelling will remain. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
### 15. PUBLIC SERVICES

<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>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

a. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 fire protection?*

Fire protection in the City of Ripon is handled by the Ripon Consolidated Fire District (Fire District). According to the City’s Municipal Service Review (MSR), the Fire District is responsible for the provision of fire service and emergency medical response for the City of Ripon and its residents, as well as to rural residents of unincorporated San Joaquin County that encompasses an additional 51.5 square miles of an area to the north, east, and west of the City. The Fire District currently maintains three (3) facilities but operates from one (1) manned facility, the Fire District headquarters located at 142 South Stockton Avenue. The Fire District has two (2) unmanned facilities, one located within the current City limits at the northwest intersection of North Ripon Road and East River Road and the other located outside of the current City limits and SOI along the 18800 block of South Murphy Road.

The Insurance Service Office (ISO) Public Protection Classification Program currently rates Ripon Consolidated Fire District as Class 3 within the City limits, on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being the highest possible protection rating and 10 being the lowest. The City’s General Plan 2040 includes Policies that
support the Fire District's continued provision of adequate facilities, staffing levels and to accommodate new development, such as the Proposed Project. The Policies applicable to the Proposed Project area as follows:

**Policy D3**
Require that the construction of new roads and streets be adequate as to width and turning to simplify access by firefighting apparatus. Plans for new streets will be submitted for review and comment by the Ripon Consolidated Fire District.

**Policy D4**
All development will be required to meet the minimum fire flow rates specified by the City's Fire Code.

**Policy D5**
Enforce building and fire codes and City ordinances regarding fire protection.

The Proposed Project is required to adhere to the City's General Plan 2040 Policies, Municipal Code and California Building and Fire Codes. Although the property is currently served by the Fire District for fire protection and emergency medical response services, annexation into the City of Ripon and development of the project will require the payment of Capital Facilities Fees to fund the construction of fire protection facilities required to service new growth areas. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

*b. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 police protection?*

The Police Department operates out of its headquarters located at 259 North Wilma Avenue. This facility was completed in 2007 and includes approximately 15,000 square feet for police services and a 1,330 square foot training facility. According to the City's MSR, dated January 2018, the Department has twenty-four (24) sworn officers. In addition, as of 2015, the Police Department also had one (1) Reserved Police Officer, six (6) Police Dispatchers, two (2) Community Service Officers, one (1) Information and Technology Administrator, one (1) part-time Information and Technology Assistant, two (2) part-time Animal Control Officers, and two (2) part-time Animal Shelter Helpers.

With a population of 15,621 as of 2017, the City's twenty-four (24) police officers equate to a police officer staffing of 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents. This ratio satisfies the target ratio (1.5 sworn officers per one thousand (1,000) residents) as established by Policy F1 of the City's General Plan 2040. As discussed in Section 14: Population and Housing, the Proposed Project includes the annexation and development of forty-seven (47) single-family residential units. This equals a population increase of 138 residents, not including the existing residence on the project site (to be a remainder lot (Lot 48) as part of the Proposed Project. Including the existing residents, an estimated population of 141 residents are proposed to be annexed into the City of Ripon. With a population of 15,762 (15,621 + 141), the City's twenty-four (24) police officers equate to a police staffing of 1.5 officers per 1,000,
which equals Policy F1. In addition, the Proposed Project will be required to pay applicable Public Facilities Financing Fees (PFFF) associated with the services and facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

c. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 schools?**

The City of Ripon is served with public education by the Ripon Unified School District. According to the Ripon Unified School District website, the Project site is within the boundary of the School District. As discussed in Section 13: Population and Housing, the project would not substantially increase permanent residents within the City of Ripon. Therefore, the project would not significantly impact school enrollment within the Ripon Unified School District. In addition, the Proposed Project will be required to pay applicable Developer Fees as it relates to new or expanded school facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

d. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 parks?**

The City’s General Plan 2040 establishes a goal to provide 3 to 5 acres of community and neighborhood park land per 60 to 80 acres of residential or 1,000 population (Policy A1). As discussed in Section 13: Population and Housing, the population would not result in a substantial increase in permanent population within the City of Ripon. In addition, the Proposed Project is 17.19 acres in size, including the remainder lot (Lot 48) that is currently improved with a single-family residence, which does not represent a significant increase in new acreage into the City. The McRoy (Magnolia) Park located at 1141 John Roos Avenue serves the subdivision and is located approximately 869 feet to the east. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

e. **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 other public facilities?**

The Proposed Project will not result in the need for additional public service facilities. The Proposed Project includes the relocation of five (5) private irrigation gates, located along the northern border of the project site. The applicant, as part of the Conditions of Approval, will be required to relocate these irrigation facilities to an agreeable location. Services provided by the City of Ripon include police, water, wastewater, and stormwater drainage. The City also provides public facilities including transportation and recreational facilities. Services provided by other agencies include fire protection.
(Ripon Consolidated Fire District) and schools (Ripon Unified School District). New development will lead to population growth and the need for additional service provision. The expanded tax base and public facilities financing fees that result from new development will provide funding for these services. Developer connection fees, covered in the public facilities financing fees, will address the capital costs and user changes will address the infrastructure and operating expenses of new development. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**MITIGATION MEASURES:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
16. RECREATION

<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>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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 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?*

The Proposed Project will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities. As a result, the Proposed Project will be required to contribute Public Facilities Financing Fees (PFFP). These Public Facilities Financing Fees will be used to develop park facilities that meet the City's park standards. The Proposed Project does not require the construction of any recreational facilities. The McRoy (Magnolia) Park located at 1141 John Roos Avenue serves the subdivision and is located approximately 869 feet to the east and is maintained by the City's Parks and Recreation Department. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**

Mitigation is not required for this topic.
17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- 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>a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

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

a. *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?*

b. *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Per the City’s General Plan 2040, the acceptable minimum Level of Service (LOS) standard within the City is LOS D (approaching unstable flow – low speeds – major delay at signals – little freedom to maneuver). The Proposed Project is bounded by existing ranchette development to the north, John Roos Avenue to the east, East Boesch Drive to the south and North Ripon Road to the west, all containing residential single-family homes. According to the General Plan 2040 Transportation and Circulation Element, North Ripon Road is a Minor Arterial Roadway with ultimate ROW of 102-feet. Boesch Drive, Pleasant Bay Drive, Sea Breeze Drive, and John Roos Avenue are all considered Local Roadways. The nearest major intersection is located at North Ripon Road and Milgeo Road, which is improved with a four (4) way stop.

Bicycle and transit facilities are both located along North Ripon Road. The City of Ripon Blossom Express bus operates Tuesdays and Thursdays providing a fixed route service to stops in Ripon including Save Mart and the Ripon Library, and in Modesto to Vintage Faire Mall and Target. Deviations within ¾-mile of the bus stop are available on request. Connections to eTrans (Escalon) at Dale and Veneman, Modesto, RTD (San Joaquin County) and MAX (Stanislaus County) bus lines are available. Class I and II bike lanes run north and south along North Ripon Road which connect various locations around the City. The Proposed Project will not conflict with any bicycle or transit facilities.
Transit and bicycle facilities are located within close proximity to the Proposed Project site; and therefore, will be utilized by residents.

As noted in the Project Description, the Proposed Project includes annexation of approximately 17.19 acres into the City of Ripon. The annexation area includes the right-of-way (ROW) for the extension of John Roos Avenue (60') and Shasta Avenue (74'). Shasta Avenue will be improved to the northern curb-line and John Roos Avenue will be improved to the eastern curb-line. Future development to the north and east (north-east) will be required to install the remaining improvements, such as the sidewalk.

As noted previously, the Proposed Project is consistent with the City’s General Plan 2040, and as such, is not expected to exceed the LOS standard adopted by the City. In addition, the Proposed Project will be required to pay applicable Public Facilities Financing Fees to the City, and Regional Transportation Impact Fees to the County, some of which is utilized to fund major transportation projects within the City. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The Proposed Project will install roadway improvements in accordance with the City’s Standards and Specifications, which are utilized to decrease hazards due to design features. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

To allow for adequate emergency access, the Proposed Project interconnects within the existing neighborhood. Points of access include Boesch Drive, John Roos Avenue, and North Ripon Road. All lots developed within the Proposed Project will have direct access to surrounding roadways.

As required by the Engineering Department, prior to the issuance of an encroachment permit, a traffic control plan is required to be submitted for review and approval. The traffic control plan will include details on how existing traffic on North Ripon Road, Boesch Drive, and John Roos Avenue will be controlled during construction activities. The encroachment permit must be approved by the Engineering Department prior to the issuance of any construction permits. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
### 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<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>
</table>

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)?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT ANALYSIS

a. Would the project cause a significant 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:

1. 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)?

2. 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?

Effective July 1, 2015, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) amended CEQA to mandate consultation with California Native American tribes during the CEQA process to determine whether or not the Proposed Project may
have a significant impact on a Tribal Cultural Resource. Section 21073 of the Public Resources Code defines California Native American tribes as "a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004." This includes both Federally and non-Federally recognized tribes. Section 21074(a) of the Public Resource Code defines Tribal Cultural Resources for the purpose of CEQA as:

1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

a. included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or
b. included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or
c. 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Because criteria A and B also meet the definition of a Historical Resource under CEQA a Tribal Cultural Resource may also require additional (and separate) consideration as a Historical Resource. Tribal Cultural Resources may or may not exhibit archaeological, cultural, or physical indicators.

Recognizing that California tribes are experts in their Tribal Cultural Resources and heritage, AB 52 requires that CEQA lead agencies carry out consultation with tribes at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify Tribal Cultural Resources. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a Tribal Cultural Resource is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is required to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures. Consultation is concluded when either the lead agency and tribes agree to appropriate mitigation measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, or when a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached, whereby the lead agency uses its best judgement in requiring mitigation measures that avoid or minimize impact to the greatest extent feasible.

The City of Ripon has received two (2) written requests for notification of projects as part of AB 52: the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. These requests were received by Ripon in 2016. Notice to the Buena Vista Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians were mailed on October 29, 2019. No responses or consultation requests were received by the City. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures:**
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
### 19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- 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) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

a. **Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Although the Proposed Project will require the installation of new utility services such as: water, sewer, gas, electrical, telecommunication, and storm drainage, it is not expected that the construction of these improvements would cause significant effects for the site or surrounding area. Upon annexation and development, the Proposed Project will connect to the City’s existing water, sanitary
sewer and storm drain systems and extend services to serve the subdivision per City Standards. In addition, the developer will be required to install gas and telecommunication to serve the subdivision. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.

**b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

According to the City’s Municipal Service Review (MSR), dated January 2018, the City provides potable and non-potable water supplies to all users within the City’s municipal service area through its own water distribution system. All potable water in Ripon is provided by the City entirely from groundwater wells, although water can be said to be conjunctive in that irrigation water purchased from the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID), as well as treated industrial water, supplements the natural recharge of the groundwater. The City has eight (8) operational wells; two (2) are located on the west side of Highway 99 and six (6) on the east side. The projected City potable and non-potable water supply is 19,010-acre feet per year (AFY) in 2020, 22,348 AFY in 2025 and 35,521 AFY in 2040. According to the MSR, the main vulnerability of the City’s potable water supply would be a simultaneous loss of multiple wells due to catastrophic events such as well collapses, power outages or water quality contamination. However, the City’s water supply system has multiple wells to provide flexibility and redundancy in the event one (1) or more well is out of service.

During dry year conditions, the supply of non-potable surface water from SSJID is subject to reductions. The City’s contract with SSJID specifies that water purchased for non-potable uses may be reduced based on annual water supply forecasts for New Melones Reservoir.

According to the City’s Water Master Plan, the City has sufficient supplies to serve the Proposed Project. It is anticipated that the City will continue to maintain sufficient water supplies for the Proposed Project and future development during multiple dry years. In addition, supply facilities and major distribution lines will be financed through the Water Fee established in the adopted City of Ripon Public Facilities Financing Plan, which the Proposed Project will be required to pay as part of the development.

The Proposed Project includes connecting to an existing 8” water line within Boesch Drive and extending an 8” water line to serve the subdivision (within Pleasant Bay Drive, Drive A and Drive B). In addition, an 8” water line will be extended from the current northern limits of John Roos Avenue to the proposed new portion of Shasta Avenue and west to Drive B to finish the “loop”. Lots fronting N. Ripon Road will be served by an existing 12” water line and lots fronting Boesch Drive and John Roos Avenue will be served by an existing 8” water line. Overall, access to the City’s water lines is adjacent to the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a **Less Than Significant Impact**.
c. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

The City of Ripon provides wastewater collection and treatment of the incorporated area of the City of Ripon. Wastewater is collected from nearly all portions of the City and routed to the City’s wastewater treatment facility (WWTF), located in the vicinity of the Stanislaus River. The City’s WWTF was constructed in the 1970s, with major expansion occurring in the 1990s. The City’s WWTF is currently permitted under the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) program, as administered by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Ripon WWTF currently operates under WDR Order No. 94-263, which originally contained a flow discharge limit of 1.4 million gallons per day (MGD), with the ability to increase discharges in the future to 2.34 MGD, pending RWQCB approval. According to the City’s MSR, the latest permit revision (2008) increased the average discharge rate to 1.8 MGD. From a physical standpoint, the current treatment configuration of the WWTF allows for a maximum treatment capacity up to 1.5 MGD.

In 2017, the annual average daily municipal wastewater flow was approximately 1.0 MGD, which is equivalent to approximately 64 gallons per capita per day. The City has a Sewer Master Plan for expansion of the sewer system to meet the present and future demands of the City. Expansion of the necessary wastewater infrastructure, including potential expansion of the WWTF, would be paid through PFFP Wastewater Fees. Therefore, adequate capacity is available to serve the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project will connect to the City’s wastewater treatment system and extend the sanitary sewer lines to serve the subdivision. The development will be required to pay applicable PFFP fees, including the Wastewater Fees.

The Proposed Project includes connecting to an existing 12” sanitary sewer line within Boesch Drive and extending a 12” sanitary sewer line to serve the subdivision (within Pleasant Bay Drive, Drive A and Drive B). An 8” sanitary sewer line will be extended from the existing 8” sanitary sewer line at the northern limits of John Roos Avenue to the proposed new portion of Shasta Avenue and west to Drive B. Lots fronting John Roos Avenue, Boesch Drive and N. Ripon Road will be served by existing sanitary sewer lines (8”, 12” and 24”, respectfully). Overall, access to the City’s sewer system is adjacent to the Proposed Project. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project will not have a significant impact on the collection and treatment of wastewater generated by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

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

d. Would the project 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. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
According to the City’s General Plan 2040 Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the Foothill Landfill handles the solid waste and recycling collection for the City of Ripon. The City also has a diversion rate of over 60% in compliance with Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939) and the City’s Source Reduction and Recycle Element through its various recycling and waste diversion practices. According to the City’s EIR, the Foothill Landfill has adequate capacity for Ripon’s projected quantity of waste. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have a Less Than Significant Impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
20. WILDFIRE -- 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>If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

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

a. *Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

b. *Would the project 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. *Would the project require the installation 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. *Would the project 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?*
The Proposed Project is not located in or near lands that are classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Therefore, the Proposed Project will have No Impact.

MITIGATION MEASURES:
Mitigation is not required for this topic.
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

<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>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT ANALYSIS

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?

As documented in this Initial Study, the Proposed Project will not have impacts on biological and cultural resources. Construction of the project will not result in the loss of open space habitat and associated wildlife; will not threaten a plant or animal community; will not 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. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the project proponent shall participate in and pay applicable fees for the San Joaquin Multi Species Habitat and Conservation Plan. As such, the impacts are considered to be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.
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 the connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

As described in this Initial Study, the potential effects of the Proposed Project will either be less than significant or will have no impact at all. Therefore, finding (b) is checked as No Impact.

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

The Proposed Project includes the demolition of existing structures on the project site, which could potentially be hazardous to construction workers and the area. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, the project proponent shall prepare a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prior to the issuance a demolition permit. As such, this impact will be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.
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