



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1010 10TH Street, Suite 3400, Modesto, CA 95354
Planning Phone: (209) 525-6330 Fax: (209) 525-5911
Building Phone: (209) 525-6557 Fax: (209) 525-7759

CEQA INITIAL STUDY

Adapted from CEQA Guidelines APPENDIX G Environmental Checklist Form, Final Text, January 1, 2020

1. **Project title:** Rezone Application No. PLN2019-0108 – Price Honda of Turlock
2. **Lead agency name and address:** Stanislaus County
1010 10th Street, Suite 3400
Modesto, CA 95354
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Jeremy Ballard, Associate Planner
(209) 525-6330
4. **Project location:** North Golden State Boulevard, between East Keyes and East Taylor Roads, in the Keyes area (APN:045-053-038).
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** James Figurell DBA Price Ford, 5200 North Golden State Boulevard, Turlock, CA 95382
6. **General Plan designation:** Planned Development
7. **Zoning:** Planned Development (P-D) (209)
8. **Description of project:**

Request to rezone a 5.14-acre parcel from expired Planned Development (P-D) (209) to a new P-D to allow for development of an auto dealership in two phases. Phase 1 will include the construction of a 35-foot-tall, two story 29,300 square-foot auto dealership building. The building will include areas for a showroom, parts storage, offices, and service areas. Phase 1 will also consist of construction of a 2,048 square-foot reception canopy attached to the main dealership, a 2,100 square-foot express service center, and 1,500 square-foot car detail building. Phase 2 proposes a 3,375 square-foot expansion to the service bay, which is anticipated to take place within 10 years of project approval. The dealership activities will include sale of new and used vehicles and car service and repair of Honda vehicles. The project site will be developed with a parking lot consisting of 315 parking stalls for vehicle inventory, employees and customers, and featuring landscaping of shade trees and groundcover, and 25-foot-tall light poles. Additionally, the perimeter of the site will be improved with a 15-foot-wide landscaping strip, which will consist of various low-water use hardy trees, shrubs, and groundcover. The project also proposes an on-site drainage basin, and installation of a masonry wall and dense evergreen shrubs for screening along the northern property line. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a 65-foot-tall pole sign, a 17-foot-tall monument sign, a 5-foot-tall directional sign, and wall-mounted signage which are proposed to display the company's logo. General Plan Amendment 93-03, Rezone 93-03, and Parcel Map 93-23 – Sanders/Patchett's Motors, adopted by the Board of Supervisors on October 26, 1993 created the parcel, amended the General Plan Land Use designation of the site to Planned Development, and approved the adjacent car sales business. The project site fronts County-maintained North Golden State Boulevard and proposes to share the existing driveway with the adjacent car dealership, as required by the project that created the site. Additionally, the applicant will be required to make road frontage improvements along North Golden State Boulevard if approved. The project will operate independently of the existing Price Ford dealership adjacent to the project site. The project will be served by the City of Turlock for public water and sanitary sewer through an Out of Boundary Service agreement. The applicant anticipates one shift per day consisting of 24 employees on a maximum shift, with up to 35 customers estimated per day, and one truck trip per day. The hours of operation are proposed as Monday through Saturday 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., and Sunday 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

STRIVING TOGETHER TO BE THE BEST!

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: | Car dealership and the City of Turlock to the south; ranchettes, a mobile home park, and commercial development to the north; State Route 99 to the west; and agricultural producing parcels to the east. |
| 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): | Stanislaus County Department of Public Works
Department of Environmental Resources
City of Turlock
California Department of Transportation
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District |
| 11. Attachments: | Central California Information Center Records Search, dated August 21, 2019
Will Serve Letter from the City of Turlock, dated December 4, 2020. |

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature on file.
Prepared by Jeremy Ballard, Associate Planner

May 19, 2021
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, than the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significant criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ISSUES

I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, could the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
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 point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Discussion: The site itself is not considered to be a scenic resource or unique scenic vista. The site is currently a vacant 5.94-acre parcel. The proposed building consisting of glass and steel, will be of similar character and nature to the adjacent car dealership. As part of the site development the applicant proposes, installation of a masonry wall and dense evergreen shrubs for screening along the northern property line, and landscaping along the frontage and in the proposed parking lot. Frontage landscaping will consist of shade trees, low-lying plants, groundcover, and 25-foot-tall light poles within the vehicle display area. Additionally, the perimeter of the site will be improved with a 15-foot-wide landscaping strip, which will consist of various low-water use hardy trees, shrubs, low-lying plants and groundcover. All landscaping will be required to meet the City of Turlock's landscaping standards. Additionally, the applicant has proposed a 65-foot-tall freeway sign, monument sign, directional sign, and building signs which propose to display the company's logo. A development standard will be added to the project to require a final landscape and sign plan be reviewed and approved by the City of Turlock, prior to issuance of any permit. Although, no perimeter lighting has been submitted in conjunction with this discretionary permit, a development standard will be added to the project requiring the applicant submit a photometric lighting plan to determine the areas of illumination of the any onsite lighting. Additionally, all lighting will be required to be aimed down and shielded to prevent skyglow or spillage onto adjoining properties. A development standard will be added requiring annexation into the Golden State Lighting District. With conditions of approval in place, no adverse impacts to the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings are anticipated.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application information; referral response from the Department of Public Works, dated October 12, 2020, referral response from the City of Turlock, dated March 24, 2021; Stanislaus County Zoning Ordinance; the Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
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))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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?			X	

Discussion: According to the USDA Web Soil Survey, the 5.14-acre project site consists of Dinuba Sandy Loam soil, 0 to 1 percent slopes. The California Department of Conservation considers the site to be Urban and Build Up Land. The site is current vacant. It is zoned P-D (209), which was originally approved for the development of a 25,000 square-foot car dealership in 1993. The dealership was required to be completed within two years, thus the parcel's zoning has now expired and requires a rezone to a new Planned Development for any new development.

The site is adjoining to agricultural zoned ranchettes, including a mobile home park to the north. 230 feet east of the site are actively farmed parcels, also agriculturally-zoned. The parcel identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 045-053-006, located two parcels away from the project site (approximately 550 feet) is the nearest property enrolled in a Williamson Act Contract or in production agriculture. According to Appendix Seven of the Stanislaus County General Plan – Buffer and Setback Guidelines, projects that are people intensive shall include a 300-foot wide buffer setback. Exceptions to the buffer include; public roadways, utilities, drainage facilities, rivers and adjacent riparian areas, landscaping, parking lots, and similar low people intensive uses. Although the majority of the site will be utilized for storage of vehicles for sale and thus not subject to the buffer policy, the applicant has proposed a masonry wall and dense evergreen shrubs for screening along the northern property line. The proposed wall and landscaping would function as acceptable alternative to the required Agricultural Buffer.

A referral response was received from the Turlock Irrigation District (TID), which stated the District has two separate irrigation pipelines that run through the site. The District stated that the existing pipelines are to be abandoned or upgraded to District standards. Development standards will be added to address the District's comments.

There are no forest resources on the site or in the surrounding area. The site is vacant and is zoned Planned Development. The site is not actively farmed and is not surrounded by commercially farmed property. There is no indication that this project will result in the removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural use. Impacts to agriculture and forest resources are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application information; Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey; California State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program - Stanislaus County Farmland 2018; Turlock Irrigation District, referral response, dated October 8, 2020; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
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?			X	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Discussion: The proposed project is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) and, therefore, falls under the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). In conjunction with the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG), the SJVAPCD is responsible for formulating and implementing air pollution control strategies. The SJVAPCD's most recent air quality plans are the 2007 PM₁₀ (respirable particulate matter) Maintenance Plan, the 2008 PM_{2.5} (fine particulate matter) Plan, and the 2007 Ozone Plan. These plans establish a comprehensive air pollution control program leading to the attainment of state and federal air quality standards in the SJVAB, which has been classified as "extreme non-attainment" for ozone, "attainment" for respirable particulate matter (PM-10), and "non-attainment" for PM 2.5, as defined by the Federal Clean Air Act.

The primary source of air pollutants generated by this project would be classified as being generated from "mobile" sources. Mobile sources would generally include dust from roads, farming, and automobile exhausts. Mobile sources are generally regulated by the Air Resources Board of the California EPA which sets emissions for vehicles and acts on issues regarding cleaner burning fuels and alternative fuel technologies. As such, the District has addressed most criteria air pollutants through basin wide programs and policies to prevent cumulative deterioration of air quality within the Basin. The project will increase traffic in the area and, thereby, impacting air quality.

The project was referred to the SJVAPCD and no response has been received to date.

Potential impacts on local and regional air quality are anticipated to be less than significant, falling below SJVAPCD thresholds, as a result of the nature of the proposed project and project's operation after construction. Implementation of the proposed project would fall below the SJVAPCD significance thresholds for both short-term construction and long-term operational emissions, as discussed below. Because construction and operation of the project would not exceed the SJVAPCD significance thresholds, the proposed project would not increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the air plans.

The SJVAPCD's Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL) Analysis indicates that the minimum threshold of significance for commercial projects is 1,550 trips per day. Phase 1 will include the construction of a two story 29,300 square-foot dealership building. The building will include areas for a showroom, parts storage, offices, and service areas. Phase 1 will also consist of construction of a 2,048 square-foot reception canopy attached to the main dealership, a 2,100 square-foot express service center, and 1,500 square-foot car detail building. Phase 2 proposes a 3,375 square-foot expansion to the service bay. The applicant anticipates a single shift of 24 employees on a maximum shift with up to 35 customers estimated per day, and one truck trip per day. This is below the District's thresholds of significance for emissions.

The proposed project is anticipated to be consistent with the applicable air quality plans. Also, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable regional plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project and would be considered to have a less than significant impact.

Construction activities associated with new development can temporarily increase localized PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, volatile organic compound (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NOX), sulfur oxides (SOX), and carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations a project's vicinity. The primary source of construction-related CO, SOX, VOC, and NOX emission is gasoline and diesel-powered, heavy-duty mobile construction equipment. Primary sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions are generally clearing and demolition activities, grading operations, construction vehicle traffic on unpaved ground, and wind blowing over exposed surfaces.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would consist primarily of site developed and construction of the building. These activities would not require any substantial use of heavy-duty construction equipment and would require little or no demolition or grading as the site is presently unimproved and considered to be topographically flat. Consequently, emissions would be minimal. Furthermore, all construction activities would occur in compliance with all SJVAPCD regulations; therefore, construction emissions would be less than significant without mitigation.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application material; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District - Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust/PM-10 Synopsis; www.valleyair.org; and the Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
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?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	

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?			X	
---	--	--	----------	--

Discussion: It does not appear this project will result in impacts to endangered species or habitats, locally designated species, or wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridors. There is no known sensitive or protected species or natural community located on the site. The project is located within the Ceres Quad of the California Natural Diversity Database. Some of the threatened species known to populate the Ceres Quad include: Swainson's hawk, the tricolored blackbird, Steelhead (Central Valley DPS), and the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The site has been previously approved for commercial development and is surrounded by ranchettes, highway, and commercial development. There are no bodies of water in the vicinity. Because of this, the site would have a low probability of containing suitable habitat.

The project will not conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other locally approved conservation plans. Impacts to endangered species or habitats, locally designated species, or wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridors are considered to be less than significant.

An early consultation was referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (formerly the Department of Fish and Game) and no response was received.

Impacts to biological resources are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application material; California Department of Fish and Wildlife's Natural Diversity Database Quad Species List; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?			X	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

Discussion: A records search conducted by the Central California Information Center for the project site indicated that there are no historical, cultural, or archeological resources recorded on-site and that the site has a low sensitivity for the discovery of such resources. It does not appear that this project will result in significant impacts to any archaeological or cultural resources. Although vacant, the site is not near areas of high sensitivity and previous agricultural production on the site has left the site disturbed. However, standard conditions of approval/development standards regarding the discovery of cultural resources during the construction process will be added to the project.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application material; Central California Information Center Report for the project site, dated August 21, 2019; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

VI. ENERGY. -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

Discussion: The CEQA Guidelines Appendix F states that energy consuming equipment and processes, which will be used during construction or operation (such as energy requirements of the project by fuel type and end use; energy conservation equipment and design features; energy supplies that would serve the project; and total estimated daily vehicle trips to be generated by the project and the additional energy consumed per trip by mode) shall be taken into consideration when evaluating energy impacts. Additionally, the project's compliance with applicable state or local energy legislation, policies, and standards must be considered.

The proposed project will include the construction of a two story 29,300 square-foot automotive dealership. The building will include areas for a showroom, parts storage, offices, and service areas. Phase 1 will also consist of construction of a 2,048 square-foot reception canopy attached to the main dealership, a 2,100 square-foot express service center, and 1,500 square-foot car detail building. Phase 2 proposes a 3,375 square-foot expansion to the service bay, which is anticipated to take place within 10 years of project approval. All construction associated with the proposed project will be required to comply with Title 24, Green Building Code, which includes energy efficiency requirements. It does not appear this project will result in significant impacts to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application material; Stanislaus County General Plan EIR.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
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.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion: According to the USDA web soil survey, the 5.94-acre project site consists of Dinuba Sandy Loam soil, 0 to 1 percent slopes. As contained in Chapter 5 of the General Plan Support Documentation, the areas of the County subject to significant geologic hazard are located in the Diablo Range, west of Interstate 5; however, as per the California Building Code, all of Stanislaus County is located within a geologic hazard zone (Seismic Design Category D, E, or F) and a soils test may be required at building permit application. Results from the soils test will determine if unstable or expansive soils are present. If such soils are present, special engineering of the structure will be required to compensate for the soil deficiency. Any structures resulting from this project will be designed and built according to building standards appropriate to withstand shaking for the area in which they are constructed. A stormwater drainage basin is proposed as part of this project. An early consultation referral response received from the Department of Public Works indicated that a grading, drainage, and erosion/sediment control plan for the project will be required, subject to Public Works review and Standards and Specifications. No septic tanks will be installed on-site as the proposed project will be served by the City of Turlock from public water and sanitary sewer services. However, DER responded to the early consultation referral, stating that if the connection to the City of Turlock were not to take place, the on-site wastewater treatment system would be required to be compliant with Measure X, which would require the approval of the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) through the building permit process, which takes soil type into consideration within the specific design requirements. A development standard will be added to the project to include this response.

The project site is not located near an active fault or within a high earthquake zone. Landslides are not likely due to the flat terrain of the area.

DER, Public Works, and the Building Permits Division review and approve any building or grading permit to ensure their standards are met. Development standards regarding these requirements will be applied to the project and will be triggered when a building permit is requested.

Impacts specific to geology and soils are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: None.

References: Referral response from the Department of Environmental Resources (DER), dated October 5, 2020; referral response from the Stanislaus County Department of Public Works, dated October 12, 2020; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Discussion: The principal Greenhouse Gasses (GHGs) are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H₂O). CO₂ is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant greenhouse gas emitted. To account for the varying warming potential of different GHGs, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e). In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] No. 32), which requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such

that feasible and cost-effective statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. Two additional bills, SB 350 and SB32, were passed in 2015 further amending the states Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) for electrical generation and amending the reduction targets to 40% of 1990 levels by 2030.

The 2016 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) went into effect on January 1, 2017, and includes mandatory provisions applicable to all new residential, commercial, and school buildings. The intent of the CALGreen Code is to establish minimum statewide standards to significantly reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from new construction. The Code includes provisions to reduce water use, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation, as well as requirements for bicycle parking and designated parking for fuel-efficient and carpool/vanpool vehicles in commercial development. The code also requires mandatory inspections of building energy systems for non-residential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that they are operating at their design efficiencies. It is the intent of the CALGreen Code that buildings constructed pursuant to the Code achieve at least a 15 percent reduction in energy usage when compared to the state's mandatory energy efficiency standards contained in Title 24. The Code also sets limits on VOCs (volatile organic compounds) and formaldehyde content of various building materials, architectural coatings, and adhesives. With the requirements of meeting the Title 24, Green Building Code energy impacts from the project are considered to be less-than significant. A development standard will be added to this project to address compliance with Title 24, Green Building Code, which includes energy efficiency requirements.

Senate Bill 743 (SB743) requires that the transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluate impacts by using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as a metric. Stanislaus County has currently not adopted any significance thresholds for VMT, and projects are treated on a case-by-case basis for evaluation under CEQA. However, the State of California - Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has issued guidelines regarding VMT significance under CEQA. One of the guidelines, presented in the December 2018 document Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, states that locally serving retail would generally redistribute trips from other local uses, rather than generate new trips.

The applicant anticipates a single shift of between eight to 24 employees, up to 35 customers and 10 visitors at peak time, and four truck deliveries per day from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Additionally, the applicant states the over 70% of daily vehicle trips associated with the proposed use would be associated with the vehicle service side of the business. Per the applicant, customers for vehicle service will comprise of 95% from within the local community. The stated trip generation would be consistent with a locally serving retail classification for the purposes of analyzing VMT and per the 2018 OPR guidelines, locally serving retail would not be considered a significant impact.

The SJVAPCD's Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL) Analysis indicates that the minimum threshold of significance for industrial projects is 1,550 trips per day. Phase 1 will include the construction of a two story 29,300 square-foot dealership building. The building will include areas for a showroom, parts storage, offices, and service areas. Phase 1 will also consist of construction of a 2,048 square-foot reception canopy attached to the main dealership, a 2,100 square-foot express service center, and 1,500 square-foot car detail building. Phase 2 proposes a 3,375 square-foot expansion to the service bay. The applicant anticipates 24 employees on a maximum shift with up to 35 customers estimated per day, and one truck trip per day. This is below the District's thresholds of significance for emissions. The Air District was referred the project but have not responded. The proposed project may be subject to the following District Rules: Regulation VIII, Rule 4102, Rule 4601, Rule 4641, Rule 4002, Rule 4102, Rule 4550, and Rule 4570, therefore, staff will include a development standard for the project to consult with the District regarding compliance with the District's rules and regulations prior to issuance of a building permit.

Impacts associated with Greenhouse Gas Emissions are expected to have a less-than significant impact.

Mitigation: None.

References: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District - Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust/PM-10 Synopsis; www.valleyair.org; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
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?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

Discussion: The proposed project will consist of construction of a two story 29,300 square-foot auto sales dealership building. The building will include areas for a showroom, parts storage, offices, and service areas. Phase 1 will also consist of construction of a 2,048 square-foot reception canopy attached to the main dealership, a 2,100 square-foot express service center, and 1,500 square-foot car detail building. Phase 2 proposes a 3,375 square-foot expansion to the service bay. The service center, will include potential storage of motor oil or other hazardous materials. Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code requires businesses that use, handle, or store hazardous materials above an identified threshold to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan. The applicant is required to use, store, and dispose of any hazardous materials in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. A referral response was received from the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) Hazardous Materials Division stating, that the proposed project will be required to obtain permits from the Division for the treatment of hazardous waste, development of under or above ground storage of hazardous materials, and requirements for registration of business plans. Additionally, the City of Turlock responded to the project referral, stating that if hazardous materials were to be stored, the applicant will be required to meet requirements for storage, containment, and record keeping. The City also stated that a sand/oil interceptor shall be installed on-site. These requirements will be added as development standards. Additionally, the project was referred to the Stanislaus County Environmental Review Committee (ERC), which responded with no comments. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with hazards or hazardous materials are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Pesticide exposure is a risk in areas located in the vicinity of agriculture. Sources of exposure include contaminated groundwater, which can drift from spray applications. Application of sprays is strictly controlled by the Agricultural Commissioner and can only be accomplished after first obtaining permits. Additionally, agricultural buffers are intended to reduce the risk of spray exposure to surrounding people. The applicant has proposed an eight-foot-tall masonry wall with accompanying landscaping along the entire northern parcel line, which abuts agriculturally zoned parcels. However, the agriculturally zoned parcels are ranchettes that are not commercially farmed. The proposed wall and landscaping would function as acceptable alternative to the required Agricultural Buffer. The project was referred to the Stanislaus County Agricultural Commissioner and no comments have been received to date.

The project site is not listed on the EnviroStor database managed by the CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or within the vicinity of any airport. The groundwater is not known to be contaminated in this area. The site is located in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) for fire protection and is served by Keyes Fire Protection District. The project was referred to the District, who have not provided a response to the project. The City of Turlock provided a referral response requiring compliance with DTSC standards for oil containment and installation of a sand/oil interceptor, with plans for which to be reviewed by the City's Engineering and Municipal Services Divisions.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application information; referral response from the Department of Environmental Resources Hazardous Materials Division, dated October 12, 2020; referral response from the Stanislaus County Environmental Review Committee (ERC), dated October 12, 2020; referral response from the City of Turlock, dated March 24, 2021; Department of Toxic Substances Control's data management system (EnviroStor); California Health and Safety Code; Stanislaus County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
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:			X	
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on – or off-site;			X	
(ii) substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
(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			X	
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

Discussion: Areas subject to flooding have been identified in accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA). The project site is located in FEMA Flood Zone X, which includes areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplains. All flood zone requirements will be addressed by the Building Permits Division during the building permit process.

By virtue of the proposed construction, the current absorption patterns of water upon this property will be altered; however, current standards require that all of a project's storm water be maintained on-site. The applicant proposes development of storm water basin on-site that would be adjoining to the basin previously developed for the adjacent auto dealership, which is under common ownership. The Department of Public Works referral response requested a Grading and Drainage Plan,

to be included in this project's development standards. A development standard will also be added to ensure that a utility easement is recorded on the property for any shared storm water facilities.

A referral response received from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) provided a list of the Board's permits and programs that may be applicable to the proposed project. The developer will be required to contact RWQCB to determine which permits/standards must be met prior to construction as a condition of approval.

The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) was passed in 2014 with the goal of ensuring the long-term sustainable management of California's groundwater resources. SGMA requires agencies throughout California to meet certain requirements including forming Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSA), developing Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSP), and achieving balanced groundwater levels within 20 years. The site is located in the Turlock Sub-basin under the jurisdiction of the West Turlock Sub-basin GSA. As the Turlock Sub-basin is considered a high and medium priority basin not currently in overdraft, the GSP has not been drafted and is not required to be adopted until January 31, 2022. The City of Turlock will be subject to meeting the requirements of the forthcoming GSP.

As stated in the project description, the proposed development of an automotive dealership will be served by the City of Turlock for public water services. The City has provided the applicant a will serve letter. As stipulated by the will serve letter, connection will require an out of boundary service agreement, subject to approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The will serve letter also requires the water connection meet City standards. Development standards will be added to the project to ensure these requirements are met.

A referral response from DER, stated that the proposed project meets the definition of a Public Water System, and if water is not obtained from the City of Turlock, the project would be subject to the requirements of SB1263. The California Safe Drinking Water Act (CA Health and Safety Code Section 116275(h)) defines a Public Water System as a system for the provision of water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances that has 15 or more service connections or regularly serves at least 25 individuals daily at least 60 days out of the year. A public water system includes the following:

- (1) Any collection, treatment, storage, and distribution facilities under control of the operator of the system that are used primarily in connection with the system.
- (2) Any collection or pretreatment storage facilities not under the control of the operator that are used primarily in connection with the system.
- (3) Any water system that treats water on behalf of one or more public water systems for the purpose of rendering it safe for human consumption.

In the event the applicant drills a new well, the applicant will be required to comply with Stanislaus County's Groundwater Ordinance and will need to obtain a well construction permit through DER. If the developer utilizes an on-site well as the water source for the project and it does not meet water quality standards, then they may need to install a water treatment system.

The landscaping associated with the project will need to meet state standards for water efficiency and is not expected to have significant effects on groundwater supplies.

As a result of the development standards required for this project, impacts associated with drainage, water quality, and runoff are expected to have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application information; referral response from the Department of Environmental Resources (DER), dated October 5, 2020; referral response from the Department of Public Works, dated October 12, 2020; referral response from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), dated October 13, 2020; Will Serve Letter from the City of Turlock, dated December 4, 2020; West Turlock Groundwater Basin Association GSA; County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
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?			X	

Discussion: The site is currently vacant. It is zoned P-D (209), which was originally approved for the development of a 25,000 square-foot car dealership in 1993. The dealership was required to be completed within two years of the project's approval, thus the parcel's zoning has now expired and requires a rezone to a new Planned Development for any new development. Therefore, the applicant has requested to rezone a 5.14-acre parcel from expired P-D 209 to a new Planned Development for an auto dealership in two phases. The project will be served by the City of Turlock for public water and sanitary sewer through an Out of Boundary Service agreement. Upon project submittal, the project site was encumbered with a development restriction easement held by the City of Turlock and entered into by the project site property owner as of December 1996 which restricted use of the site for automotive uses until 2033. During project review, the City has determined that the terms and conditions of the easement deed are no longer in the interest of either the City or the current property owner; consequently, executed as of March 24, 2021, the City filed a quitclaim/termination of the restriction easement.

To approve a Rezone, the Planning Commission must find that it is consistent with the General Plan. Pursuant to the General Plan, land within a Planned Development designation should be zoned A-2 (General Agriculture) until development occurs through Planned Development zoning. The request to rezone the expired Planned Development to a new Planned Development to accommodate the proposed auto dealership, would be consistent with the County's General Plan.

The project site is located a ¼ mile from City of Turlock city limits but is not located within Turlock's Sphere of Influence. The Stanislaus County General Plan Land Use Element Policy 27 requires all discretionary projects outside the sphere of influence of a city but located within one mile of the city's adopted sphere of influence be referred to and application of that city's development standards. Consequently, the project was referred to the City of Turlock, who provided a referral response requiring city development fees to be paid and standards for landscaping, drive aisles, stormwater, signage, and sand/oil interceptors be met. Development standards will be added to the project requiring city standards in these areas.

The site is adjoining to agricultural zoned ranchettes, including a mobile home park to the north. 230 feet east of the site are actively farmed parcels, also agriculturally-zoned. The parcel identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 045-053-006, located two parcels away from the project site (approximately 550 feet) is the nearest property enrolled in a Williamson Act Contract or in production agriculture. According to Appendix Seven of the Stanislaus County General Plan – Buffer and Setback Guidelines, projects that are people intensive shall include a 300-foot wide buffer setback. Exceptions to the buffer include; public roadways, utilities, drainage facilities, rivers and adjacent riparian areas, landscaping, parking lots, and similar low people intensive uses. Although, the majority of the site will be utilized for storage of vehicles for sale and thus not subject to the buffer policy, the applicant has proposed an eight-foot-tall masonry wall and dense evergreen shrubs for screening along the northern property line. The proposed wall and landscaping would function as acceptable alternative to the required Agricultural Buffer.

The project will not physically divide an established community nor conflict with any habitat conservation plans.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application; referral response from the City of Turlock, dated March 24, 2021; Stanislaus County General Plan Land Use Element and Support Documentation.¹

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
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?			X	

Discussion: The location of all commercially viable mineral resources in Stanislaus County has been mapped by the State Division of Mines and Geology in Special Report 173. There are no known significant resources on the site, nor is the project site located in a geological area known to produce resources.

Mitigation: None.

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XIII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
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?			X	

Discussion: The Stanislaus County General Plan identifies noise levels up to 65 dB Ldn (or CNEL) as the normally acceptable level of noise for commercial and professional buildings. On-site grading and construction resulting from this project may result in a temporary increase in the area's ambient noise levels; however, noise impacts associated with on-site activities and traffic are not anticipated to exceed the normally acceptable level of noise. The site itself is impacted by the noise generated from State Route 99. The applicant anticipates 24 employees on a maximum shift, with up to 35 customers estimated per day, and one truck trip per day. The hours of operation are proposed as Monday through Saturday, 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., and Sunday 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The majority of activities will take place indoors and the applicant has proposed to construct an eight-foot-tall masonry wall with landscaping for the purposes of noise attenuation and screening from the adjacent agricultural and residential development. Additionally, a development standard will be added to the project prohibiting the placement or use of a Public Announcement (PA) system on-site to further decrease any noise impacts.

The site is not located within an airport land use plan.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application material; Stanislaus County General Plan Noise Element and Support Documentation.¹

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

Discussion: The site is not included in the vacant sites inventory for the 2016 Stanislaus County Housing Element, which covers the 5th cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the county and will therefore not impact the County's ability to meet their RHNA. No population growth will be induced nor will any existing housing be displaced as a result of this project.

Mitigation: None.

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES --	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in the substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion: The County has adopted School, Public Facilities Fees, as well as Fire Facility Fees on behalf of the appropriate fire district, to address impacts to public services. All adopted public facility fees will be required to be paid at the time of building permit issuance. As required by the Department of Public Works, the site will be required to be annexed into the Golden State Lighting District for any required street lighting.

This project was circulated to all applicable: school, fire, police, irrigation, public works departments, and districts during the Early Consultation referral period, and no concerns were identified with regard to public services. As stated in the project description the proposed development of an automotive dealership will be served by the City of Turlock for public water services. The City has provided the applicant a Will Serve letter. As stipulated by the Will Serve letter, connection will require an Out of Boundary Service agreement, subject to approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The Will Serve Letter also requires the water connection to meet City standards. Development standards will be added to the project to ensure these requirements are met.

A referral response was received from the Turlock Irrigation District (TID), which stated the District has two separate irrigation pipelines that run through the site. The District stated that the existing pipelines are required to either be abandoned or upgraded to District standards. Development standards will be added to address the District's comments.

Mitigation: None.

References: Referral response from Turlock Irrigation District (TID), dated October 8, 2020; Will Serve Letter from the City of Turlock, dated December 4, 2020; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XVI. RECREATION --	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
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?			X	

Discussion: This project will not increase demands for recreational facilities, as such impacts typically are associated with residential development.

Mitigation: None.

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XVII. TRANSPORTATION-- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	

Discussion: Access for the site will be taken off County-maintained North Golden State Boulevard, via a driveway located within a 40-foot-wide access easement shared with the adjacent parcel to the south. North Golden State Boulevard is identified as a 110-foot-wide Minor Arterial in the Circulation Element of the General Plan.

Senate Bill 743 (SB743) requires that the transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluate impacts by using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as a metric. Stanislaus County has currently not adopted any significance thresholds for VMT, and projects are treated on a case-by-case basis for evaluation under CEQA. However, the State of California - Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has issued guidelines regarding VMT significance under CEQA. One of the guidelines, presented in the December 2018 document Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, states that locally serving retail would generally redistribute trips from other local uses, rather than generate new trips.

The applicant anticipates a single shift of between eight to 24 employees, up to 35 customers and 10 visitors at peak time, and four truck deliveries per day from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Additionally, the applicant states that over 70% of daily vehicle trips associated with the proposed use would be associated with the vehicle service side of the business. Per the applicant, customers for vehicle service will comprise of 95% from within the local community. The stated trip generation would be

consistent with a locally serving retail classification for the purposes of analyzing VMT and per the 2018 OPR guidelines, locally serving retail would not be considered a significant impact.

This project was referred to the Department of Public Works, City of Turlock, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), all of which had no comments related to impacts to traffic the proposed project. The Department of Public Works stated the proposed project will be required to install frontage improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalks, concrete median, lighting, and extension of a south-bound dedicated turn lane. Prior to plan review, the applicant shall sign a "Plan Check/Inspections Agreement" and post a \$5,000 deposit with Public Works, as well as a financial guarantee deposit for the street improvements installation along the road frontage. Public Works also requested the property annex into the Golden State Lighting District, and pay all fees associated for the annexation into the district prior to the final of any building or grading permit, whichever comes first. The annexation shall be completed prior to the final/occupancy of any building permit associated with this project. The comments received from Public Works will be applied to the project as development standards.

As stated in Section Fifteen, the County has adopted Public Facilities Fees, to address impacts to public services. Fees paid on behalf of the proposed dealership will be utilized for improvements to existing County road networks affected by the project. Therefore, impacts to traffic are anticipated to be less than significant for the proposed project.

Mitigation: None.

References: Referral response from the Department of Public Works, dated October 12, 2020; referral response from the City of Turlock, dated March 24, 2021; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set for the in subdivision (c) of Public Resource 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.			X	

Discussion: The rezone a 5.14-acre parcel from expired P-D 209 to a new Planned Development for an auto dealership in two phases. In accordance with SB 18 and AB 52, this project was not referred to the tribes listed with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as the project is not a General Plan Amendment and no tribes have requested consultation or project referral noticing. As stated in Section Five, a records search conducted by the Central California Information Center for the project site indicated that there are no historical, cultural, or archeological resources recorded on-site and that the site has a low sensitivity for the discovery of such resources. It does not appear that this project will result in significant impacts to any archaeological or cultural resources. Although vacant, the site is not near areas of high sensitivity and previous agricultural production on the site has left the site disturbed. However, standard conditions of

approval/development standards regarding the discovery of cultural resources during the construction process will be added to the project.

Mitigation: None.

References: Application material; Central California Information Center Report for the project site, dated August 21, 2019; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
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?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Discussion: Limitations on providing services have not been identified. As stated in the project description the proposed development of an automotive dealership will be served by the City of Turlock for public water and sanitary services. The City has provided the applicant a Will Serve letter. As stipulated by the Will Serve letter, connection will require an Out of Boundary Service agreement, subject to approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). The Will Serve letter also requires the water and sewer connections meet City standards. Development standards will be added to the project to ensure these requirements are met.

The project was referred to the Department of Public Works and conditions of approval addressing their comments will be applied to the project. The Department of Public Works will review and approve grading and drainage plans prior to construction. Per the City's referral response, the on-site drainage basin shall be landscaped to enhance the filtering of stormwater runoff. This comment will also be added to the project as a development standard.

A referral response was received from the Turlock Irrigation District (TID), which stated the District has two separate irrigation pipelines that run through the site. The District stated that the existing pipelines are to either be abandoned or upgraded to District standards. Development standards will be added to address the District's comments.

Mitigation: None.

References: Referral response from Turlock Irrigation District (TID), dated October 8, 2020; referral response from the Department of Public Works, dated October 12, 2020; referral response from the City of Turlock, dated March 24, 2021; Will Serve Letter from the City of Turlock, dated December 4, 2020; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
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?			X	
c) Require the installation of maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
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?			X	

Discussion: The Stanislaus County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies risks posed by disasters and identifies ways to minimize damage from those disasters. With the Wildfire Hazard Mitigation Activities of this plan in place, impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan are anticipated to be less than significant. The terrain of the site is relatively flat, and the site has access to a County-maintained road. The site is located in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) for fire protection and is served by Keyes Fire Protection District. The project was referred to the District who have not provided any comments on the project. California Building Code establishes minimum standards for the protection of life and property by increasing the ability of a building to resist intrusion of flame and embers. The proposed project will be required to meet these standards.

Wildfire risk and risks associated with postfire land changes are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: None.

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: Review of this project has not indicated any features which might significantly impact the environmental quality of the site and/or the surrounding area, as the site was previously zoned for an automotive dealership. The site is predominantly surrounded by commercial development to the south, west and northwest of the site. The agriculturally zoned parcels to the north and east of the site are limited to development to uses consistent with the A-2 (General Agricultural) zoning district. While not proposed as part of the requested project, commercial development of parcels located in the A-2 zoning district as well as expansions or alterations to the existing commercial development adjacent to the project site, would require discretionary land use permits that are subject to CEQA in each instance. An analysis of any potential cumulative impacts with take place with each individual project.

Mitigation: None.

References: Initial Study; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation.¹

¹Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation adopted in August 23, 2016, as amended. **Housing Element** adopted on April 5, 2016.



CENTRAL CALIFORNIA INFORMATION CENTER
California Historical Resources Information System
 Department of Anthropology – California State University, Stanislaus
 One University Circle, Turlock, California 95382
 (209) 667-3307

Alpine, Calaveras, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus & Tuolumne Counties

Date: August 21, 2019

CCaIC Records Search File #: 11171N

Re: Project: Rezone Application for APN 045-053-038, 5200 N. Golden State Blvd., Turlock, CA

Jim Freitas
 Associated Engineering Group, Inc.
 4206 Technology Drive, Ste. 4
 Modesto, CA 95356

Email: jim@assoceng.com

Dear Mr. Freitas,

We have conducted a records search as per your request for the above-referenced project area located on the Ceres USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle map in Stanislaus County.

Search of our files includes review of our maps for the specific project area and the immediate vicinity of the project area, and review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (1976), the *California Historical Landmarks* (1990), and the California Points of Historical Interest listing (May 1992 and updates), the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File (HPDF) and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility (ADOE) (Office of Historic Preservation current electronic files dated 03-20-2014 and 04-05-2012, respectively), the *Survey of Surveys* (1989), the Caltrans State and Local Bridges Inventory, GLO Plats, and other pertinent historic data available at the CCaIC for each specific county.

The following details the results of the records search:

Prehistoric or historic resources within the project area:

No prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources or historic properties have been reported to the CCaIC.

Other information:

- GLO Plat map T4S/R10E Sheet #44-245, dated 1853-1854: no cultural features or references noted in Section 32.
- *Official Map of Stanislaus County* (1906): project area property at that time fell within the larger land holdings of O. McHenry.
- 1916 Ceres USGS 7.5' (1:31680) and 1939 Modesto East USACE 15' (1:62500) maps do not indicate any buildings or structures on the property at that time.

- The 1953 and 1969 Ceres USGS 7.5' maps (1:24000) both show one building on or at the edge of the property at that time, which was removed for the SR 99 freeway interchange construction that took place later.

Prehistoric or historic resources within the immediate vicinity of the project area:

None have been reported to the CCalIC

Resources that are known to have value to local cultural groups:

None have been formally reported to the Information Center.

Previous investigations within the project area:

None have been reported to the CCalIC in the project area, although it is possible that there is a Caltrans study report prior to 1976 that we never received for the freeway interchange project.

One Caltrans survey report has been reported in the immediate vicinity:

CCaIC report #ST-07537

Kuzak (2011)

Historic Property Survey Report, 10-STA-99, P.M. 0.0/24.7, 2576 E-FIS1000020344, Stanislaus County, California.

Recommendations/Comments: Based on existing data in our files the project area has a low sensitivity for the possible discovery of prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources or historic properties. No recommendations for further study are offered at this time.

Please be advised that a historical resource is defined as a building, structure, object, prehistoric or historic archaeological site, or district possessing physical evidence of human activities over 45 years old. Since the project area has not been subject to previous investigations, there may be unidentified features involved in your project that are 45 years or older and considered as historical resources requiring further study and evaluation by a qualified professional of the appropriate discipline.

If archaeological resources are encountered, work should be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers should avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. Project personnel should not collect cultural resources.

If at any time you might require the services of a qualified professional the Statewide Referral List for Historical Resources Consultants is posted for your use on the internet at <http://chrisinfo.org>

If human remains are discovered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires you to protect the discovery and notify the county coroner, who will determine if the find is Native American. If the remains are recognized as Native American, the coroner shall then notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 authorizes the NAHC to appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) who will make recommendations for the treatment of the discovery.

We further advise you that if you retain the services of a historical resources consultant, the firm or individual you retain is responsible for submitting any report of findings prepared for you to the Central California Information Center, including one copy of the narrative report and copies of any records that document historical resources found as a result of field work, preferably in PDF format. If the consultant wishes to obtain copies of materials not included with this records search reply, additional copy or records search fees may apply.

Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the State Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the CHRIS Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law.

We thank you for contacting this office regarding historical resource preservation. Please let us know when we can be of further service. Please sign and return the attached **Access Agreement Short Form** (which can be returned by email).

Note: Billing will be transmitted separately via email from the Financial Services office (\$150.00), payable within 60 days of receipt of the invoice.

Sincerely,



Robin Hards, Assistant Research Technician
Central California Information Center

California Historical Resources Information System

Copy of invoice to Laurie Marroquin, Financial Services (lamarroquin@csustan.edu)



OFFICE OF THE CITY ENGINEER
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
ENGINEERING DIVISION

156 S. BROADWAY, SUITE 150 | TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA 95380 | PHONE 209-668-5520 | FAX 209-668-5563 | TDD 800-735-2929

December 4, 2020

James Figurell dba Price Ford
5200 N Golden State Blvd
Turlock, CA 95382

RE: Will Serve Letter for 5200 and 5202 N Golden State Blvd., APN: 045-053-039 and 045-053-038

Dear Mr. Figurell,

Please accept this document as a response to your will serve letter request for potable water and sanitary sewer services. The City can and will provide potable water and sanitary sewer services to the subject property, pending Stanislaus County Local Agency Formation Commission approval, provided the following conditions are met:

1. Developer shall apply and pay all fees associated with the execution of an out-of-boundary service agreement with the City of Turlock for the proposed utility services.
2. An Out-of-Boundary Service Agreement must be fully executed between the City of Turlock and the property owners.
3. Developer shall pay all application fees to the Stanislaus County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to consider and authorize the City of Turlock to provide utility services to the property.
4. The developer shall pay all City of Turlock water and sewer fees prior to the installation of any utility services.
5. All water and sewer work shall be constructed in accordance with the City of Turlock Standard Specifications and Drawings.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at 668-5599 ext. 4435.

Sincerely,

Nathan Bray, PE
Interim Director of Development Services / City Engineer



NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NAME OF PROJECT: REZONE APPLICATION NO. PLN2019-0108 – PRICE HONDA

LOCATION OF PROJECT: North Golden State Boulevard, between East Keyes and East Taylor Roads, in the Keyes/Turlock area. APN: 045-053-008

PROJECT DEVELOPERS: James Figurell, Price Honda of Turlock
5200 N. Golden State Boulevard
Turlock, CA 95382

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: The project is a request to rezone a 5.14-acre parcel from expired Planned Development (P-D) (209), to a new P-D to allow for development of an auto dealership in two phases.

Based upon the Initial Study, dated **May 19, 2021**, the Environmental Coordinator finds as follows:

1. This project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, nor to curtail the diversity of the environment.
2. This project will not have a detrimental effect upon either short-term or long-term environmental goals.
3. This project will not have impacts which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
4. This project will not have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects upon human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The Initial Study and other environmental documents are available for public review at the Department of Planning and Community Development, 1010 10th Street, Suite 3400, Modesto, California.

Initial Study prepared by: Jeremy Ballard, Associate Planner.

Submit comments to: Stanislaus County
Planning and Community Development Department
1010 10th Street, Suite 3400
Modesto, California 95354

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REFERRALS

PROJECT: REZ APP. NO PLN2019-0108 - PRICE HONDA

REFERRED TO:				RESPONDED		RESPONSE			MITIGATION MEASURES		CONDITIONS	
	2 WK	30 DAY	PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE	YES	NO	WILL NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	MAY HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO COMMENT NON CEQA	YES	NO	YES	NO
CA DEPT OF FISH & WILDLIFE	X	X	X		X							
CA DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION DIST 10	X	X	X		X							
CA SWQCB: DRINKING WATER DIVISION	X	X	X		X							
CA OPR STATE CLEARINGHOUSE	X	X	X	X				X		X		X
CA RWQCB CENTRAL VALLEY REGION	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
CITY OF: TURLOCK	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	X	X	X		X							
FIRE PROTECTION DIST: KEYES	X	X	X		X							
GSA: WEST TURLOCK	X	X	X		X							
IRRIGATION DISTRICT: TURLOCK	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
MOSQUITO DISTRICT: TURLOCK	X	X	X		X							
MT VALLEY EMERGENCY MEDICAL	X	X	X		X							
MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL: KEYES	X	X	X	X				X		X		X
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC	X	X	X		X							
RAILROAD: UNION PACIFIC	X	X	X		X							
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY APCD	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
SCHOOL DISTRICT 1:KEYES UNION	X	X	X		X							
SCHOOL DISTRICT 2: TURLOCK UNIFIED	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO AG COMMISSIONER	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO BUILDING PERMITS DIVISION	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
STAN CO CEO	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO DER	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
STAN CO ERC	X	X	X	X				X		X		X
STAN CO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
STAN CO PUBLIC WORKS	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
STAN CO SHERIFF	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO SUPERVISOR DIST 2: CHIESA	X	X	X		X							
STAN COUNTY COUNSEL	X	X	X		X							
STANISLAUS FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU	X	X	X		X							
STANISLAUS LAFCO	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
SURROUNDING LAND OWNERS		X	X		X							
TELEPHONE COMPANY: ATT	X	X	X		X							