

Attachment 3

CENTRAL LATHROP SPECIFIC PLAN
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
AMENDMENT AND REASSIGNMENT PROJECT

ADDENDUM

to the previously-certified EIR
State Clearinghouse No. 2003072132

for the

CENTRAL LATHROP SPECIFIC PLAN
CITY OF LATHROP, CA

October 12, 2016

CITY OF LATHROP
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
390 Towne Center Drive
Lathrop, CA
209-941-7260

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
3.0	APPLICABLE CEQA REQUIREMENTS	4
4.0	ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUS EIR	5
4.1	Changes in Project Description	5
4.2	Changes in Circumstances	6
4.3	Availability of New Information	6
4.4	Conclusions	7
APPENDIX		
A	Initial Study	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is an Addendum to the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP), and has been prepared to analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with a proposed amendment to the CLSP Development Agreement (DA).

The CLSP EIR was certified by the City of Lathrop (City) in conjunction with its approval of the CLSP in 2004. The certified EIR will be referred to in this document as “the previous EIR.” The previous EIR considered the potential environmental impacts associated with the CLSP as well as several related entitlements, including adoption of the DA. Together these entitlements proposed the development of 1,521 acres located west of I-5 in the City of Lathrop, and permitted development of up to 6,790 residential units and 5 million square feet of commercial uses as well as parks, schools and other community facilities. The DA established general development rights and governs the relationship between the City and the private sector developer with respect to the CLSP.

The CLSP EIR included mitigation measures needed to reduce most of the project’s potentially significant environmental effects to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures were adopted by the City via a Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program. However, not all of the potentially significant environmental effects identified in the previous EIR could be reduced to a less than significant level. Thus the previous EIR concluded that the CLSP resulted in significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic, air quality, noise, utilities, agriculture and biology. A statement of overriding considerations was therefore also adopted by the City.

In 2012, property comprising a portion of the CLSP Specific Plan area changed ownership and is now under the control of Saybrook CLSP, LLC (Saybrook). Saybrook now requests that the City amend the DA to reassign its benefits and obligations to Saybrook for that portion of the CLSP area that Saybrook controls (the “DA Amendments”). An initial study was prepared to determine whether the previous EIR provides adequate coverage under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the DA Amendments. This initial study determined that no subsequent environmental review was required.

The proposed modifications to the CLSP and DA as analyzed in the previous EIR are described in additional detail in Section 2.0. The basis for preparation of an Addendum is described in Section 3.0. The consistency of the modified project with CEQA addendum requirements, and the adequacy of the previous EIR in addressing the impacts of the modified project, are addressed in Section 4.0. Documentation supporting preparation of the Addendum is provided in Appendix A, an Initial Study of the modified project.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Saybrook CLSP, LLC (Saybrook) proposes an amendment to the CLSP Development Agreement (DA) and the reassignment of the benefits and obligations of the existing DA for a 623 acre portion of the CLSP specific plan area that Saybrook now controls, as well as property within the CLSP that Saybrook may control in the future. The DA benefits and obligations are currently shared by the City of Lathrop (City) and its private sector partner, Richland Planned Communities, Inc. As proposed, provisions of the amended DA would be reassigned to Saybrook for the portion of the CLSP area controlled by Saybrook.

The City adopted the CLSP and approved the CLSP DA with Richland in 2004 after certifying an Environmental Impact Report (the “previous EIR”). The DA establishes general development rights and governs the relationship between the City and the private sector partner with respect to the CLSP land use entitlements listed in the DA, including the specific plan. Approved development for the CLSP project as a whole is described in more detail in the CLSP and other project approvals.

The adopted CLSP establishes approved land uses for the entire CLSP area, including those areas now controlled by Saybrook. The applicable designations, allowable development intensities and other related information are described in detail in the CLSP and represented schematically on Figure 3. Development pursuant to the CLSP could result in as much as 5 million square feet of commercial development and up to 6,790 residential units.

The Central Lathrop Specific Plan is a 1,520 acre planning area in the northwestern portion of the City between the San Joaquin River and Interstate 5, north of Louise Avenue and the Mossdale Landing residential community. The CLSP Development Agreement would pertain to lands owned or controlled by Saybrook, which includes approximately 623 acres north of Mossdale Landing, west of Interstate 5.

The proposed amendments to the DA also include updates that reflect CLSP history since the approval of the DA, that reflect changed conditions, such as the Delta Act and SB 5 200-year floodplain requirements, and that modify descriptions of benefits and obligations to reflect current conditions. The DA, as currently approved, will remain in force with respect to CLSP lands not controlled by Saybrook.

Principal points addressed in the proposed amendments to the DA include:

- Reassignment of developer rights and obligations from Richland to Saybrook for 623 acres and those areas of the CLSP that may be controlled by Saybrook in the future;
- Replacement of the previous DA as to Saybrook and the Saybrook-owned property;
- Recognition of Saybrook investment in the CLSP project
- DA term extension to 2036, including entitlements received by Saybrook
- City/Saybrook cooperation with respect to compliance with flood protection requirements of SB 5
- Establishment of SSJID water entitlements provided other agreement requirements are met

The amended DA does not modify any of the approved CLSP land use designations in the original DA and the adopted CLSP; maximum allowable development as described in the CLSP and as analyzed in the previous EIR would be unchanged by the proposed amendments.

This Addendum and the Initial Study provided in Appendix A consider the sufficiency of the previous EIR to provide CEQA documentation for the proposed amendments to the DA. The Initial Study considers whether the previous EIR's description of the environmental setting and environmental impacts adequately address the DA amendment and reassignment, whether project changes or changed conditions would cause new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of environmental effects identified in the previous EIR, and whether mitigation measures specified in the previous EIR are sufficient to reduce potentially significant environmental effects attributable to the amended DA, if any, to a less than significant level. The findings of the Initial Study are incorporated into this Addendum.

3.0 APPLICABLE CEQA REQUIREMENTS

The California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21000 et seq.) (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., §§ 15000 et seq.) require a public agency to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration prior to taking discretionary actions that have the potential to cause significant, adverse impacts on the environment (CEQA Guidelines § 15064). CEQA encourages reductions in paperwork as well as the use of previously-prepared documents to address the potential environmental effects of proposed projects (CEQA Guidelines § 15006).

Pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City's review of this Addendum focuses on the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendments to the DA that might cause a change in the conclusions of the certified EIR, including changes in circumstances or new information of substantial importance that would substantially change the conclusions of the certified EIR.

Pursuant to CEQA section 21166, and State CEQA Guidelines section 15162, where an EIR has been certified or a Negative Declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR or Negative Declaration shall be prepared for the project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence, that one or more of the following conditions are met:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project that would require major revisions in the EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require major revisions in the EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- New information of substantial importance, that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified or the Negative Declaration was adopted that shows the proposed project would result in new significant effects, an increase in the severity of previously identified effects, or dictate additional consideration of mitigation measures or alternatives exists.

If some changes or additions to a previously certified EIR are necessary, but none of the conditions specified above have occurred, a lead agency may prepare an addendum, as opposed to a subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report or negative declaration, prior to issuing subsequent discretionary approvals. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15164(a).)

An Initial Study (Appendix A) was prepared to determine whether any of the above conditions have occurred. The Initial Study includes findings for the potential environmental effects of the proposed DA amendments, as compared with the findings in the previous EIR. As documented in the initial study, the proposed amendments do not meet any of the specified conditions for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR; any changes in circumstances and changes to the project would not involve any new significant effects or cause an increase in the severity of significant effects described in the previous EIR.

4.0 ADDENDUM TO PREVIOUS EIR

This document is an Addendum to the previously certified Environmental Impact Report on the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) (SCH #2003072132), or “the previous EIR.” In this document, references to “the previous EIR” encompass both the Draft and Final versions of the EIR, which are hereby incorporated into this document by this reference as specifically described below. Copies of these documents are available for review at the City of Lathrop.

EDAW 2004. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan, SCH# 2003072132. July 2004.

EDAW 2004a. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan, SCH# 2003072132. October 2004.

This Addendum documents the City’s review of the previous EIR for its adequacy in fulfilling the requirements of CEQA for the proposed amendment and reassignment of the Development Agreement (DA) for the CLSP, as discussed below.

Specifically, the Addendum considers: 1) whether substantial changes in the project are proposed that require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; 2) whether substantial changes have or would occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that require major revisions to the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or 3) whether new information of substantial importance has become available and that shows the project will have one or more new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162). Evidence supporting this analysis is provided in the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A.

4.1 CHANGES IN PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The approved CLSP DA governs various aspects of the relationship between the City and the former CLSP developer Richland Communities as it pertains to the implementation of the approved CLSP over the entire 1,521-acre specific plan area. The applicant, Saybrook CLSP, LLC (Saybrook), now proposes the amendment and reassignment of the CLSP DA for the 623 acre portion of the CLSP currently controlled by Saybrook as well as other CLSP lands that may come under the control of Saybrook in the future. The provisions of the DA amendment and reassignment do not involve any changes to the location, quantity and intensity of planned development within the CLSP and therefore would have no direct physical effects.

As a result the project would not result in any substantial change to the previous EIR’s Project Description or a change that would require major revisions to the EIR as a consequence of new significant effects or an increase in the severity of effects. As discussed in detail in Appendix A, the proposed project would not result in any new or more severe environmental effects than were described in the previous EIR.

4.2 CHANGES IN CIRCUMSTANCES

There have been relatively few changes in circumstances surrounding the CLSP project since certification of the previous EIR, due to the general economic slowdown and changes in project ownership during the recession. Although the CLSP Specific Plan area has been graded and is served by existing City streets and utilities, development within the area has been limited to Lathrop High School and the Lathrop Generations Center. These projects and community infrastructure development, as well as much more development in the area, were anticipated in the CLSP EIR.

Development within the adjacent Mossdale Landing projects to the south, and the River Islands project west of the San Joaquin River have proceeded at a relatively slow pace through 2014. Development in those areas is consistent with the approved specific plans, urban design concepts and other entitlements considered in the EIRs prepared for those projects; the Mossdale Landing and River Islands EIRs preceded and were considered during the preparation of the CLSP EIR.

Senate Bill 5 (SB5), and related companion bills, created a new requirement for certain land use decisions made by cities and counties in the California Central Valley. Prior to approving discretionary land use decisions for non-residential projects, and prior to approving ministerial land use decisions (building permits) for new residential buildings, land use agencies are required to make findings related to the provision of 200- year or Urban Level of Flood Protection (ULOP). In order to comply with this requirement and remain consistent with DWR Guidance regarding how cities can comply with the requirement, the City must make Findings of Adequate Progress toward the provision of Urban Level Flood Protection (ULOP) and/or 200-year flood protection. On June 20, 2016, the Lathrop City Council adopted a Resolution, acting as the land use agency, adopting Findings of Adequate Progress Toward Providing a 200-Year Urban Level of Flood Protection in Reclamation District 17.

As documented in the Initial Study, there have been no substantial changes in circumstances related to the CLSP that were not adequately anticipated by and accounted for in the previous EIR. The minor changes that have occurred would not result in any new or more severe environmental effects than were identified in the previous EIR and would not require any major revisions in the EIR.

4.3 AVAILABILITY OF NEW INFORMATION

The Initial Study also did not identify any new information that would bear on the analysis of environmental effects in the previous EIR. No other substantial new information that is directly associated with the project or its potential environmental effects has been identified, other than as described above for changes in circumstances.

Thus, there is no known new information available that would result in the identification of new significant effects or that would cause an increase in the severity of effects as described in the previous EIR.

4.4 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the above analysis, and on the Initial Study shown in Appendix A, the City has determined that:

- (1) No substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and
- (3) No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The City has therefore determined that the previous EIR, as updated by this Addendum, is sufficient for use in consideration of the proposed amendment and reassignment of the CLSP DA. Any significant or potentially significant environmental effects related to the CLSP, including as altered by the proposed DA amendments, are adequately described in the previous EIR as updated by this Addendum.

The applicable mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to be applied to the CLSP development as governed by the amended and reassigned DA. These mitigation measures are shown in the adopted CLSP Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program.

**APPENDIX A
INITIAL STUDY**

**CITY OF LATHROP
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)
(Public Resources Code 21000-21177)
and the CEQA GUIDELINES
(California Code of Regulations, Title 14,
Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387)

A. GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

1. Project Title: Central Lathrop Specific Plan
Saybrook, Development Agreement Amendment and
Reassignment
2. Project Entitlements: City of Lathrop, Approval of D.A. Amendment and
Reassignment
3. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lathrop
390 Towne Center Drive
Lathrop CA 95330
(209) 941-7260
4. Contact Person, Phone, E-mail: Rebecca Schmidt, Community Development Director
(209) 941-7267
rschmidt@ci.lathrop.ca.us
5. Project Location: The CLSP project site comprises 1,521 acres
designated for development, which are a portion of the
City of Lathrop, and 838 acres designated for
wastewater treatment storage ponds and spray fields.
The site is comprised of the several APNs.

For the purposes of this document, the Saybrook
“ownership” comprises 514 acres owned in fee, 109
acres held in options and other portions of the CLSP
project site that may be owned or controlled by
Saybrook over time.

The City of Lathrop is located at the interchange of
Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route (SR) 120 in central
San Joaquin County, California, immediately south of
the City of Stockton and west of the City of Manteca.

Additional location information is shown on the attached
figures.

6. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Saybrook CLSP, LLC
303 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 600
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
7. General Plan Designations and Zoning: General Plan Designations:
The project site is within the approved Central Lathrop Specific Plan (CLSP) area. Lathrop General Plan designations were assigned in conjunction with approval of the CLSP and reflect corresponding CLSP land use designations. Major and use designations applicable to the CLSP include:
- Variable Density Residential (VR-CL)
 - Residential (Mixed Use) (R/MU-CL)
 - High Density Residential (HR-CL)
 - Office/Commercial (OC-CL)
 - Community Park (CP-CL)
 - Neighborhood Park (NP-CL)
 - Open Space (OS-CL)
 - High School (HS-CL)
 - K-8 School (K-8-CL)
- Zoning of the project area corresponds closely to the CLSP land use designations listed above:
8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: North: Agricultural land
East: Interstate 5
South and West: Mossdale Village commercial and residential areas
9. Previous Environmental Document: Environmental Impact Report for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan (SCH # 2003072132), certified on November 9, 2004. Notice of Determination filed November 10, 2004.
9. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

10. Project Description

Saybrook CLSP, LLC (Saybrook) proposes an amendment of the CLSP Development Agreement (DA) and the reassignment of the benefits and obligations of the existing DA for a 623 acre portion of the CLSP specific plan area that is now under Saybrook's ownership or control, as well as any parcels that will be under Saybrook's ownership and control in the future. The DA benefits and obligations are currently shared by the City of Lathrop (City) and its private sector partner, Richland Planned Communities, Inc. As proposed, provisions of the amended DA would be reassigned to Saybrook for the portion of the CLSP area controlled by Saybrook now and in the future.

The City adopted the CLSP and approved the CLSP DA with Richland in 2004 after certifying an Environmental Impact Report (the previous EIR"). The DA establishes general development rights and governs the relationship between the City and the private sector partner with respect to the CLSP land use entitlements listed in the DA, including the specific plan. Approved development for the CLSP project as a whole is described in more detail in the CLSP and other project approvals.

The adopted CLSP established approved land uses for the entire CLSP area, including those areas now owned or otherwise by Saybrook now and in the future. The applicable designations, allowable development intensities and other related information are described in detail in the CLSP and represented schematically on Figure 3. Development pursuant to the CLSP could result in as much as 5 million square feet of commercial development and up to 6,790 residential units.

The Central Lathrop Specific Plan is a 1,520 acre planning area in the northwestern portion of the City between the San Joaquin River and Interstate 5, north of Louise Avenue and the Mossdale Landing residential community. The CLSP Development Agreement would pertain to lands owned or controlled by Saybrook, which includes approximately 623 acres north of Mossdale Landing, west of Interstate 5.

The proposed amendments to the DA also include updates that reflect CLSP history since the approval of the DA, that reflect changed conditions, such as the Delta Protection Act and SB 5 200-year floodplain requirements, and that modify descriptions of benefits and obligations to reflect current conditions. The DA, as currently approved, will remain in force with respect to CLSP lands not controlled by Saybrook.

The amended DA does not modify any of the approved CLSP land use designations in the original DA and the adopted CLSP. Allowable development as described in the CLSP and as analyzed in the EIR would be unchanged by the proposed amendments to the DA.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

This Initial Study considers the degree to which the certified EIR for the CLSP addresses the potential environmental effects of the CLSP under CEQA, as modified by the proposed amendments to the DA. The CLSP EIR was prepared as a "project-level" EIR and was intended to provide CEQA compliance for subsequent CLSP development projects. The EIR notes at page 1-2:

“Implementation of the CLSP is considered a development project for CEQA purposes. For this reason, this DEIR has been prepared to meet the requirements of a project EIR as defined by §15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This type of EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the physical environment that would result from the development of a project, including its planning, construction, and operation. The City’s intention in preparing a project EIR is that no further environmental analysis will be required for additional regulatory approvals following adoption of the specific plan absent grounds for a subsequent EIR, a supplement to the EIR, or an addendum. (See State CEQA Guidelines §§15162–15164.)”

Each section of this Initial Study describes the scope of the CLSP EIR as to the environmental effects that were considered and the environmental setting information that was provided. The adequacy of the EIR in describing the potentially significant effects of the proposed DA amendments is assessed, as is the applicability and effectiveness of the EIR’s mitigation measures. This analysis considers any change in circumstances that might affect the applicability of the EIR analysis, including relevant regulatory and physical changes affecting the project site and vicinity. If additional feasible mitigation measures are needed and available, they are described. The checklist summarizes the results of the analysis as follows:

Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact. Potential environmental effects in this issue area were adequately addressed in the CLSP EIR. If significant effects were identified, any available feasible mitigation measures were identified that could substantially reduce or avoid the significant effects. The project will not cause any new or substantially more severe environmental effects in this issue area than were described in the CLSP EIR.

Requires Additional Mitigation Measures. If the EIR’s mitigation measures would not be effective in reducing potentially significant environmental effects to a less than significant level, and if feasible mitigation measures are now available that would be effective, they are identified in the analysis.

Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact. Potential environmental effects in the subject issue area were not specifically addressed in the CLSP EIR. These potential impacts, if any, are less than significant and do not require mitigation.

New or More Severe Significant Effect. The project would involve new significant effects or significant effects that are substantially more severe than those identified in the CLSP EIR. Preparation of a supplemental or subsequent environmental review, in the form of either an EIR or Negative Declaration would be required per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162-15164. No such effects are identified in this Initial Study.

The environmental factors checked below, if any, are potential environmental effects of the project that are new or substantially more severe than were identified in the certified CLSP EIR, or they require consideration of additional feasible mitigation measures. No such issue areas are identified

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology /Soils

Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality
Land Use/Planning	Mineral Resources	Noise
Population/Housing	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation/Traffic	Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance

C. LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

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.

- X** 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 pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

RSchmidt

Rebecca Schmidt, Community Development Director
City of Lathrop

10/10/2016

October 10, 2016

D. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
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) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X		
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The aesthetic setting of the CLSP area and vicinity were thoroughly described in the CLSP EIR. The Specific Plan area, including the project site, is now cleared of the previous agricultural land uses, graded and developed with public streets and utilities in anticipation of urban development. This is a change in circumstances that was anticipated in the EIR and does not involve any potential for new or more severe significant environmental effects.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR addressed each of the environmental issues identified in the above checklist section in detail, considering the potential aesthetic effects of all proposed CLSP development, including planned development of the project site. The CLSP EIR determined that impacts relating to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and impacts relating to light and glare would be less than significant. However, the CLSP EIR also determined that the CLSP would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, as a result of converting the existing agricultural land to developed urban uses, as well as construction of offsite recycle water storage ponds. The CLSP EIR determined that because of the scale and location of the CLSP, there was no feasible mitigation available to address these impacts, as mitigation measures were limited to design requirements that will be applicable to the project and other development within the CLSP. The project site and surrounding lands have now been converted from agricultural use to vacant urban land. No additional mitigation for this effect is needed or available.

The proposed amendments to DA will not result in an additional new or more severe impacts relating to aesthetics, because the amendments do not involve any changes in the land use designations, density, intensity, or location of development within the CLSP – they merely reassign developer rights from Richland to Saybrook, extend the existing entitlements to 2036, and make other minor administrative changes. No changes related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, light or glare, or visual character beyond those already analyzed and disclosed in the

previous EIR would occur. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified aesthetics effects.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.18, pp 1-13.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
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 forestland to non-forest use?	X			

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described the agricultural setting of the project site and vicinity as it existed at the time, and which was predominantly used for agriculture. The entire specific plan area, including the project site, has since been converted from agricultural use, and graded and developed with streets and utilities in anticipation of urban development and consistent with the CLSP and the CSLP EIR. This change in circumstances was anticipated in the EIR and does not involve any potential for new or more severe significant effects on agriculture.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR addressed each of the agriculture-related environmental issues identified in the above checklist section, detailing the effect of CLSP development on agriculture, including the conversion and cancellation of Williamson Act contracts on over 1,500 acres of agricultural land, including those parcels subject to the proposed amendments to the DA.

Agricultural effects, including impacts relating to the conversion of farmland, conflicts with Williamson Act Contracts, and potential conflicts between agricultural and nonagricultural uses, were identified in the EIR as potentially significant. Adopted mitigation measures require payment of San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitation Conservation Plan (SJMSCP) fees (Mitigation Measure 4.13-a), which would be used to purchase easements over agricultural land for habitat enhancement purposes. The project proponents also agreed to pay an additional agricultural mitigation fee that would purchase additional agricultural land easements. Both fees will be payable in conjunction CLSP development. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.13-b

minimizes impacts on agricultural production by requiring the project applicant to continue to allow/promote farming operations as long as possible on portions of the CLSP plan area until an area is to be developed. Mitigation Measure 4.13-c also requires the project applicant to phase development of agricultural lands in the CLSP area in such a way as to avoid the fragmentation of continuing agricultural operations.

Although Mitigation Measure 4.13-c reduces potential impacts associated with land use conflicts to a less than significant level, the above measures would only partially mitigate loss of agricultural lands; agricultural land conversion effects and effects related to the cancellation of Williamson Act contracts; therefore these impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable in the previous EIR. There is no known additional mitigation that would further reduce or compensate for agricultural land conversion associated with CLSP development.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts to agricultural resources, as they do not involve any changes in the land use designations, density, intensity, or location of development within the CLSP – they merely reassign developer rights from Richland to Saybrook, extend the existing entitlements to 2036, and make other minor administrative changes. No additional loss of agricultural land or additional conflicts with agricultural uses would occur beyond that which was analyzed and disclosed in the previous EIR. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects to agriculture.

The CLSP EIR did not address potential effects on forestry. There are no forestry resources in the CLSP area; the project would have no effect on forestry resources.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.13, pp 1-13.

3. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	X			
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X			
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	X			
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	X			

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described the air quality setting of the project vicinity in detail. Since the certification of the EIR, regional air quality conditions have improved somewhat, per-vehicle emissions have been reduced, and additional air quality protection regulations are in place. These setting changes are incidental and generally encompassed by the EIR analysis, especially mitigation measures as discussed below that tend to reduce the overall air quality effects of the larger CLSP project. There are no known changes in air quality circumstances that would result in new or potentially more severe environmental effects than were identified in the CLSP EIR.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR provided a detailed description of the potential air pollutant emissions associated with the construction and development of the CLSP, including property subject to the proposed DA amendments. The operations analysis included in the previous EIR was comprehensive and conservative. It determined that air quality impacts related to construction emissions, operational activities, odors from the proposed wastewater treatment plant, and long term regional emissions would be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures 4.5-a and 4.5-b were identified to address significant air quality effects and toxic air contaminants; these measures mandate controls on construction equipment emissions and compliance with the measures described in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's *Guide to the Assessment and Mitigation of Air Quality Impacts* (GAMAQI). This guideline has been updated and would apply to the project in its current form. Any future development within the CLSP, including on property subject to the proposed DA amendments, would also be subject to other applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations. The CLSP concluded that the project's air quality effects would, even with these mitigation measures, remain significant and unavoidable

Mitigation Measure 4.5-c was adopted to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with odors, however the wastewater treatment needs of CLSP are now addressed by the Lathrop Consolidated Treatment Facility, as discussed in Section 16; CEQA review for these improvements has been provided in separate non-CLSP EIR documents.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in new or potentially more severe impacts associated with air quality, air emissions, or odors. This is because the proposed amendments will not alter the maximum allowable land use density or intensity, or alter when and where land uses are developed. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. Development in the CLSP will not generate additional emissions, beyond those identified in the previous EIR, as a result of the proposed DA amendments. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects to air quality.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.5, pp 1-26.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Adversely impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, any endangered, rare, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?				X
b) 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
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
d) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
e) 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
f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR provided a very detailed inventory of the occurrence and protection status of terrestrial and aquatic biological resources that could be affected by the CLSP. These included general biological resources, special-status plants, special-status wildlife species, special-status fish, sensitive habitats and fish and wildlife movement corridors. The resources of the CLSP area, including the adjacent San Joaquin River were described in detail. The EIR also described the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (SJMSCP) and its role in mitigating potential losses of important biological resources.

Since certification of the EIR, the project site and surrounding CLSP lands have been converted from agricultural and related land uses to vacant land that has been graded and otherwise developed in preparation for urban use. Consequently, the biological values of the project site and surrounding lands have been substantially reduced or eliminated. The SJMSCP remains in force and will require contributions as development of the CLSP proceeds.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR provided a detailed accounting of the potential upland and aquatic biological resources effects of development in the specific plan area, including the project site, addressing all of the above-listed biological issues. The uplands analysis included a range of federal- and state-listed plant, wildlife and fish and other special-status species and identified significant biological effects on rare plants, the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle, the giant garter snake, riparian brush rabbit, Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, migratory birds and raptors, among others. Elements of the project adjacent to the San Joaquin River were identified as having potential impacts on riparian habitats and related species.

The CLSP EIR determined that potential impacts to special status plants, the valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB), giant garter snake, western pond turtle, Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, certain nesting birds, common raptors, riparian brush rabbit, sensitive habitats, and wildlife corridors were potentially significant.

The CLSP EIR also determined that the CLSP would have potentially significant effects on aquatic resources, including fisheries. Three of five fishery effects were related to development on the water side of the San Joaquin River levees; the current project would not involve any work in this area and will not trigger these effects. The fourth fishery issue area was related to the discharge of storm water to the river, which was identified as a less than significant or beneficial effect. The fifth issue area involved beneficial effects from reductions in existing diversions from the river.

The EIR identified mitigation measures for each of the identified significant biological effects, including Mitigation Measures 4.14-b (special status plants), 4.14-c (VELB), 4.14-d (giant garter snake), 4.14-f (Swainson's Hawk), 4.14-h (burrowing owl), 4.14-j (ground-nesting or streamside/lakeside nesting birds), 4.14-k (birds nesting in isolated trees), 4.14-l (birds nesting along riparian corridors), 4.14-o (common raptors), 4.14-q (riparian brush rabbit), 4.14-r (sensitive habitats), 4.14-s (wildlife corridors), and 4.15-c (degradation of aquatic habitat from construction of stormwater outfall). Among other things, these mitigation measures require compliance with the SJMSCP, which is still in force and is applicable to all development within the CLSP area.

SJMSCP compliance involves payment of fees and observance of Incidental Take Minimization Measures (ITMMs) during development.

With the implementation of the above mitigation measures, the CLSP EIR determined that with the exception of impacts to the riparian brush rabbit, impacts all other biological resources, species, and habitats would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts to any sensitive biological resource. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects to biological resources.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.14, pp 1-38, and Section 4.15, pp 1-25.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		X		
e) 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:			X	
a) 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				
b) 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.				

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR describes the cultural resources and paleontological setting of the CLSP area, based on searches of applicable archives, field surveys and historic evaluation of structures. Archival searches did not identify any archaeological or historic resources on or near the project site. The project site and other portions of the CLSP area are underlain by sediments of the Modesto Formation, which is considered sensitive for discovery of paleontological resources.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR identified potentially significant impacts to one recorded prehistoric archaeological site, CA-SJO-3, as a result of the construction of proposed recycled water storage ponds. The CLSP EIR also determined there were potentially significant impacts to as-yet-undiscovered or unrecorded archaeological sites, and undiscovered or unrecorded human burial sites. The CLSP EIR also found there were no potentially significant impacts to historic resources. There are no historic structures within the CLSP as a whole, or on or near those parcels affected by the proposed amendments to the DA.

The EIR identified mitigation measures for these potential effects, including Mitigation Measure 4.16-a, requiring avoidance to the extent feasible of CA-SJO-3, and archeological monitoring, Mitigation Measure 4.16-c, requiring archeological surveys and identifying preservation performance measures in the event a resource is found, and Mitigation Measure 4.16-d, which identifies proper procedures for the identification and protection of human remains. These measures remain in effect and pursuant to the previous EIR, reduce any potentially significant effects of the proposed project to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts to archeological, paleontological, historic, or tribal cultural resources than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects to cultural resources.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.16, pp 1-17 and Section 4.17, pp 1-9.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	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 strata 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, creating substantial risks to life or property?		X		
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X	

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR included a comprehensive description of the geology and geologic hazards of the project area, including discussion of all of the concerns listed in Subsection “a” above. The EIR also described the classification and characteristics, including building limitations, of the soils of the project area. The sources used in this description remain applicable today. Other than surficial grading, geological and soil conditions on the project site have not changed since the certification of the EIR.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR identified the potential exposure of the project to the range of geological hazards and building limitations of soils addressed in the Environmental Setting. The analysis determined that potential impacts relating to soil erosion would be less than significant. The CLSP EIR also determined that impacts relating to seismic hazards such as ground shaking, liquefaction, expansive soils, and mineral resources were potentially significant.

The EIR prescribed mitigation measures for addressing these potentially significant impacts, including Mitigation Measure 4.7-b, which requires project facilities to be designed to meet minimum safety standards during a seismic event, Mitigation Measures 4.7-c and 4.7-d, which

require preparation of a site-specific geotechnical study prior to issuance of a grading permit in conjunction with specific development projects, and implementation of the study recommendations. The CLSP EIR determined that implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce potential geology and soils impacts to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures continue to apply to all new development within the CLSP, including development on those parcels subject to the proposed DA amendments. No additional mitigation measures are needed.

The EIR did not consider the suitability of project site soils for on-site sewage disposal, as City sewer service would be provided to all development within the CLSP area.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to soils, seismic activity, or mineral resources than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to geology and soils.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.7, pp 1-21.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			✗	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			✗	

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR did not quantify the greenhouse gas emissions generated by the CLSP, nor did it analyze the potential impacts of these emissions on the environment. However, the CLSP EIR did describe the air quality setting of the CLSP area in detail. As discussed further in Section 3, above, regional air quality conditions have improved somewhat since 2004, when the previous EIR was certified and the CLSP adopted. Global warming and global climate change were broadly known and understood in 2004, and could have been more specifically addressed in the 2004 EIR had the City chosen to do so at the time. In the intervening years, thresholds of significance have been adopted for greenhouse gas emissions, however the adoption of such

thresholds does not constitute “new information” for purposes of determining whether or not supplemental or subsequent environmental review is required pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21166 or State CEQA Guidelines section 15162. (See *Concerned Dublin Citizens v. City of Dublin* (2013) 214 Cal.App.4th 1301.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Although the previous EIR did not quantify greenhouse gas emissions from the CLSP, regardless of the quantity, the proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe greenhouse gas emissions than under the CLSP and CLSP DA that were previously approved. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR, including those related to air quality, will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact relating to greenhouse gas emissions.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
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 for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h) 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?			X	

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR included an inventory of existing hazardous material or waste contamination based on Phase I Environmental Site Assessments prepared for the CLSP Specific Plan area. No Recognized Environmental Conditions were located within the CLSP. No new land uses that could contribute to environmental contamination have been located in the project area since EIR certification. There are no “Geotracker” or “Envirostor” sites in the vicinity of those parcels subject to the proposed amendments to the DA.

Although not specifically addressed in the EIR, there are no public use airports within two miles of the project. There are no wildland fire hazards in the vicinity.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR considered potential environmental effects related to the storage, use and transportation of hazardous materials and waste during project construction and operation, finding these potential effects to be less than significant. Although the Phase I ESAs did not identify areas of significant contamination, the EIR considered the potential for occurrence of undiscovered contamination in the CLSP area as a whole as well as within those parcels subject to the proposed DA amendments, to be potentially significant. The CLSP EIR also determined that potential impacts related to the use of hazardous materials and recycled water would be less than significant.

To address the potentially significant impacts related to undiscovered and unknown hazardous contaminants, the EIR identified Mitigation Measure 4.9-b, which requires site investigations prior to excavations in areas not covered by the previous Phase I site assessments. Mitigation Measure 4.9-b also requires hiring of qualified consultants to investigate and identify asbestos containing materials prior to the demolition of any onsite buildings. The CLSP EIR determined that this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 4.9-b would apply to any future development within the CLSP. No additional mitigation is needed.

The EIR did not address airport and wildland-related hazards, but, as noted above, these hazards do not occur in the project area. There are no other known hazards issues associated with the project.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to hazardous materials or hazardous wastes than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not alter the uses allowed within the CLSP, nor do they alter the density, intensity, or location of development. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to hazardous materials.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.9, pp 1-7.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	X			
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	X			
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	X			
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?	X			
f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	X			
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	X			
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described the surface and groundwater resources of the project area, volumes, quality and flooding exposure. The CLSP EIR is located within Reclamation District 17 (RD 17) within the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed. RD 17 is currently certified by FEMA as providing 100-year flood protection. Thus, there are no current flood-related restrictions on development. Since certification of the EIR, additional flood protection measures have been constructed to maintain 100-year flood protection.

Since EIR certification, Senate Bill 5 was enacted, which requires that urban and urbanizing areas within the Sacramento-San Joaquin watershed achieve a 200-year level of flood protection by 2025, and mandates milestones that must be reached in the interim. The City fully

intends to comply with all requirements of SB5 within the established deadlines. The Cities of Lathrop and Manteca have developed a plan to bring the RD 17 area into compliance with SB 5's 200-year flood protection requirement.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The EIR considered potential flooding risks to planned new development from the San Joaquin River, finding these risks to be less than significant based on then-existing 100-year flood protection. Levees protecting the project area have been or are being improved to maintain 100-year protection. Specifically, the EIR determined that the CLSP is in an area of designated by FEMA as Flood Hazard Zone B, which indicates that the surrounding levees provide protection for flooding up to at least the 1-in-100 year flood event. Thus, the CLSP is located outside of the 100-year floodplain (i.e., is protected from the 100-year flood by levees). Therefore, the CLSP did not require levee or other flood control improvements.

The EIR also considered potential internal flooding from stormwater runoff, finding this potential effect to be less than significant based on the proposed storm drainage system, which includes a stormwater runoff collection system, including drainage detention facilities, to provide onsite stormwater storage and discharge capacity sufficient to protect the CLSP area during a 48-hour, 100-year flood event. Long-term water quality effects, potential effects on surface and groundwater quality, and conformance to water quality standards were also found to be less than significant based on the required use of Best Management Practices for water quality control.

Finally, the EIR also considered potential exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of flooding as a result of the failure of a levee. The EIR determined that the CLSP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee, because the east levee of the San Joaquin River has been constructed consistent with all applicable requirements, has been improved in recent years by RD 17 and the US Army Corps of Engineers consistent with the latest levee design and construction policies, and has resulted in FEMA removing the CLSP area from the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the EIR determined the potential for impacts was less than significant. Construction water quality effects were considered potentially significant, but these potential effects would be reduced to a less than significant level as a result of required conformance with applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. These requirements remain in effect, are becoming progressively more stringent and will apply to the proposed project. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

Potential effects on groundwater quantity were addressed in the EIR and are discussed in Section 16 of this Initial Study.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to hydrology, flooding, and water quality than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. Further, nothing has changed as to the circumstances surrounding the levees protecting RD 17, except that SB 5 now sets forth even more stringent requirements for levees, mandating that levees be even further improved to protect against a 200-year flood by the year 2025.

As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to hydrology and water quality.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.8, pp 1-30.

Economic Benefits of Investment to Comply with SB 5 Requirements, June 18, 2015.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Physically divide an established community?	X			
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	X			
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	X			

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described existing land use and plans applicable to the project area. Adoption of the Central Lathrop Specific Plan superimposed revised land use designations and zoning for the project area. The CLSP Specific Plan area has since been improved in anticipation of urban development. These changes were anticipated in the EIR and do not constitute a substantial change in circumstances.

As noted in Section 8, the City will be required to amend its general plan and zoning by July 2, 2016 in order to comply with the requirements of Senate Bill 5. These amendments would require City compliance with 200-year floodplain requirements.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR considered each of the issues in the checklist and found that CLSP development would result in less than significant effects in each issue area. No mitigation measures were required.

The proposed DA amendments do not allow for development densities, intensities or designations different from those adopted in the CLSP and considered in the previous EIR. All future land uses, including those on the parcels affected by the proposed DA amendments will be consistent with the CLSP and the Lathrop General Plan. Therefore, all potential effects are adequately addressed in the previous EIR. The project would not involve any new land use effects or require any additional mitigation measures.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.2, pp 1-23.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist 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		

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described the mineral resources of the project vicinity, indicating that areas with important mineral resources are designated by the State of California as Mineral Resource Zones MRZ-2 or MRZ-3. Proposed waste disposal areas linked to the CLSP are designated MRZ-2 or MRZ-3. Proposed development areas within the CLSP are designated MRZ-1, which is an area where “no significant mineral deposits are present or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.”

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR indicated that planned land development would not affect mineral resource lands, other than indirectly through development of wastewater disposal areas. The potential environmental impacts of wastewater facilities needed to serve the project are addressed in other certified CEQA documents.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to mineral resources than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the

proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to important mineral resources, and no mitigation is necessary.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.7, pp 1-21.

12. NOISE

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	X			
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	X			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described applicable existing noise standards and noise conditions in and around the Specific Plan area, including ambient noise levels and transportation noise generated by I-5, the principal noise source in the project area. There has been no change in the applicable noise standards since the certification of the EIR. I-5 noise levels have likely increased with annual increase in traffic; however, progressive traffic and associated noise increases were considered in the EIR’s impact analysis.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The EIR considered a range of potential noise effects including construction noise effects on nearby sensitive receptors, effects of commercial development and other stationary sources on

nearby receptors, the effects of noise generated by project traffic increases on receptors adjacent to the affected roadways, and exposure of residences and other sensitive receptors to projected noise from I-5 operations and project-generated traffic on local streets. All of these effects were found to be significant or potentially significant.

To address these potentially significant impacts, the EIR identified several mitigation measures. Mitigation Measure 4.6-a, addressing increases in short term construction-generated noise, limits construction activities to day time hours, and requires the use of mufflers and acoustical shields during construction. Mitigation Measure 4.6-b, addressing onsite operation generation of noise, requires the consideration of dual-pane windows and sensitive siting of mechanical equipment, among other measures. Mitigation Measure 4.6-c, addressing increases in traffic-related noise, mandates a traffic noise study and the use of sound walls, vegetative screening, and dual-pane windows were necessary. Finally, Mitigation Measure 4.6-d, addressing land use compatibility, requires sound walls, vegetative screening, dual pane windows, and setbacks where needed to minimize exterior noise levels. All of these measures would continue to be applicable to CLSP development.

While the EIR proposed that exposure of residences and other sensitive receptors to freeway and other noise be mitigated through noise barrier construction and other improvements, it nonetheless determined that potential effects may not be reduced to a less than significant level in all cases. Therefore, noise effects were identified as potentially significant and unavoidable in the EIR. No mitigation measures are available that would further reduce these effects.

There are no airports or airstrips in the vicinity of the project, and the project would not be exposed to noise from these sources.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to noise than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to noise.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.6, pp 1-24.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
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)?	X			
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		X		
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		X		

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described the then-existing population and housing stock of, as well as employment in, the City of Lathrop. Projected population estimates were presented from several sources. The EIR described the existing jobs-housing balance of San Joaquin County. Population, housing and employment in the City have been subject to substantial growth since the certification of the EIR; the growth that has been experienced is well within the City's projections as described in the EIR.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The EIR described the potential for temporary population increases during project construction as well as long-term population growth associated with the project. These effects, although substantial and in excess of City and County projections, were identified as less than significant, and no mitigation was required. The EIR's growth projections were not realized as a result of economic conditions, and future growth within the City and the CLSP project is expected to be more modest than predicted in the EIR.

The EIR considered potential displacement of people and housing by the project and found this effect to be less than significant, and no mitigation was required. There is no new information that would suggest that the project would now involve such effects.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to population and housing than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to population and housing.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.3, pp 1-13.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR describes the providers responsible for public services in the CLSP area. These included the Lathrop-Manteca Fire District (LMFD), the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department (Lathrop Police Services), Lathrop Animal Control, the Manteca School District (MUSD) and the waste management provider. Then-existing service facilities were described for each provider.

Some facilities and services for relevant public services providers have changed since certification of the EIR. LMFD has a new fire station in Mossdale Village immediately south of CLSP. Police services are provided by the Sheriff's Department but based from a facility in the City. The City's animal control operations have expanded with a growing population. MUSD has constructed an elementary school in Mossdale Village and a high school within the CLSP area. These changes are the result of ongoing growth and development in the City of Lathrop and were anticipated, if not specifically, at least on a general level in the CLSP EIR. None of these changed conditions would lead to new or more severe impacts that were identified in the previous EIR.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR identified potentially significant services effects in all areas except schools and solid waste management; these latter potential effects were identified as less than significant. To address the CLSP's potentially significant impacts to public services, several mitigation measures were identified. Mitigation Measure 4.10-a requires the preparation and implementation of traffic control plans prior to construction activities to ensure continued emergency access. Mitigation Measures 4.10-b and 4.10-c require confirmation of 2- to 4-minute average emergency response times, and adequate emergency fire flow, prior to

occupancy of new structures. Mitigation Measure 4.10-d requires payment of pro-rata impact fees for police protection services, and Mitigation Measure 4.10-e requires provision of animal control services via the CLSP DA. These mitigation measures remain applicable to CLSP development and were determined by the previous EIR to reduce potential public service effects to a less than significant level.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to public services, including police and fire protection, than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to public services.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.10, pp 1-17.

15. RECREATION

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described then-existing parks facilities and standards for the provision of additional parks facilities in conjunction with new development. Park standards remain the same as described in the EIR. Following certification of the EIR, additional parks have been developed in Mossdale Village. The City is recently completed the Lathrop Generations Center on Spartan Way.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The EIR acknowledged and quantified the increased demand for parks associated with development in the CLSP area. However, considering that the CLSP provides park facilities in excess of City standards, and in conjunction with urban development of the specific plan area, potential impacts were identified as less than significant. The EIR also considered potential

project effects on the existing Dos Reis Regional Park adjacent to the specific plan; in that the project would construct a community park adjacent to the Regional Park, the potential effects of the project on the existing park were judged to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are needed.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to recreational resources than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. The amendments also do not alter the CLSP's provision of recreational facilities, nor would they result in increased impacts on existing facilities. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to recreational resources.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.12, pp 1-9.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	X			
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	X			
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	X			
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	X			
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	X			

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described the geometry and operations of existing roads and highways in and near Lathrop that would be potentially affected by CLSP development, including I-5, SR 120 and the interchanges of I-5/Roth Road, I-5/Lathrop Road and I-5/Louise Avenue, among others. The EIR described applicable County and City transportation policies and quantified then-existing traffic and levels of service at local road intersections, on freeway segments and along freeway ramps. Existing transportation improvement programs including the Lathrop Capital Facilities Fee, the West Lathrop Regional Transportation Impact Fee and the Lathrop Traffic Monitoring Plan, and the planned improvements addressed by those programs, were identified.

Since EIR certification, there have been substantial improvements to selected transportation facilities in and near the CLSP. Within the CLSP area, major access roadways have been constructed, including Spartan Way from Manthey Road to Land Park Drive, Land Park Drive from Spartan Way to Golden Valley Parkway, and Golden Valley Parkway between Louise Avenue and Spartan Way. Streets internal to the major CLSP development areas will be built in conjunction with future development, but entry aprons, curb returns and utility stubs have been installed at each of these planned locations. In addition to internal roadway improvements, interim improvements have been made to the I-5/Lathrop Road and I-5/Louise Avenue interchanges, including addition of turn lanes and signals. The extension of River Islands Parkway from Louise Avenue across The San Joaquin River to the River Islands project are is currently under construction.

Traffic on highways and local streets have increased since EIR certification, consistent with new residential and commercial development in Mosssdale Village and in “old” Lathrop, east of I-5. Traffic growth is generally consistent with and anticipated by the 2010 and 2020 future traffic projections considered in the EIR. There have been no changes in circumstances that would suggest that the project would result in any new or substantially more severe environmental effects than were discussed in the CLSP EIR.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR analyzed the potential effects of CLSP Phase 1 and CLSP buildout on highway and local road traffic under Existing, Future 2010 and Future 2020. The analysis identified background traffic under each scenario and considered transportation improvements assumed to be in place, with or without CLSP development. Traffic generated by the development was predicted using Institute for Traffic Engineering (ITE) trip generation rates for each of the proposed land uses provided for in the Specific Plan. The analysis predicted operating levels of service for the subject streets and highways under each of the analysis scenarios during AM and PM peak hour conditions.

The analysis considered the consistency of predicted traffic levels with applicable general plan and other traffic standards and identified improvements that would be needed to accommodate projected traffic on existing and planned highways and streets. The analysis considered the applicable congestion management program as well as any relevant safety and emergency access concerns. Emergency access concerns would be further met by conformance with City street standards, which were then and are now applicable to development within the CLSP. The analysis also considered transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; these needs will be further

addressed in conjunction with detailed City review of future development projects and improvement plans.

The EIR predicted significant traffic effects on most local street intersections, and on freeway segments and ramps, under the analysis scenarios. Significant effects were also identified with respect to construction traffic and vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle safety. The EIR identified a range of transportation improvements that would, in most cases, be sufficient to reduce the significant traffic effects to a less than significant level. Some significant effects, especially those pertaining to the freeways, were identified as significant and unavoidable. Some improvements were infeasible on a technical basis, e.g. provisions for prohibited turning movements. Needed improvements include road construction and widening, addition of turning lanes and signalization. As described in the EIR, development projects will be responsible for payment of their proportionate share of the necessary improvements.

The EIR identified several mitigation measures to address the potentially significant impacts at several intersections. These measures, Mitigation Measures 4.4-a1 through 4.4-f, identify a variety of improvements, including crosswalks, freeway ramp improvements, addition of travel lanes and turn lanes, and traffic signals. As new development projects are brought forward for consideration, traffic impact fees will be assessed and project-specific traffic improvements constructed as required.

However, even with incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures, the EIR determined that impacts to some intersections will remain significant and unavoidable.

There are no airports or associated air traffic patterns in the project vicinity. As such, this issue was not addressed in the EIR.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to traffic or circulation than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to traffic or circulation.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.4, pp 1-112 plus exhibits.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	X			
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	X			
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	X			
d) Are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	X			
e) Has the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	X			
f) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	X			
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	X			

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

Environmental Setting

The CLSP EIR described then-existing and planned future public utility services in the City of Lathrop, including potable water, wastewater collection and treatment, recycled water storage and disposal, storm drainage and electrical and gas utilities. Since certification of the EIR, several of the City's utility systems have been substantially improved. Among other things:

The South County Surface Water Supply Project (SCSWSP) has been completed by the South San Joaquin Irrigation District, providing a substantial long-term potable water supply to the City from reliable surface water sources.

The backbone wastewater collection system, pump station and force main serving the CLSP area is largely completed. Additional collection system components will need to be added in order to extend service to new development.

The City has constructed and is operating Water Recycling Plant No. 1 (WRP-1) in the Crossroads area. In 2013, the City determined that planned additional WRPs, including the WRP-2 and WRP-3 concepts considered in the CLSP EIR, will instead be consolidated into a unified facility at WRP-1. An initial Expansion of wastewater treatment capacity was completed in 2015, and plans are being prepared for an additional expansion. An adopted

master plan for wastewater treatment outlines additional expansion units, which will be designed and constructed as required.

Recycled water storage ponds, distribution lines and spray fields have been developed, or secured for development when required, in order to meet recycled water disposal needs created by new development in the near-term. Some of these facilities were secured as a part of the CLSP project. Distribution lines have been installed within the CLSP area in conjunction with the backbone streets.

Storm drainage lines for CLSP and the proposed project site have been installed in conjunction with backbone street development. Short-term terminal drainage is provided by an existing retention pond adjacent to Lathrop High School; in the long-term, a river discharge facility will be constructed in conjunction with planned CLSP development.

The above-described improvements represent fulfillment or partial fulfillment of utility improvements foreseen by the EIR or required as a result of CLSP development pursuant to the Specific Plan. These improvements have been subject to CEQA review, either in the CLSP and SCSWSP EIRs or in separate EIRs prepared in conjunction with the City's Water, Wastewater, Recycled Water and Storm Drainage Master Plan and WRP-1 and LCTF expansion plans. None involve changed circumstances that would result in new significant effects or more severe effects than were anticipated in the CLSP EIR or the other certified CEQA documents.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The CLSP EIR identified the effects of planned development on potable water, wastewater and storm drainage utilities, including the availability and capacity of the available utilities. The potential environmental effects of required utility improvements, including the SCSWSP, were considered based on separate environmental review documents prepared for these projects. The required development of potable water facilities and wastewater treatment capacity were identified as significant. Based on improvement plans included in the Specific Plan, potential effects on recycled water storage, storm drainage and electrical and gas service were identified as less than significant.

The EIR identified several mitigation measures that would reduce the significant effects to a less than significant level, except for significant and unavoidable environmental effects associated with required expansion of WRP-1. These mitigation measures include Mitigation Measure 4.11-a, which requires a showing of water availability, and Mitigation Measure 4.11-d, which requires that wastewater treatment capacity be available prior to occupation of any part of the CLSP development.

The potential effects of wastewater treatment capacity development have, however, been considered in the CLSP and other certified City EIRs as acceptable on the basis of adopted statements of overriding considerations. Required mitigation measures included provision of new potable water supplies; these needs have been met with the completion of the SCSWSP and new City wells since EIR certification. As discussed above, mitigation measures require a water supply finding for future projects that exceed 500 units. Additional mitigation measures have been imposed on the development of water and wastewater system improvements by other adopted or certified CEQA documents for these projects. The proposed amendments to the DA would not result in development beyond that allowed in the CLSP and analyzed in the previous EIR.

Potential solid waste effects of the CLSP project were considered Section 4.10 of the EIR and found to be less than significant. The potential solid waste effects of the proposed project are adequately addressed by this analysis. Solid waste services within the City of Lathrop conform to applicable statutes and regulations.

The proposed amendments to the DA will not result in additional new or more severe impacts relating to public utilities than were previously identified in the EIR. This is because the amendments do not allow development in areas that were previously not analyzed in the EIR, nor do they increase the density, intensity, or location of the development within the CLSP. As a result, demand for public utilities and services would not increase as a result of the proposed amendments. All the mitigation measures identified in the previous EIR will continue to apply. As a result, the proposed amendments to the DA would not create a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects relating to utilities.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004, Section 4.11, pp 1-31.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Adequately Addressed by CLSP EIR, No New Impact	Requires Additional Mitigation Measures	Not Addressed, Less Than Significant or No Impact	New or More Severe Significant Effect
a) Does the project have the potential to 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, 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

NARRATIVE EXPLANATION

CLSP development would involve a range of potentially significant environmental effects, including effects on plant, fish and wildlife species, and cultural resources, that could trigger mandatory findings of significance. These potential effects were explored in detail, and available mitigation was identified, in the CLSP EIR. As discussed in Sections 4 and 5 of this

Initial Study, the CLSP EIR adequately addresses any such impacts that could be caused by the proposed project, and identifies adequate mitigation measures for those impacts.

Similarly, the CLSP EIR comprehensively addresses the potential cumulative impacts of CLSP buildout. Any potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project are adequately encompassed by the CLSP EIR analysis.

During the CLSP EIR analysis, the potential for the larger project to result in substantial effects on human beings in the various issue areas, as well as the potential for substantial effects on human beings to occur outside of the issue areas addressed in the EIR, were considered, and no other such effects were identified.

SOURCES

EDAW. Final and Draft Environmental Impact Reports for the Central Lathrop Specific Plan. 2004.