



CEQA INITIAL STUDY

Adapted from CEQA Guidelines APPENDIX G Environmental Checklist Form, Final Text, December 30, 2009

- 1. **Project title:** General Plan Amendment Rezone, Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map Application No. PLN2017-0013 – Gold Star Investment, LLC
- 2. **Lead agency name and address:** Stanislaus County
1010 10th Street, Suite 3400
Modesto, CA 95354
- 3. **Contact person and phone number:** Denzel Henderson, Assistant Planner
- 4. **Project location:** 4827 Nunes Road, south of Norma Way and west of Washington Road, in the Community of Keyes. (APN:045-071-006)
- 5. **Project sponsor’s name and address:** Gold Star Investments, LLC
528 E. Main Street
Turlock, CA 95380
- 6. **General Plan designation:** LDR (Low Density Residential)
- 7. **Zoning:** R-1 US (Single-Family Residential Urban Services)
- 8. **Community Plan** Low Density Residential (Northern section)
Commercial (Southern section)
- 8. **Description of project:**

This is a request to create 28-residential lots ranging in size from 5,100± square feet to 8,500± square feet and a 4± acre remainder lot from a 9.54± acre site in the R-1 US (Single Family Residential – Urban Services) zoning district. The request also includes an amendment to portions of the Keyes Community Plan from Commercial to Low-Density Residential. The subdivision proposes to connect to the neighboring residential subdivision “Keyes 19 South” drainage basin; however, if the neighboring subdivision improvements fail to be constructed prior to this project, an independent stormwater retention basin has been designed replacing two of the proposed lots, resulting in a 26-residential lot creation. The project will be serviced with water and sewer services from the Keyes Community Services District.

The site has a General Plan designation of Low Density Residential, a zoning designation of Single-Family Residential with Urban Services, and a Community Plan Designation of LDR (Low Density Residential) and Commercial. The site is developed with two single-family dwellings and accessory structures on the south side of the parcel which is proposed to become a remainder parcel.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The site is surrounded by residential lots to the west and north, and ranchettes to the east. To the south are vacant agriculture and plan development properties, scattered single-family dwellings lots leading to highway 99. Immediately adjacent east is a vacant lot that was recently approved for residential subdivision Keyes 19 South.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):** Department of Public Works
Stanislaus Local Agency Formation Commission
California Department of Transportation
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution District
Turlock Irrigation District
Keyes Community Service District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture & Forestry 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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature on file.
Signature

July 2, 2018
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, than the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration.

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

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
 - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
 - 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
 - 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significant criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ISSUES

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) 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	

Discussion: The site is not considered to be a scenic resource or a unique scenic vista. Community standards do not dictate the need or desire for an architectural review of agricultural or residential subdivisions. The project site is currently improved with a single-family dwelling and an accessory structure. The structures will remain on the newly created 4-acre remainder parcel. The northern portion of the lot is proposed to be developed into 28-residential lots along with necessary improvements (street improvements, landscaping, and drainage basin). The project is not expected to degrade any existing visual character of the site or surrounding area. Any lighting installed with the subdivision shall be designed to reduce any potential impacts of glare per the County's Public Works adopted Standards and Specifications.

Mitigation: None

References: Application; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	

Discussion: The project site is 9.54± acres in size and is improved with a single-family dwelling, accessory structure, and predominately undeveloped land. The project site has soils classified by The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as “Urban and Built-Up Land”. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service’s Eastern Stanislaus County Soil Survey, shows that the dominant soil present is Dinuba sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes and is grade one with a storie index of 81. A storie Index rating from 80-100 and Grade I and II are considered to be prime farmland; however, this site is zoned R-1 (US) and is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land.

The project site is surrounded by residential parcels to the west, north, and east. The parcel located to the east has been approved for a residential subdivision titled “Keyes 19 South”; and to the south are a mix of scattered single-family dwellings and vacant parcel before highway 99. The location is between the city of Ceres and Turlock. The closest agriculturally zoned property is adjacent to the southern border across Nunes Road; however, the proposed development is located more than 300-feet from the closest Agriculture property which exceeds the Agriculture Buffer requirement.

A referral response received from the Turlock Irrigation District (TID) described a 30-inch irrigation pipeline and control structure on the project site belonging to Improvement District 770. The irrigation facilities are to remain unless the downstream parcels abandon the services. TID also commented that the existing dirt ditch that serves the parcel shall be removed and the opening in the control structure be sealed. TID also requires that all grading be finished to elevations that are at least six inches higher than any adjacent irrigated ground with a protective berm to prevent irrigation water from reaching non-irrigated properties. Conditions of approval will be placed on the project to comply with these requirements.

The project site is considered to be in-fill development and will not contribute to the loss of farmland or forest land. The project is not anticipated to create any adverse impacts to any adjacent agriculture.

Mitigation: None

References: California State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitor Program- Stanislaus County Farmland Finder 2018; United States Department of Agriculture; Referral response received from Turlock Irrigation District dated December 13, 2017; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially 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	

Discussion: The project site is within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, which has been classified as “severe non-attainment” for ozone and respirable particulate matter (PM-10) as defined by the Federal Clean Air Act. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has been established by the State in an effort to control and minimize air pollution. As such, the District maintains permit authority over stationary sources of pollutants.

The project was referred to SJVAPCD who responded, that the project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the following District’s significance thresholds: 100 tons per year of carbon monoxide (CO), 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 27 tons per year of oxides of sulfur (SOx), 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM10), or 15 tons per year of particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM2.5). Therefore, the District concluded that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air quality when compared to the above-listed annual criteria pollutant emissions significance thresholds. The district also included conditions of approval with ways to further reduce project impacts to air quality to less than significant thresholds.

The project will not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, any applicable air quality plan. The construction phase of this project will be required to meet SJVAPCD’s standards and to obtain all applicable permits.

Mitigation: None

References: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District’s letter dated December 5, 2017; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District’s Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL) guidance; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	

Discussion: The project site is currently developed with single-family dwellings and detached accessory structures. The proposed project will subdivide the 9.54± acre parcel into 28 residential lots ranging in size from 5,100 square feet to

8,500 square feet; with a General Plan of LDR (Low Density Residential) , zoning designation of R-1 US (Single Family Residential with Urban Services) and a Keyes Community Plan designation of Low Density Residential. The 4± acre remainder parcel will continue to have a General Plan LDR a zoning designation of R-1 US and Community Plan of Commercial.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) website identifies the Ceres quadrant as having four species listed as candidates for endangered or threatened species. The Swainson’s Hawk, Tricolored blackbird, Steelhead – Central Valley DPS, and the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle are all identified as candidates for endangered or threatened species for the Ceres quadrant. There is no evidence to suggest that this project would result in impacts to sensitive and endangered species or habitats, locally designated species, wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridors.

The project was referred to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) but no comments have been received as a part of the Early Consultation referral. The project site does not appear to contain streams or ponds that could be considered Waters of the United States. The project will not conflict with a Habitat Conservation Plan, a Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other locally approved conservation plans. Impacts to endangered species or habitats, locally designated species, wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridors are considered to be less than significant.

Mitigation: None

References: Application Material; California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?			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 formal cemeteries?			X	

Discussion: The Keyes Community Plan Update identified that a potential exists for discovery of previously identified buried archaeological resources. A records search, prepared by the Central California Information Center (CCIC), indicated that no prehistoric or historic archaeological resources or historic properties known to have value to local cultural groups were formally reported to the CCIC and, as such, the project site has a low-sensitivity for the possible discovery of historical resources. Conditions of approval will be placed on the project to protect any pre-historic or historic resources found during construction activities. Based on the aforementioned record searches, Staff has determined that additional consultation is not warranted; however, a condition of approval will be placed on the project requiring that if any archaeological or cultural resources are found during construction, activities shall halt until an on-site archaeological mitigation program has been approved by a qualified archaeologist.

Mitigation: None

References: Keyes Community Plan adopted April 18, 2000; Application; Record Search from Central California Information Center dated December 12, 2016; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Discussion: According to the United States Department of Agriculture NRCS web soil survey, the site is listed as containing Dinuba Sandy Loam soil, 0 to 1 percent slopes. As contained in Chapter Five of the General Plan Support Documentation, the areas of the County subject to significant geologic hazard are located in the Diablo Range, west of Interstate 5; however, as per the California Building Code, all of Stanislaus County is located within a geologic hazard zone (Seismic Design Category D, E, or F) and a soils test may be required as part of the building permit process. The applicant provided a preliminary soils report to the Department of Public Works for review. After reviewing the soils report, the Public Works Department provided comments and a condition of approval to address stormwater management to be consistent with the department standards.

Any earth moving must be approved by Public Works as complying with adopted Standards and Specifications, which consider the potential for erosion and run-off prior to permit approval. The Building Division may utilize the results from the soils test, or require additional soils tests, to determine if unstable or expansive soils are present. If such soils are present, special engineering of any structures will be required to compensate for the soil deficiency. Any structures resulting from this project will be designed and built according to building standards appropriate to withstand shaking for the area in which they are constructed. Per the County’s Safety Element of the General Plan, the site is not located in the most hazardous areas for earthquakes, or flooding areas.

Mitigation: None

References: Application material; Referral response received from Stanislaus County Department of Public Works dated on April 16, 2018; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

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

Discussion: The principal Greenhouse Gasses (GHGs) are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H₂O). CO₂ is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant greenhouse gas emitted. To account for the varying warming potential of different GHGs, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e). In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] No. 32), which requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures, such that feasible and cost-effective statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. GHGs emissions resulting from residential projects include emissions from temporary construction activities, energy consumption, and additional vehicle trips.

Minimal greenhouse gas emissions will occur during construction. Construction activities are considered to be less than significant as they are temporary in nature and are subject to meeting SJVAPCD standards for air quality control.

The proposed structures are subject to the mandatory planning and design, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resources efficiency, and environmental quality measures of the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11). The California Energy Commission (CEC) has published reports estimating the percentage deductions in energy use resulting from these new standards. Based on CEC’s discussion on average savings for Title 24 improvements, these CEC savings percentages by end use can be used to account for a 22.7% reduction in electricity and a 10% reduction in natural gas use for single-family residential units.

As mentioned in the Air Quality section, the project was referred to SJVAPCD and the project specific annual emissions of criteria pollutants are not expected to exceed any of the Air District significance thresholds. The analysis of mobile source pollution within the Air Quality section based on SPAL would apply in regards to Greenhouse Gas Emissions as well. Therefore, the proposed project would pose less than significant impacts air emissions.

Mitigation: None

References: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District’s letter dated December 5, 2017; San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District’s Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL) guidance, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures (August 2010); Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard 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	

Discussion: The Envirostor Database was accessed to determine if the property was listed as potential hazardous waste or superfund site. The project site located at 4827 Nunes Road was not identified as a hazardous site. No known hazardous materials are on-site. Pesticide exposure is a risk in areas located in the vicinity of agricultural uses. Sources of exposure include contaminated groundwater, which is consumed and drift from spray applications. Applications of sprays are strictly controlled by the Agricultural Commissioner and can only be applied after first obtaining permits. The groundwater is not known to be contaminated in this area. The Department of Environmental Resources (DER) is responsible for overseeing hazardous materials in this area. To date, there has not been any comment letters received from DER or the Stanislaus Consolidated Fire District in regards to hazardous material management. The project is located outside any land designated a fire hazard severity zone by Cal Fire per the County’s Safety Element of the General Plan. The property is served by the Keyes Fire Protection District and will pay fire impact fees for all new construction. The project site is not located near an airport and is therefore not included in any airport land use compatibility plan.

Mitigation: None

References: Application material; Department of Toxic Substances Control (<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov>); Airport Land Use Commission Plan¹; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			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 or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) 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
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) 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	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

Discussion: On-site areas subject to flooding have not been identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and/or County designated flood areas. Development of the project sites will include paving for the roadway, houses pads, driveways, curb, gutter and sidewalks. This type of development will alter the existing drainage pattern of the sites. Stormwater is being proposed to be managed for the development through a storm drain retention basin; however, it is the preference to connect to the adjoining residential subdivision “Keyes 19 South” drainage basin. If the neighboring subdivision “Keyes 19 South” improvements fail to be constructed prior to this project, an independent stormwater retention basin has been designed replacing two of the proposed lots resulting in a 26-residential lot creation. The stormwater is proposed to be conveyed for the development through gravity by gutter to each basin. Preliminary drainage plans were reviewed and have been conditioned to conform to the Public Works Department Standards. A condition of approval will be added to require the project site to annex into the existing County Service Area (CSA) to provide funding for maintenance of the system in perpetuity.

The proposed project will be served with domestic water from Keyes Community Service District (CSD). The applicant has received a will serve letter from Keyes CSD for each lot. Water quality and supply is monitored by Keyes CSD.

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

Mitigation: None

References: Application material; Keyes Community Service District Will Serve Letter dated November 28, 2016; Referral response from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control District dated December 11, 2017; Referral response received from Stanislaus County Department of Public Works dated on April 16, 2018; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

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

Discussion: The land use designations for the project site include a General Plan designation of Low Density Residential (LDR), a Zoning Designation of R-1 US (Single-Family Residential with Urban Services), and a Keyes Community Plan designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) & Commercial. The LDR General Plan designation intent is to provide locations and adequate areas for single-family detached homes in either conventional or clustered configurations. The zoning designation Single-Family Residential – Urban Services zoning district allows for a minimum parcel size of 5,000 square feet when serviced by public water and sewer.

The project site is currently developed with single-family dwelling and detached accessory structure. The proposed project will subdivide the 9.54± acre parcel into 28-residential lots ranging in size from 5,100 square feet to 8,500 square feet, and the Community Plan Designation will be changed from Commercial to LDR. The 4± acre remainder parcel will continue to have a General Plan Designation of LDR, a Zoning Designation of R-1 US and Community Plan Designation of Commercial. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community. The project is a residential in-fill development located within the Community of Keyes.

As described earlier, each lot will be served with domestic water and sewer from the Keyes Community Services District. The proposed project was presented to the Stanislaus County Subdivision Committee and all of the committee's comments have been incorporated into the project.

The proposed project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, as there are none in the area.

Mitigation: None

References: Application; Referral response from Stanislaus County Subdivision Committee dated February 14, 2018; Zoning Ordinance; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion: The location of all commercially viable mineral resources in Stanislaus County has been mapped by the State Division of Mines and Geology in Special Report 173. There are no known significant resources on the site.

Mitigation: None

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion: New construction would result in a temporary increase in noise and, as such, a standard condition of approval will be added to the project to address the temporary increase in noise by limiting hours of construction. The project is not included in any airport land use compatibility plan, nor is it located near any private airports.

Mitigation: None

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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

Discussion: The proposed project will not create significant service extensions or new infrastructure which could be considered as growth inducing, as services are available to neighboring properties. At full build-out the proposed parcels could only create a total of 28 residential units per the R-1 US zoning district. The extension of Keyes Community Services District (CSD) water and sewer services will not induce any further growth as the development is an in-fill project. The site is surrounded by similar low density residential development.

Mitigation: None

References: Application Materials; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

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

Discussion: The County has adopted Public Facilities Fees, school and Fire Facility Fees on behalf of the appropriate district, to address impacts to public services. All new dwellings will be required to pay the applicable Public Facility Fees through the building permit process. The Sheriff’s Department also uses a standardized fee for new dwellings that will be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval. The Stanislaus County Department of Parks and Recreation has calculated an in-lieu fee which will be paid by the developer to accommodate increased recreation needs occurring as a result of the residential development. A referral was sent to the Keyes Union School District but no response has been received to date. However, schools fees will be collected prior to issuance of any new dwelling.

A referral response was received from Turlock Irrigation District (TID) regarding impacts to irrigation and electric facilities. The Districts comments will be incorporated as conditions of approval to protect the existing infrastructure and allow for safe placement of new infrastructure for irrigation and electrical facilities.

Lastly, a referral response was received by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) regarding the water and sewer service being provided to the project site. LAFCO stated that the project site is currently outside the boundaries of the Keyes Community Service District service area. Prior to the commencement of services LAFCO has requested that the project site be annexed into the Keyes Community Service District. A condition of approval will be added to address these concerns.

Mitigation: None

References: Application material; Referral response from LAFCO, dated December 7, 2017; Referral response from Turlock Irrigation District, dated December 13, 2017; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XV. RECREATION --	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

Discussion: The General Plan requires at least three net acres of developed neighborhood parks, or the maximum number allowed by law, to be provided for every 1,000 residents. Based on the number of lots being created, conditions of approval will be added to the project to require in-lieu park fees of \$2,050. These fees will be required prior to issuance of a building permit for each lot.

Mitigation: None

References: Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 due 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	

Discussion: According to the Federal Highway Administration the average daily vehicle trips per household is 9.6, which would equal 537.6 additional trips per day as a result of project approval (28 proposed Parcels, 56 new units x 9.6 = 537.6). The project proposes to create two new cul-de-sac (Street B & Tanya Way) and a hammerhead design on Street C until the neighboring parcels develop. The main roads for the Community of Keyes include Faith Home Road, Keyes Road, Golden State Boulevard, and Rohde Road, 7th Street, Nunes Road, and Washington Road which are all classified as collectors. No direct access is proposed from Nunes Road, which is located along the southern boundary of the project site. The proposed project also includes curb, gutter, and sidewalks. It is not anticipated that the proposed project will have any significant impacts on transportation or traffic. All development related to the project must be completed to the satisfaction of the Stanislaus County Department of Public Works.

The increased number of vehicle trips per day is not considered to be significant, as the 28 parcels will be in-fill and have been anticipated as residential development within the Keyes Community Plan.

This project was referred to the Department of Public Works and the State of California Department of Transportation (CalTrans). CalTrans responded with conditions of approval to include the fair share improvements to the ramps at State Route 99/Keyes Road; and to be notified when the proposed remainder parcel develops.

The Keyes Community Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) anticipated traffic impacts to the Keyes Road and State Route 99 ramp intersections, and adopted mitigation measures to address those impacts. A fair share amount shall be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit for any new dwelling. The County’s Environmental Review Committee, submitted a referral response with the applicant’s fair share amount, as determined by the Keyes Community Plan. The fair share amount has been updated to account for inflation. These fees have been added as a mitigation measure.

Mitigation:

1. Prior to issuance of any building permit for a single-family dwelling, the applicant shall pay the Keyes Community Plan Mitigation Funding Program fees for Low Density Residential (R-1) per the Keyes Community Plan Adopted on April 18, 2000. The fees were calculated in 2003 at \$178.92 per dwelling. With the fees adjusted for inflation using the Engineering News-Record index, the April 2017 fees are \$293.43 per dwelling.

References: Application; Referral response from Department of Transportation, dated December 18, 2017; Referral response from Environmental Review Committee, dated February 14, 2018; Keyes Community Plan EIR adopted April 18, 2000; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be 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	

Discussion: The project will be served by the Keyes Community Service District (CSD) with public water and sewer services. A will serve letter received from the Keyes CSD indicates that the developer will be responsible for installing all necessary infrastructure improvements required for the public water and sewer connections. The developer also must submit improvement plans to the District for review and approval. These requirements will be required as conditions of approval for the project.

The project site is currently not located within the Keyes CSD service area and therefore a referral response was received from the Local Agency Formation Commission Organization (LAFCO) that the project site will need to be annexed into the Keyes CSD prior to service. As part of the LAFCO referral response, information regarding the proposed utilities service regarding quantity and quality of the water being served was requested.

The subdivision proposes to connect to the neighboring residential subdivision "Keyes 19 South" drainage basin; however, if the neighboring subdivision improvements fail to be constructed prior to this project, an independent stormwater retention basin has been designed replacing two of the proposed lots resulting in a 26-residential lot creation. County Public Works has reviewed this request and preliminary approved the connection and has attached conditions of approval to ensure compliance with County regulations.

Mitigation: None

References: Application material; Keyes Community Service District Will Serve Letter, dated November 28, 2016; Referral response from LAFCO, dated December 7, 2017; Referral response received from Stanislaus County Department of Public Works dated on April 16, 2018; Stanislaus County General Plan and Support Documentation¹

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Included	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to 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	

Discussion: Review of this project has not indicated any features, which might significantly impact the environmental quality of the site and/or adjacent areas.

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

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

Stanislaus County
Planning and Community Development

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Adapted from CEQA Guidelines sec. 15097 Final Text, October 26, 1998

May 17, 2018

- 1. Project title and location: General Plan Amendment & Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map Application No. PLN2017-0013 – Gold Star Investments, LLC
4827 Nunes Road, in the Community of Keyes, south of Norma Way and west of Washington Road, between the City of Ceres and Turlock. APN: 045-071-006
- 2. Project Applicant name and address: Gold Star Investments, LLC
528 E. Main Street
Turlock, CA 95380
- 3. Person Responsible for Implementing Mitigation Program (Applicant Representative): Stanislaus County Department of Public Works
- 4. Contact person at County: Denzel Henderson, Assistant Planner
(209) 525-6330

MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING PROGRAM:

List all Mitigation Measures by topic as identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration and complete the form for each measure.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

No.1. Prior to issuance of any building permit for a single-family dwelling, the applicant shall pay the Keyes Community Plan Mitigation Funding Program fees for Low Density Residential (R-1) per the Keyes Community Plan Adopted on April 18, 2000. The fees were calculated in 2003 at \$178.92 per dwelling. With the fees adjusted for inflation using the Engineering News-Record index, the April 2017 fees are \$293.43 per dwelling.

- Who Implements the Measure: Applicant
- When should the measure be implemented: At time of permit issuance
- When should it be completed: At time of permit issuance
- Who verifies compliance: Stanislaus County Planning and Community Development Department
- Other Responsible Agencies: Stanislaus County Public Works Department

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I understand and agree to be responsible for implementing the Mitigation Program for the above listed project.

Signature on file.

Person Responsible for Implementing Mitigation Program

May 21, 2018

Date

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NAME OF PROJECT: General Plan Amendment & Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map Application No. PLN2017-0013 – Gold Star Investments, LLC

LOCATION OF PROJECT: 4827 Nunes Road, south of Norma Way and west of Washington Road, in the Community of Keyes. APN: 045-071-006

PROJECT DEVELOPER: Gold Star Investments, LLC
528 E. Main Street
Turlock, CA 95380

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: This is a Request to create 28-residential lots, ranging in size from 5,100± square feet to 8,500± square feet, and a 4± acre remainder parcel from a 9.54± acre lot zoned R-1 US (single-family residential Urban Services) zoning district. The request includes an amendment to a portion of the site's Keyes Community Plan Designation from Commercial to Low Density Residential.

Based upon the Initial Study, dated **July 2, 2018**, the Environmental Coordinator finds as follows:

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

The aforementioned findings are contingent upon the following mitigation measures (if indicated) which shall be incorporated into this project:

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

No.1 Mitigation Measure: Prior to issuance of any building permit for a single-family dwelling, the applicant shall pay the Keyes Community Plan Mitigation Funding Program fees for Low Density Residential (R-1) per the Keyes Community Plan Adopted on April 18, 2000. The fees were calculated in 2003 at \$178.92 per dwelling. With the fees adjusted for inflation using the Engineering News-Record index, the April 2017 fees are \$293.43 per dwelling.

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

Initial Study prepared by: Denzel Henderson, Assistant Planner

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

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REFERRALS

PROJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT & VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP PLN2017-0013 - GOLD STAR INVESTMENTS, LLC

REFERRED TO:	RESPONDED			RESPONSE			MITIGATION MEASURES		CONDITIONS			
	2 WK	30 DAY	PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE	YES	NO	WILL NOT HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	MAY HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO COMMENT NON CEQA	YES	NO	YES	NO
CA DEPT OF FISH & WILDLIFE	X	X	X		X							
CA DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION DIST 10	X	X	X	X		X			X			X
CA OPR STATE CLEARINGHOUSE	X	X	X	X				X		X		X
CA RWQCB CENTRAL VALLEY REGION	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
CITY OF TURLOCK	X	X	X		X							
COMMUNIUTY SERVICES DISTRICT KEYES	X	X	X		X							
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	X	X	X		X							
FIRE PROTECTION DIST: KEYES	X	X	X		X							
IRRIGATION DISTRICT: TID	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
MOSQUITO DISTRICT: TURLOCK	X	X	X		X							
MT VALLEY EMERGENCY MEDICAL	X	X	X		X							
MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL: KEYES	X	X	X		X							
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC	X	X	X		X							
POSTMASTER:	X	X	X		X							
RAILROAD: UNION PACIFIC	X	X	X		X							
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY APCD	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
SCHOOL DISTRICT 1:KEYES UNION	X	X	X		X							
SCHOOL DISTRICT 2: TURLOCK JOINT UNIFIED	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO AG COMMISSIONER	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO BUILDING PERMITS DIVISION	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO CEO	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO DER	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO ERC	X	X	X	X			X		X			X
STAN CO FARM BUREAU	X	X	X									
STAN CO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	X	X	X	X							X	
STAN CO PARKS & RECREATION	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO PUBLIC WORKS	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
STAN CO SHERIFF	X	X	X		X							
STAN CO SUPERVISOR DIST 2: CHIESA	X	X	X		X							
STAN COUNTY COUNSEL	X	X	X		X							
STANCOG	X	X	X									
STANISLAUS FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU	X	X	X		X							
STANISLAUS LAFCO	X	X	X	X				X		X	X	
SURROUNDING LAND OWNERS			X		X							
TELEPHONE COMPANY: ATT	X	X	X		X							
TRIBAL CONTACTS												
(CA Government Code §65352.3)	X	X	X		X							
US MILITARY AGENCIES												
(SB 1462) (5 agencies)	X	X	X		X							
USDA NRCS	X	X	X		X							

- C. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT & VESTING TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION NO. PLN2017-0013 – GOLD STAR INVESTMENTS, LLC** – Request to create 28 residential lots, ranging in size from 5,100± to 8,500± square feet, and a 4± acre remainder parcel from a 9.54± acre lot in the R-1 US (Single-Family Residential Urban Service) zoning district. The request includes an amendment to a portion of the site's Keyes Community Plan Designation from Commercial to Low Density Residential. The property is located at 4827 Nunes Road, south of Norma Way and west of Washington Road, in the Community of Keyes. The Planning Commission will consider a CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. APN: 045-071-006.
 Staff Report: Kristin Doud, Senior Planner, Recommends, **APPROVAL**.
OPPOSITION: None
FAVOR: Coy Stark, Representative
 Public hearing closed.
 Blom/Hicks (6/0) **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT.**

EXCERPT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Signature on file.

 Secretary, Planning Commission

October 25, 2018

 Date

Recommendation

- Findings (1-5 of Board Report)
 - Environmental Review
 - General Plan Amendment
 - Tentative Subdivision Map
 - Increase for demands and services
 - Project Approval
 - Including amended Condition of Approval No. 22