EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential for the Reynolds Ranch Project to result in environmental impacts under the following topics: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy conservation, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology, land use and planning/agricultural resources, noise, public services, traffic and circulation, and utilities and service systems.

PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located within the southeast portion of the City's Planning Area lying south of Harney Lane and west of State Route 99. At present, the project is located outside and adjacent to the City of Lodi corporate boundary but within the General Plan and Sphere of Influence of the City of Lodi in the County of San Joaquin. Specifically, the project is bounded by Harney Lane to the north, State Route 99 to the east, and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to the west. The project's southern boundary lie approximately 650 feet to the north of Scottsdale Road. The project site is located on the Lodi South, California United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-Minute Topographic Quadrangle.

The project site is approximately 220 acres and is comprised of 22 parcels which are currently developed with residential, agricultural and private lodge (Moose Lodge) uses. The dominant uses on the project site are agricultural. Grape vineyards are found throughout the project area and are the predominate agricultural use on the project site, which also contains fallow cropland and orchards.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is located on a 220-acre site and includes a Development Plan (Project Level) for a 60-acre retail (40 AC) and office (20 AC) development, a Concept Plan (Program Level) for planned residential uses, parks, a fire station, K-8 school, and a mini-storage facility on the remaining 160 acres, and an Infrastructure Master Plan (Project Level) to guide the overall development of the remaining site. A project level analysis has been provided in this EIR for the Development Plan portion of the site and the Infrastructure Master Plan, whereas a program level analysis has been prepared for the future residential, parks, school, mini-storage, and various public facility uses to be built on the remaining portion of the site. More detailed descriptions of the Development Plan and Concept Plan, and their component land uses, as well as the Infrastructure Master Plan are provided below.

Development Plan

The Development Plan encompasses only the office and retail uses totaling 60± acres along the eastern portion of the proposed site. The retail portion will border along Harney Lane and occupy approximately 40 acres, whereas, the office site will be located south of the retail uses on approximately 20 acres. Both sites will be accessible from the future construction of "A" Street, which will result in the realignment of Frontage

Road-West and connect to Harney Lane approximately 1,000 feet west of Cherokee Lane.

The office building is anticipated to be an approximately 200,000 square foot multistory building to be occupied by Blue Shield of California. This proposed Blue Shield facility is expected to provide expansion for their back office services and a large call center. At full capacity, the proposed office facility will employ a maximum of 1,600 employees on two shifts with an expected parking demand of 900± spaces.

The retail site will potentially accommodate a total building area of approximately 350,000 square feet of retail space. A schematic project site plan shows that overall development of the retail site may include two major retail tenants, two junior tenants, and small retail establishments each under 15,000 square feet. Additionally, the Morse/Skinner Ranch House, near the southeast corner of the retail site will remain an identified historic resource. It is anticipated that this historic resource will be preserved in place as part of the overall retail development of this site. Further discussion on this historic resource and other cultural resource issues are provided in Chapter 3.3 (Cultural Resources) of this document.

Concept Plan

The Concept Plan will accommodate future planned residential development, a K-8 school, a fire station, parks/open space, and a mini-storage facility. These planned uses are further described below.

Proposed Residential Uses

If approved, the Concept Plan will allow up to a total of 1,084 residential units. These units consist of 103 Low Density Residential dwelling units, 631 Medium Density Residential units, 200 High Density Residential units, and 150 High Density Senior Residential units. These future residential land uses have not undergone a project level analysis as part of this document, because architectural styles, layouts/configurations, and lot sizes are undetermined at this time. When such development is ready to proceed through the entitlement process, additional environmental review will need to be conducted.

Proposed K-8 School

The Concept Plan includes a school site for the Lodi Unified School District (LUSD). The proposed school site is a 14-acre site, which the LUSD proposes to develop with a K-8 school sometime in the future as additional new developments in the vicinity create the demand to warrant its construction. The LUSD will be the lead agency for the proposed elementary school, as they are a separate and independent entity from both the City of Lodi and the current project applicant. Once completed, the proposed school is anticipated to serve approximately 500 K-6 grade students and 500 6-8 grade students.

Fire Station

A fire station has been proposed on a one-acre parcel as part of overall development of the site. This facility is intended to accommodate the project related demand for emergency services as well as to increase efficiency and response to neighboring areas within the surrounding community.

Proposed Open Space and Recreational Use

The proposed Concept Plan includes 12.7 acres of open space for recreational use. A majority of this open space, 7.3 acres, is a proposed linear park that would run primarily along the western and southern boundary of the site. This linear park would provide passive recreational opportunities as well as a trail network throughout its length. In addition, a 5.5-acre park would be constructed as part of the overall planned development.

This future neighborhood park would likely provide active recreational uses for residents of the project and surrounding community. Such future park amenities would be provided in conjunction with the proposed school facility located just south of the proposed park site. It is expected that any school recreational facilities would also be accessible to the public during non-school hours. Other recreational opportunities provided under the Concept Plan development include a separate network of off-street trails proposed throughout the Concept Plan area to accommodate convenient and safe pedestrian access throughout the various uses proposed for future development

Mini-Storage Facility

A mini-storage facility is proposed along a narrow 5.3-acres strip of land on the western boundary of the site. This use is intended to accommodate future and existing storage needs of local residents and surrounding businesses in the community as well as provide buffering of noise and vibration impacts associated with the adjacent UPRR rail corridor and its current and future operations. It is anticipated that access to the facility will be provided from Harney Lane via the proposed on-site street system.

Infrastructure Master Plan

The Infrastructure Master Plan focuses on the infrastructure needed to serve land uses proposed under the 60-acre Development Plan and the 160-acre Concept Plan.

The Infrastructure Master Plan includes plans for improvements to the Circulation System, Water Supply System, Wastewater Collection System, Drainage System, Electricity, Gas, Telephone, and Cable Service Connections. More detailed discussions of each of these items are given in the appropriate sections of this EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

The City of Lodi has directed the preparation of this EIR to examine the potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the project and to identify mitigation measures and alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening those impacts. A summary of the project's potentially significant environmental impacts and mitigation measures is presented in Table ES-1. The mitigation measures included in this EIR were designed to reduce the environmental impacts of the entire Reynolds Ranch/Blue Shield Development Plan and Infrastructure Master Plan.

The analysis in this EIR contains the words "significant" and "less than significant" in the discussion of impacts. These words specifically define the degree of impact and coincide with language used in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines. As required by CEQA, mitigation measures have been included to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts. Where mitigation would require project redesign, alternatives have been provided which would lessen impacts. Impacts that cannot be completely mitigated, even with the inclusion of all mitigation measures are identified by CEQA as "unavoidable significant impacts." The only unavoidable significant impacts of the proposed project are to air quality. An analysis of the project impacts indicate that operation of the proposed project would generate Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Nitric Oxides (NOx) in excess of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) thresholds of significance.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

Section 4.0 of this EIR evaluates three alternative to the proposed project. These alternatives are:

- **Alternative I: No Project/No Development Alternative -** The "no project" alternative represents the status quo, or maintaining the project site in its current state, which is primarily agricultural land.

- **Alternative 2: Reduced Scale Residential Alternative –** Under this alternative, residential dwelling units would be reduced by 245 units, representing a 23% reduction in the total number of residential units from the proposed project. This reduction in density would primarily occur within the residential areas south of Loop Street, with the exception of the proposed low-density residential area along the southern project boundary. Conversely, the proposed senior housing site and low density residential area would be increased from 150 to 205 senior units and 103 to 280 units, respectively. In essence, the Medium Density Residential uses are reduced to Low Density Residential uses and the High Density Residential uses are reduced to Medium Density Residential uses with the exception of the Senior Housing units. Otherwise, the retail and office uses remain the same as shown in the proposed project.

- **Alternative 3: Reduced Scale/Park-N-Ride Alternative -** Under this alternative, the total commercial/retail building area would be reduced by 46,000

square feet to accommodate a proposed park-n-ride facility along the frontage of the proposed retail site on Harney Lane. The total retail square footage would be reduced from approximately 350,000 square feet to 304,000 square feet and result in the loss of proposed retail buildings "Jr. A" and "Shops A" from the proposed retail development. The new park-n-ride facility would be expected to accommodate up to 75 surface parking spaces on a 5.5-acre site with the remainder of the proposed retail site development to remain the same as the proposed project. The remaining office, residential, and public facility uses identified within the Development and Concept Plans would also remain unchanged from the proposed project.

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
Air Quality	Impact 3.1.1 (A): (Construction Generated Air Pollutants) Construction of the proposed project would generate air pollutants, including equipment exhaust and fugitive dust.	Mitigation Measure 3.1.1: In addition to implementing the "Dust Control Measures for Construction" required by San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), construction onsite shall implement the "Enhanced and Additional Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM-10" identified in Table 6-3 of the SJVAPCD's *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts*. The measures identified in Table 6-3 are as follows: • Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent; • Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site; • Install wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas; • Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds exceed 20 mph; and • Limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time. This impact would also be lessened through project design features and compliance with SJVAPD Regulation VIII. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.1 (B) on pages 3.1-13 through 3.1-15.	Less than Significant After Incorporation of Mitigation Measures	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.1.1 (B): (Operational Emissions of Ozone Precursors) Operation of the proposed project would generate NOx and ROG, which are ozone precursors, in excess of the SJVAPCD's yearly emission significance thresholds.	This impact would be lessened through project design features and compliance with SJVAPD Rule 9510. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.1 (B) on pages 3.1-16 through 3.1-15. There are no other feasible mitigation measures available to reduce or avoid this impact.	Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.1.1 (C): (Operational Emissions of Particulate Matter) Operation of the proposed project would generate particulate matter.	This impact would be lessened through project design features and compliance with SJVAPD Rule 9510. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.1 (C) on pages 3.1-15 through 3.1-16. No further mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		measures are required.		
	Impact 3.1.1 (D): (Operational Emissions of Carbon Monoxide) Operation of the proposed project would generate carbon monoxide (CO).	This impact would be lessened through project design features. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.1 (D) on pages 3.1-16 through 3.1-17. No further mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.1.2: (Contribution to Cumulative Criteria Air Pollutants) The project would emit ozone precursors (NOx and ROG) at levels that are significant as cumulatively considerable net increases of non-attainment criteria pollutants for the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin.	This impact would be lessened through project design features and compliance with SJVAPD Rule 9510. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.2 on page 3.1-17. There are no other feasible mitigation measures available to reduce or avoid this impact.	Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.1.3: (Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Air Pollution) The proposed project would generate air pollutants that could affect sensitive receptors and the project involves siting sensitive receptors in the vicinity of air pollution generators.	This impact would be lessened through project design features, compliance with SJVAPD Regulation VIII and Rule 9510, and incorporation of Mitigation Measure 3.1.1. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.3 on pages 3.1-18 through 3.1-19. No further mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant After Incorporation of Mitigation Measures	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.1.4: (Objectionable Odors) The proposed land uses could be exposed to occasional odors emitted by surrounding agricultural operations.	This impact would be lessened through project design features. See the discussion of Impact 3.1.4 on pages 3.1-19 through 3.1-20. No further mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Biological Resources	Impact 3.2.1: (Wildlife Movement, Migration, and Nursery Sites) The proposed project would not affect the regional movement of wildlife, wildlife migration patterns, or nursery sites.	None required. See the discussion of Impact 3.2.1 on pages 3.2-17 through 3.2-18.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.2.2: (Habitat Conservation Planning) The proposed project is located within the	Mitigation Measure 3.2.2: Development on the subject site shall participate in the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat	Less than Significant	None

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	area covered by the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMHCP) for development.	Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMHCP). This includes payment of Open Space Conversion fees in accordance with the fee schedule in-place at the time construction commences and implementation of the Plan's "Measures to Minimize Impacts" pursuant to Section 5.2 of the SJMHCP.	Impact	
	Impact 3.2.3(a): (Special-Status Species – Swainson's Hawk) The proposed project has a low potential to impact the Swainson's hawk by eliminating marginal foraging habitat and marginal nesting habitat.	Mitigation Measure 3.2.1: Clearing, grubbing, and/or removal of vegetation shall not occur during the bird-nesting season (from February 1 - September 31) unless a biologist with qualifications that meet the satisfaction of the City of Lodi conducts a preconstruction survey for nesting special-status birds including Swainson's hawk, western burrowing owl, white-tailed kite, California horned lark, and loggerhead shrike. If discovered, all active nests shall be avoided and provided with a buffer zone of 300 feet (500 feet for all raptor nests) or a buffer zone that otherwise meets the satisfaction of the California Department of Fish and Game. Once buffer zones are established, work shall not commence/resume within the buffer until the biologist confirms that all fledglings have left the nest. In addition to the preconstruction survey, the biologist shall conduct weekly nesting surveys of the construction site during the clearing, grubbing, and/or removal of vegetation phase, and any discovered active nest of a special-status bird shall be afforded the protection identified above. Clearing, grubbing, and/or removal of vegetation conducted outside the bird-nesting season (from October 1 - January 31) will not require nesting birds surveys. Mitigation Measure 3.2.2	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.2.3(b): (Special-Status Species – Western Burrowing Owl) The proposed project would eliminate marginal habitat for the western burrowing owl, including agricultural land with ground squirrel burrows that could provide nesting opportunities for the western	Mitigation Measure 3.2.1 Mitigation Measure 3.2.2	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	burrowing owl. Construction of the proposed project also has the potential to impact individual burrowing owls, if any are present onsite during the time of construction.			
	Impact 3.2.3(c): (Special-Status Species – White-Tailed Kite) The proposed project has the potential to eliminate potential nesting and foraging habitat for the white-tailed kite. Additionally, construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact individual white-tailed kites or their nests if any are present onsite during the time of construction.	Mitigation Measure 3.2.1 Mitigation Measure 3.2.2	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.2.3(d): (Special-Status Species – California Horned Lark) The proposed project has the potential to eliminate potential foraging and nesting habitat for the California horned lark from the site. Additionally, construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact individual California horned larks or their nests if any are present onsite during the time of construction.	Mitigation Measure 3.2.1 Mitigation Measure 3.2.2	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.2.3(e): (Special-Status Species – Loggerhead Shrike) The proposed project has the potential to eliminate suitable nesting and foraging habitat for the loggerhead shrike, and construction of the proposed project has the potential to impact individual loggerhead shrikes or their nests if any are present onsite during the time of construction.	Mitigation Measure 3.2.1 Mitigation Measure 3.2.2	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	Impact 3.2.3(f): (Special-Status Species – Rufous Hummingbird) The proposed project has the potential to temporarily reduce the foraging habitat for the rufous hummingbird onsite.	None required. See the discussion of Impact 3.2.3 (f) on page 3.2-22.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.2.3(g): (Special-Status Species – Bats) The proposed project has the potential to reduce the roosting and foraging habitat onsite for the pallid bat and the greater western mastiff bat.	Mitigation Measure 3.2.2.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.2.4: The project site contains one tree that is protected under San Joaquin County's tree protection ordinance. This tree is a valley oak that would be classified as a "Heritage Oak Tree" by the County's ordinance. Development of the project site has the potential to either remove this tree or damage this tree during construction.	Mitigation Measure 3.2.3: Regardless of whether the project develops in a manner that is subject to the San Joaquin County tree protection ordinance (San Joaquin County Code Division 15, Natural Resources Regulations; Chapter 9-1505, Trees), the proposed project shall comply with the ordinance's "Replacement" requirements (Section 9-1505.4) and "Development Constraints" (Section 9-1505.5).	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Cultural Resources	Impact 3.3.1: (Historic Resources): The proposed project would adaptively reuse the Morse-Skinner Ranch House and water tower, a significant historic resource listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The proposed Development Plan and subsequent development of the balance of the 220-acre project site could result in the demolition of a Moose Lodge facility, 12 residences, and ancillary structures. None of	Mitigation Measure 3.3.1: The Morse-Skinner Ranch House and water tank, including the one acre parcel on which it is situated, is listed on the NRHP and it is therefore a historical resource eligible for the CRHR. Any adaptive reuse of the Morse-Skinner Ranch property shall comply with standards set forth by the Secretary of the Interior. Mitigation Measure 3.3.2: The residences, barn, and Moose Lodge that are situated within the 60 acres included in the Development Plan shall be evaluated for the CRHR. Some of these resources, such as the Moose Lodge, were clearly constructed within the last 50 years and are unlikely to be eligible for the CRHR. However, some of the residences may be more than 50 years old and their architectural	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	these structures are known or expected to be historically significant per Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. However, none of these structures have been evaluated by an architectural historian for historic significance. As such, it cannot be precluded that the removal, alteration, or demolition of these structures would not result in significant impacts on historical resources.	significance shall be evaluated by a qualified architectural historian. This process includes the recording of the buildings and structures on Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Structures Forms (DPR 523). Any structures that are found to be ineligible for the CRHR warrant no further consideration. If any of those structures are determined to be CRHR eligible, the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) shall be consulted to determine the significance of the discovery, and any resources that are CRHR eligible shall be treated in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mitigation Measure 3.3.3: The CRHR eligibility of existing buildings and structures within the 160-acre Concept Plan shall be determined. This will require the services of a qualified architectural historian. This process includes the recording of the buildings and structures on Department of Parks and Recreation Historic Structures Forms (DPR 523). Any structures that are found to be ineligible for the CRHR warrant no further consideration. If any of those structures are determined to be CRHR eligible, the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) shall be consulted to determine the significance of the discovery, and any resources that are CRHR eligible shall be treated in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards.		
	Impact 3.3.2: (Archaeological Resources) Although not anticipated, grading and construction activities onsite could encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	Mitigation Measure 3.3.4: The Yokuts who inhabited the project area prehistorically left no apparent archaeological remains on the ground surface within the Study Area. Previous studies in the Central Valley have shown that archaeological sites are sometimes buried (Moratto 1984). If buried Native American archaeological resources are discovered during the project activities, work shall stop immediately in the vicinity of the discovery, until a qualified archaeologist that meets the satisfaction of the City of Lodi determines the significance of the discovery and develops plans to preserve the significance of any discovered CRHR eligible resources. Such archaeological resource preservation plans shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Lodi.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	Impact 3.3.3: (Paleontological and Unique Geologic Features) Although not anticipated, grading and construction activities could encounter previously undiscovered paleontological resources.	Mitigation Measure 3.3.5: Should paleontological resources be encountered during construction excavation, the project proponent shall halt excavation in the vicinity of the discovery and contact a qualified vertebrate paleontologist to evaluate the significance of the find and make recommendations for collection and preservation of discovered paleontological resources in a written report to the City of Lodi. Said recommendations shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Lodi.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.3.4: (Disturbance of Human Remains) The project site is not known or expected to contain human remains and, as such, the proposed project is not expected to disturb human remains. In the unlikely event that human remains are discovered onsite, existing regulations ensure such remains are handled appropriately.	No mitigation measures required. Public Health and Safety Code Section 5097.98, as described in the discussion of Impact 3.3.4 on page 3.3-13, further reduces the potential for impacts to human remains.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Impact 3.5.1: (On-site Hazardous Materials) The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment determined that site conditions at certain locations on the project site constitute potentially significant impacts or potential impediments to future development of the project site and, therefore, require mitigation.	Mitigation Measure 3.5.1: The City of Lodi shall not issue permits for construction activites on the project site unless the portion of the site involved in the requested permit has been deemed clear of recognized environmental conditions in writing by a California State Registered Environmental Assessor with HAZWOPER 40-hour OSHA Certification. Portions of the site require further hazardous material investigations to make a determination of the presence of recognized environmental conditions. Such investigations shall be conducted in accordance with the most recent American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standards, such as the ASTM's "Standard Guide for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I [or II] Environmental Site Assessment Process". In total, the updated hazardous material investigations of the site shall minimally evaluate the areas previously inaccessible to hazardous material investigators, the southern-most	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		barn on the eastern portion of APN 058-110-41, the contents of the vault in the shed on the southern portion of APN 058-110-04, the function of the "water" basin and its previous discharges must be determined, the exact location of the 10 inch Kinder Morgan refined product pipeline, the areas adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way, and the onsite residential structures and buildings which were previously inaccessible. Mitigation Measure 3.5.2: A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be completed prior to the approval of individual development plans within the project area. Said Phase II ESA report shall include subsurface investigations and recommended remedial actions, if required, at specific locations as recommended in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Kleinfelder, Inc., or any subsequent updated report. The following additional requirements shall apply: a. Soil sampling and analysis for pesticides shall only be conducted in those areas of the site that are still agricultural; and b. If levels of organochloride pesticides are found to be in excess of applicable residential or commercial Preliminary Remediation Goals/Maximum Contaminant Limits (PRGs/MCLs) then an evaluation shall be required to determine the depth and extent of these elevated concentrations. Mitigation Measure 3.5.3: If subsurface structures are encountered during site development or excavation onsite, care should be exercised in determining whether or not the subsurface structures contain asbestos. If they contain asbestos, it shall be removed, handled, transported, and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Mitigation Measure 3.5.4: The wells onsite should not be used as a		

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		water supply for any of the proposed land uses unless the water from said wells is tested and found to meet state and federal drinking water standards as confirmed by the City's water department. Mitigation Measure 3.5.5: An asbestos and lead paint assessment shall be conducted for structures constructed prior to 1980, if they are to be renovated or demolished prior to future development on the project site. The following requirements apply: a. A Certified Cal-OSHA Asbestos Consultant shall conduct said surveys. If asbestos is detected, all removal shall be completed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor; and b. Any lead paint that is detected and which is in poor condition shall be removed prior to building demolition. Mitigation Measure 3.5.6: All locations of underground storage tanks (USTs) on the project site, where past releases are known or are suspected, shall be subject to further investigation and analysis to confirm or deny evidence of past releases (See Mitigation Measure 3.5.3). Said investigations shall be conducted in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and per Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) guidelines. Mitigation Measure 3.5.7: Septic systems which are associated with existing residences shall be removed and/or abandoned in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. Soil samples shall be collected in the vicinity of said septic systems and leach lines to determine the potential for hazardous materials discharged from the septic systems. Any removal of septic systems shall be performed with oversight provided by the San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department. Mitigation Measure 3.5.8: Miscellaneous debris located throughout		

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		the project site, and described in the Phase I ESA, shall be removed prior to development activities. Any petroleum products and/or hazardous materials encountered should be disposed of or recycled in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. Mitigation Measure 3.5.9: Various sized buckets and drums containing petroleum products were noted at several locations on the project site in the Phase I ESA. All such drums and buckets shall be removed from the project site in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. In addition, soil sampling shall be conducted at those bucket and drum locations where staining was noted (See Mitigation Measure 3.5.3). Mitigation Measure 3.5.10: The vault located in the storage shed along the southern portion of APN 058-110-04 shall be investigated and its nature determined prior to development activity occurring on the project site. Mitigation Measure 3.5.11: Limited soils samples shall be taken along the project site boundary adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to determine the presence and levels of metals or hazardous materials associated with the railroad right-of-way.		
Hydrology and Water Quality	Impact 3.6.1: (Risk of Flooding as a Result of the Failure of a Levee or Dam): Failure of water supply and/or flood control facilities along the Mokelumne River, including Pardee Dam, Camanche Dam, and the Camanche Dikes, could cause inundation of the project site.	None required. Potential project impacts would be lessened by the existing Emergency Action Plan that would be initiated by the East Bay Municipal Utility District. See the discussion of Impact 3.6.1 on pages 3.6-11 through 3.6-12.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.6.2: (Stormwater Drainage System Capacity and Polluted Runoff): The proposed project would replace the existing informal	Mitigation Measure 3.6.1: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, a detailed engineering analysis for the development of a stormwater collection system that will serve the	Less than Significant Impact After	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	and/or non-existent drainage system onsite with an engineered drainage system. With the proper design the proposed drainage system will have adequate stormwater capacity and would not be a substantial source of polluted runoff.	project and potential future development between Reynolds Ranch and the Woodbridge Irrigation District (WID) canal shall be prepared. Said analysis shall include sizing of the pipe network and sizing of the detention basins and pump station discharging to the WID canal. Mitigation Measure 3.6.2: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, the proposed pump station shall include provisions for managing the discharge flow rate to serve the needs of the City and to satisfy the terms of the discharge agreement. Mitigation Measure 3.6.3: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, all drainage facilities shall be constructed in conformance with the standards and specifications of the City of Lodi. Mitigation Measure 3.6.4: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, the detention basin shall include a low flow facility to enhance water quality and to help manage nuisance flows. Other water quality control features shall be incorporated into the project design to improve water quality of the storm discharge to the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department. Mitigation Measure 3.6.5: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, as part of the design process, a detailed drainage master plan shall be developed to identify collection and storage facilities, phasing and other appurtenances needed to insure that the system meets the requirements of the City drainage system. Mitigation Measure 3.6.6: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, the project proponents shall participate in a financing mechanism to fund the required drainage infrastructure to serve the demands of the project. Funding of drainage infrastructure in accordance with Conditions of Approval for the project shall satisfy this mitigation measure.	Mitigation	

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		Potential project impacts would be lessened through the project's Infrastructure Master Plan. See the discussion of Impact 3.6.2 on page 3.6-13.		
	Impact 3.6.3: (Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements): The proposed project has the potential to generate water pollutants from construction and from typical urban land uses. Complying with existing requirements ensures the project would not affect the beneficial uses of any receiving waters.	None required. Potential project impacts would be lessened through the required compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. See the discussion of Impact 3.6.3 on pages 3.2-13 through 3.2-14.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.6.4: (Alteration of 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 Offsite) The proposed project would alter the site's drainage pattern. However, the proposed drainage of the site would not induce erosion or siltation.	None required. Potential project impacts would be lessened through the project's Infrastructure Master Plan. See the discussion of Impact 3.6.4 on pages 3.2-14 through 3.2-15.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.6.5: (Alteration of 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) The proposed project would alter the site's drainage pattern. However, with the proper design of the proposed drainage system, the proposed drainage pattern	Mitigation Measures 3.6.1 – 3.6.6: Potential project impacts would be lessened through the project's Infrastructure Master Plan. See the discussion of Impact 3.6.5 on page 3.6-15.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	change would not result in on- or off-site flooding.			
	Impact 3.6.6: (Groundwater) The proposed project would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces onsite and, as a result, reduce the site's groundwater recharge potential. In addition, the proposed project would increase the use of groundwater as a water source and contribute to the existing overdraft of the groundwater basin.	Potential project impacts would be lessened through project design features and the City's water supply strategy. See the discussion of Impact 3.6.6 on pages 3.6-15 through 3.6-17.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Land Use	Impact 3.7.1: The proposed project could result in a land use conflict with surrounding land uses.	Mitigation Measure 3.7.1: To reduce agricultural/residential land use incompatibilities, the following shall be required: a. The applicant shall inform and notify prospective buyers in writing, prior to purchase, about existing and on-going agricultural activities in the immediate area in the form of a disclosure statement. The notifications shall disclose that the residence is located in an agricultural area subject to ground and aerial applications of chemical and early morning or nighttime farm operations which may create noise, dust, et cetera. The language and format of such notification shall be reviewed and approved by the City Community Development Department prior to recordation of final maps. Each disclosure statement shall be acknowledged with the signature of each prospective owner. Additionally, each prospective owner shall also be notified of the City of Lodi and the County of San Joaquin Right-to-Farm Ordinance. b. The conditions of approval for tentative maps shall include requirements ensuring the approval of a suitable design and the installation of a landscaped open space buffer area, fences, and/or walls around the perimeter of the project site affected by the potential conflicts in land use to minimize conflicts between	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		project residents, non-residential uses, and adjacent agricultural uses prior to occupancy of adjacent houses. c. Prior to recordation of the final maps for homes adjacent to existing agricultural operations, the applicant shall submit a detailed wall and fencing plan for review and approval by the Community Development Department.		
	Impact 3.7.2: The proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 110 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses.	Mitigation Measure 3.7.2: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall pay an Agricultural Land Mitigation fee to the City of Lodi. Said fee is to be determined by the pending adoption of an ordinance of the City establishing a fee mitigation program to offset the loss of agricultural land to future development. In the event said ordinance is not effective at the time building permits are requested, the applicant shall pay a fee to the Central Valley Land Trust (Central Valley Program) or other equivalent entity to offset the loss of the Prime Farmland. The loss of Prime Farmland caused by the project is mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7.2. The inclusion of Parcel 058-110-41 on the project site in an active Williamson Act Contract was formally protested by the City with the County Board of Supervisors (Resolution 4449 adopted December 21, 1977). Additionally, the San Joaquin Local Agency Formation Commission adopted a formal resolution upholding the City's protest of the conservation contract because the parcel is located within one mile of the City limits.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Noise	Impact 3.8.1: Construction of the proposed project would temporarily generate noise above levels existing without the project.	Mitigation Measure 3.8.1: All construction shall require a permit and shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. Staging areas shall be located away from existing residences, and all equipment shall use properly operating mufflers. Mitigation Measure 3.8.2: The project contractor shall place all	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.		
	Impact 3.8.2: Increased traffic would generate noise levels above levels existing without the project.	Mitigation Measure 3.8.3: Habitable second-story residential space, located within 245 feet of the Harney Lane centerline, must have upgraded structural protection including dual-paned windows and supplemental ventilation (air conditioning) to allow for window closure, in compliance with the City of Lodi Compatibility Standards. Mitigation Measure 3.7.4: Outdoor recreational space within 145 feet of the Harney Lane centerline must be shielded by solid perimeter walls of 6-7 feet in height or landscape berming, or any combination of the two to achieve the desired noise attenuation. Mitigation Measure 3.8.5: New residential development both north and south of Harney Lane shall require installation of 6-7 foot high sound walls or landscape berming, or any combination of the two to achieve the desired noise attenuation. Current and future homes located across Harney Lane will be masked from noise associated with major retail uses by the already elevated ambient background freeway noise and by setback distances of approximately 300 feet.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.8.3: Location of residential uses in proximity to noise sources can result in exposure to noise levels in excess of standards.	Mitigation Measures 3.8.3 – 3.8.8. Potential project impacts would be lessened through project design features, including buffering of sensitive land uses from nearby noise sources. See the discussion of Impact 3.8.3 on pages 3.8-15 through 3.8-15.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.8.4: The proposed project would place sensitive receptors in the vicinity of train noise.	Mitigation Measure 3.8.6: Homes situated adjacent to the train tracks require either a setback distance of 430 feet or a 6 foot sound wall, landscape berming, or any combination of the two to mitigate train noise to 65 dB at the residential exterior and ground floor interior. This attenuation may be achieved by the design of the mini-	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		storage facility. An interior noise analysis should be submitted in conjunction with building plan check, to verify that structural noise reduction will be achieved in a livable upstairs space, at the perimeter tier of homes by the specified structural components (windows, walls, doors, roof/ceiling assembly) shown on building plans. Disclosure of the presence of the tracks should be included in all real estate transfer documents to anyone buying or leasing a property within 500 feet of the train tracks. Potential project impacts would also be lessened through project design features, including buffering of sensitive land uses from the UPRR. See the discussion of Impact 3.8.4 on pages 3.8-15 through 3.8-16.		
	Impact 3.8.5: Detention basin pump noise could result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project.	Mitigation Measure 3.8.7: A detention basin pump system will be required to empty the detention basin. The planned proximity of homes to the basin would likely require substantial shielding if such pumps were to operate at night. To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi, noise levels at residences in proximity to any required basin pump system shall be attenuated to meet the City's noise standards. Said attenuation can be achieved through enclosing the pump system or using upgraded sound rating building materials in nearby residences.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.8.6: Agricultural noise resulting from existing on-going agricultural operations in the vicinity of the project site could impact sensitive receptors onsite.	Mitigation Measure 3.8.8: Noisiest agricultural activities will have substantial setback from onsite residences, particularly as the site is progressively developed. Buyer notification of the presence of possible agricultural activity noise shall be made as part of any property transfer documents. Potential project impacts would be lessened through project design features, including buffering of sensitive land uses from nearby agricultural uses. See the discussion of Impact 3.8.6 on page 3.8-16.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	Impact 3.8.7: (Location of School Uses in Proximity to Noise Sources) The proposed project includes the placement of an elementary school, a sensitive noise receptor.	No mitigation measures required. This impact would be lessened through project design features, including the proposed location of the school site in the center of the project site away from SR 99 and the UPRR. See the discussion of Impact 3.8.7 on pages 3.8-16 through 3.8-17.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.8.8: Potential to temporarily generate vibration and ground borne noise during construction.	No mitigation measures required. See the discussion of Impact 3.8.8 on page 3.8-17.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.8.9: Operation of the project will result in new noise sources.	No mitigation measures required. This impact would be lessened through project design features, including the placement of sensitive receptors removed from noise-generating land uses. See the discussion of Impact 3.8.9 on pages 3.8-17 through 3.8-18.	Less Than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Public Services	Impact 3.9.1: (Schools) The project would add to the city's growing population; however, the impact to schools would be less than significant.	No mitigation measures required. This impact would be lessened through the project's design, which includes a designated school site.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.9.2: (Police Service) The project involves the development of an office building, retail commercial center, a mini-storage facility, residential structures, a school, and parkland and, as a result, would increase the structures and population served by the Lodi Police Department.	No mitigation measures required. See the discussion of Impact 3.9.2 on page 3.9-4.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.9.3: (Fire Service) The project involves the development of an office building, retail commercial center, a mini-storage facility, residential structures, a school, and parkland and, as a result, would increase the	Mitigation Measure 3.9.1: A fire station is proposed to be constructed as part of the proposed project and will be constructed during Phase II development of the site. This impact would be lessened through the project's design, which	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	structures and population served by the Lodi Fire Department.	includes a designated fire station site that is the subject of Mitigation Measure 3.9.1.		
Traffic and Circulation	Impact 3.10.1: The project will require roadway improvements as part project development for an internal roadway network as well as address impacts resulting from increased travel demand on surrounding streets. As a result, identified transportation improvements are needed to mitigate the potential project traffic impacts upon project buildout.	Mitigation Measure 3.10.1: Prior to approval of the first tract or parcel map with the Reynolds Ranch Project, a roadway improvement plan for "A," "B," and "Loop" Streets including a detail plan for an off-street multi-use trail to be utilized within the internal network of trails and pedestrian access within the project shall be required for review and approval by the City's Traffic Engineer. Additionally, the roadway improvement plan shall identify all recommended intersection controls and geometrics as noted under "Proposed Improvements" in Section 3.10.7 of this document.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.10.2: A development of this size and scope will likely be developed over a period of time and in a phased manner. To accommodate a phased development, necessary roadway improvements shall be provided to support the pace of development. A comprehensive and coordinated approach will also be needed to address concurrent development in surrounding areas adjacent to the project.	Mitigation Measure 3.10.2: Prior to approval of the first tract or parcel map for Reynolds Ranch Project, the Traffic Engineer shall review and approve a roadway phasing and improvement plan to ensure that timing of new roadway construction and improvements will be provided as necessary to serve and support new development for "Year 2008 Pre-Project Plus Phase I Project Conditions." The phasing plan shall also note completion and timing of roadway improvements by other adjacent development to coincide with proposed improvements on the same facilities by the proposed project.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.10.3: Because the project has not identified a specific development plan (layout) for the residential, school, mini-storage and public use facilities, an evaluation of the internal roadway network by a qualified Traffic Engineer shall be necessary once a development plan can be defined to ensure that any potential access or circulation conflicts can be addressed and minimized.	Mitigation Measure 3.10.3: As part of the subdivision review process, a roadway improvement plan shall include, but not be limited to providing, the following items: 1) identify all entry/access points for all future development within the project area to ensure proper intersection control and signage, 2) show adequate sight distance in consideration of grading and landscaping at all intersections and drive entries, and 3) identify all bikeways, off-street multi-use trails and sidewalks within the project area. Submittal of the above information is intended to address any potential for vehicle and pedestrian conflicts in the development of the project roadway plan	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		and ensure safe and adequate access for all residents and businesses within the project site.		
	Impact 3.10.4: Construction traffic will occur over time during project development. Because of existing and future residential land uses located near or adjacent to the development during construction, operation of such heavy equipment vehicles need to be considered.	Mitigation Measure 3.10.4: Proponents of development onsite shall submit a construction Traffic Control Plan to the City Traffic Engineer for review and approval prior to commencing construction on the project and any related off-site improvements.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.10.5: The project serving a largely future residential population will require critical fire and police services. Emergency vehicle access is considered a vital function as part of any future roadway network to accommodate a safe and efficient access for both future residents and critical emergency services.	Mitigation Measure 3.10.5: The design of the internal circulation system and vehicular access will be subject to review and approval by the City of Lodi's Police and Fire Departments prior to issuance any building permits for the project.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.10.6: Future land uses for the project will be required to provide adequate off-street parking facilities. Available on-street parking on future roadways may be limited or, otherwise, prohibited.	Mitigation Measure 3.10.6: Prior to map approval and issuance of building permits, ensure that adequate parking demand is satisfied for all proposed uses (i.e. parks, commercial and residential development, etc.) in accordance to the City of Lodi Zoning Ordinance.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
Utilities and Service Systems	Impact 3.11.1: (Increase in the Demand for Energy) The proposed project would increase energy demand; however, the Lodi Electric Utility has sufficient capacity available to accommodate the increased demand, provided the applicant pays the fair cost of expanding the electrical infrastructure to meet the need of the City's electrical system.	None required. See the discussion of Impact 3.11.1 on page 3.11-10 and Section 3.4 "Energy Conservation" of this EIR. The applicant is also required to pay the fair cost of expanding the electrical infrastructure to meet the need of the City's electrical system, as well as any required exit fees charged by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E).	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
	Impact 3.11.2: (Increase in the Demand for Natural Gas) The proposed project would increase the demand for natural gas; however, PG&E has sufficient capacity available to accommodate the increased demand.	None required. See the discussion of Impact 3.11.2 on pages 3.11-10 through 3.11-11 and Section 3.4 "Energy Conservation" of this EIR.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.11.3: (Wastewater Treatment Requirements) The proposed project would generate wastewater; however, the wastewater generated by the project would not exceed the wastewater treatment capacity of the existing treatment facilities.	None required. Potential project impacts would be lessened through the project's Infrastructure Master Plan. See the discussion of Impact 3.11.3 on page 3.11-11.	Less than Significant Impact	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)
	Impact 3.11.4: (Increase in the Demand for Water Service) The proposed project would increase water demand. The increased demand could be accommodated by a water supply system that includes two new groundwater wells.	Mitigation Measure 3.11.1: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, a new well shall be added in the project to support water needs for the project area and shall be included in the first phase of development. The triangular area by the Morse-Skinner Ranch House is a recommended area, although other sites may prove acceptable. A higher fire flow can be maintained by placing the well in the east portion of the project where office and retail fire flows will be higher. Mitigation Measure 3.11.2: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, a second well shall be constructed as part of the second phase of development as demands indicate the need. Alternatively, since the project only necessitates a portion of a second well, the well could be constructed offsite and the development pay its fair share of the second well. Mitigation Measure 3.11.3: Prior to improvement plan approval, a looped water pipeline plan will be developed for the project that will provide for fire flows within the project, connections to the existing City system and a phasing plan for pipe installation. This plan shall	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. Mitigation Measure 3.11.4: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, the development shall be assessed its fair share of the cost of developing additional water sources, including but not limited to participation in acquiring additional water rights, development and construction of surface water treatment or recharge the groundwater system, construction of water transmission facilities, and other related water infrastructure. Mitigation Measure 3.11.5: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, as part of the design process, a detailed water master plan shall be developed to identify facilities, phasing and other facilities needed to insure that the water system for the project meets the requirements of the City water system. Mitigation Measure 3.11.6: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, the project proponents shall participate in a financing mechanism to fund the required water infrastructure to serve the demands of the project. Funding of water infrastructure in accordance with Conditions of Approval for the project shall satisfy this mitigation measure. Potential project impacts would be lessened through the project's Infrastructure Master Plan. See the discussion of Impact 3.11.4 on pages 3.11-11 through 3.11-13.		
	Impact 3.11.5: (Increase in the Demand for Wastewater Service) The proposed project would increase the demand for wastewater service. The increased demand could be accommodated by an onsite sewer system and improvements to wastewater infrastructure in the project vicinity.	Mitigation Measure 3.11.7: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, a detailed engineering analysis for the development of a collection system that will serve the project area shall be prepared. Said analysis shall include sizing of the pipe network, sizing of the pump station modifications, and establishing timing for the pump station modifications.	Less than Significant Impact After Mitigation	Alternative 1 (No Project / No Development)

TABLE ES.1:
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

RESOURCE	IMPACT DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	RESIDUAL IMPACT	ALTERNATIVES THAT COULD REDUCE IMPACT
		Mitigation Measure 3.11.8: To reflect the investment that has been made by existing development and other potential developers, a financing mechanism shall be developed and implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Lodi to fund the modification of the pump station and the station outfall force mains. Funding of the pump station in accordance with Conditions of Approval for the project shall satisfy this mitigation measure. Mitigation Measure 3.11.9: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, and as part of the design process, a detailed sewer master plan shall be developed to identify facilities, phasing and other facilities needed to insure that the wastewater system meets the requirements of the City sewer system. Mitigation Measure 3.11.10: To the satisfaction of the City of Lodi Public Works Department, the project proponents shall participate in a financing mechanism to fund the required sewer infrastructure to serve the demands of the project. Funding of sewer infrastructure in accordance with Conditions of Approval for the project shall satisfy this mitigation measure. Potential project impacts would be lessened through the project's Infrastructure Master Plan. See the discussion of Impact 3.11.5 on pages 3.11-13 through 3.11-14.		

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The only significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project are short- and long-term construction induced air pollutants. The only project alternative that would not have significant short- and long-term air quality impacts is the No Project/No Development Alternative. Thus, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. When the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA requires that a second alternative be identified as environmentally superior. In this case, none of the remaining project alternatives could reduce short- and long-term air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. Alternative 3 (Reduced Scale Retail/Park-N-Ride) would generate less vehicle trips and, hence, contribute less short- and long-term air quality pollutants than the project and Alternative 2 and, thus, would be environmentally superior.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSEY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The following issues were raised during the preparation of the EIR for the Reynolds Ranch Project.

Issues Raised by Agencies and the Public

- The Lodi Unified School District (LUSD) expressed school impact concerns at the project's Scoping Meeting. Based on the LUSD concerns, the proposed project included a proposed K-8 school facility as part of the overall development of the site. Therefore, this EIR has included the proposed K-8 school as part of the program level analysis for this project.

- The Department of Health Services expressed concerns regarding the quality and quantity of water to serve the project. As part of the preparation of this EIR, an assessment was performed to assure that water production is adequate to meet the long term demands of the developed area in conformance with California Water Code Sections 10910 through 10915. The project's Water Supply Assessment is contained in Appendix H of this EIR.

- The Public Utilities Commission noted concerns regarding rail safety due to the proximity of an existing rail corridor along the western boundary of the project. This EIR examines all potential rail impacts (hazards, noise, etc.) and identifies mitigations to address potential impacts from the existing rail activity.

- The San Joaquin County Public Works has identified several traffic and transportation related issues to be addressed as part of preparation of the EIR. These issues include:

    - A required traffic study to assess project traffic impacts and any associated improvements and fair share costs that may be necessary.

    - Study parameters that will include several intersections that border along the existing City/County jurisdictional limits.

- Assessment of the project impacts upon State Route 99/Harney Lane interchange.

- The project is subject to County's Regional Transportation Impact Fee.

- Any work and/or traffic control within the County's jurisdiction will require an Encroachment Permit.

The EIR includes a traffic study to address any noted traffic impacts caused by the project. The study examines all affected roadways and intersections serving both local and regional travel that could be impacted by the project. See Section 3.10.

- The San Joaquin Council of Governments, as administrator of the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), expressed their concerns regarding potential project impacts upon any endangered and sensitive species affected by development of the project site. This EIR includes a biological resource assessment that identifies the potential for endangered or sensitive species to be present on-site and identifies required mitigation to offset potential project impacts. See Section 3.2 of this EIR.

- After the Notice of Preparation (NOP) comment period had ended, the California Railroad Industry provided comment, noting their opposition to providing residential development adjacent to an active rail corridor and the inherent impacts to future residents.

- After the NOP comment period had ended, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) noted concerns that the project would contribute to the overall decline in air quality due to project construction, ongoing traffic and other operational emissions. The EIR includes an air quality study to assess the project contribution to produce emissions, largely as a result of vehicle traffic, and identifies and incorporates appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its air quality impacts. See Section 3.1 of this EIR.

- After the NOP comment period had ended, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) provided comments related to the project's transportation/traffic impacts.

Other Items That May Raise Controversy

- The proposed project would convert 220 acres of existing agricultural land into a mixed-use development. This would contribute to the overall loss of future agricultural productivity and open space in the region.

- The proposed project would result in unavoidable significant impacts to both short-term and long-term air quality.