



DRAFT  
PROGRAMMATIC AND PROJECT-LEVEL  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE  
(SCH: 2014022008)

APRIL 28, 2015

*Prepared for:*

Manteca Community Development Department, Planning Division  
1001 West Center Street  
Manteca, CA 95337  
(209) 456-8511

*Prepared by:*

De Novo Planning Group  
1020 Suncastr Lane, Suite 106  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
(916) 580-9818

D e N o v o P l a n n i n g G r o u p

---

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm





DRAFT  
PROGRAMMATIC AND PROJECT-LEVEL  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE  
MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE  
(SCH: 2014022008)

APRIL 28, 2015

*Prepared for:*

Manteca Community Development Department, Planning Division  
1001 West Center Street  
Manteca, CA 95337  
(209) 456-8511

*Prepared by:*

De Novo Planning Group  
1020 Suncast Lane, Suite 106  
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762  
(916) 580-9818



Chapters	Page Numbers
Executive Summary .....	ES-1
1.0 Introduction.....	1.0-1
1.1 Purpose and Intended Uses of the EIR .....	1.0-1
1.2 Type of EIR .....	1.0-1
1.3 Known Responsible and Trustee Agencies .....	1.0-2
1.4 Environmental Review Process .....	1.0-3
1.5 Organization and Scope .....	1.0-5
1.6 Comments Received on the Notice of Preparation.....	1.0-7
2.0 Project Description .....	2.0-1
2.1 Project Location .....	2.0-1
2.2 Project Setting.....	2.0-1
2.3 Project Goals and Objectives .....	2.0-3
2.4 Project Description .....	2.0-5
2.5 Uses of the EIR and Required Agency Approvals .....	2.0-30
3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources.....	3.1-1
3.1.1 Environmental Setting .....	3.1-1
3.1.2 Regulatory Setting .....	3.1-4
3.1.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.1-6
3.2 Agricultural Resources .....	3.2-1
3.2.1 Environmental Setting .....	3.2-1
3.2.2 Regulatory Setting .....	3.2-7
3.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.2-11
3.3 Air Quality.....	3.3-1
3.3.1 Existing Setting .....	3.3-1
3.3.2 Regulatory Setting .....	3.3-11
3.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.3-19
3.4 Biological Resources.....	3.4-1
3.4.1 Environmental Setting .....	3.4-1
3.4.2 Regulatory Setting .....	3.4-12
3.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	3.4-20

3.5 Cultural Resources ..... 3.5-1

    3.5.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.5-1

    3.5.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.5-5

    3.5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.5-8

3.6 Geology, and Soils ..... 3.6-1

    3.6.1 Geologic Setting ..... 3.6-1

    3.6.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.6-7

    3.6.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.6-10

3.7 Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change ..... 3.7-1

    3.7.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.7-1

    3.7.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.7-6

    3.7.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.7-15

3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials ..... 3.8-1

    3.8.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.8-1

    3.8.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.8-7

    3.8.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.8-9

3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality ..... 3.9-1

    3.9.1 Existing Setting ..... 3.9-1

    3.9.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.9-11

    3.9.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.9-17

3.10 Land Use and Population ..... 3.10-1

    3.10.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.10-1

    3.10.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.10-13

    3.10.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.10-18

3.11 Mineral Resources ..... 3.11-1

    3.11.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.11-1

    3.11.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.11-3

    3.11.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.11-4

3.12 Noise ..... 3.12-1

    3.12.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.12-1

    3.12.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.12-7

    3.12.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.12-12

3.13 Public Services and Recreation ..... 3.13-1

    3.13.1 Existing Conditions ..... 3.13-1

    3.13.2 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.13-8

    3.13.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.13-14

3.14 Transportation and Circulation ..... 3.14-1

    3.14.1 Environmental Setting ..... 3.14-1

    3.14.2 Analysis Methods ..... 3.14-3

    3.14.3 Project Travel Characteristics ..... 3.14-8

    3.14.4 Regulatory Setting ..... 3.14-12

    3.14.5 Thresholds of Significance ..... 3.14-16

    3.14.6 Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.14-17

3.15 Utilities ..... 3.15-1

    3.15.1 Wastewater ..... 3.15-1

        Existing Setting ..... 3.15-1

        Regulatory Setting ..... 3.15-4

        Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.15-8

    3.15.2 Water Supplies ..... 3.15-12

        Existing Setting ..... 3.15-12

        Regulatory Setting ..... 3.15-18

        Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.15-27

    3.15.3 Storm Water ..... 3.15-32

        Existing Setting ..... 3.15-32

        Regulatory Setting ..... 3.15-35

        Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.15-41

    3.15.4 Solid Waste ..... 3.15-44

        Existing Setting ..... 3.15-44

        Regulatory Setting ..... 3.15-45

        Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 3.15-47

4.0 Other CEQA-Required Topics ..... 4.0-1

    4.1 Cumulative Setting and Impact Analysis ..... 4.0-1

    4.2 Significant Irreversible Effects ..... 4.0-34

    4.4 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts ..... 4.0-35

5.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project ..... 5.0-1

    5.1 CEQA Requirements ..... 5.0-1

# TOC TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

5.2 Alternatives Considered in this EIR .....	5.0-3
5.3 Environmental Analysis .....	5.0-4
6.0 Report Preparers .....	6.0-1
7.0 References.....	7.0-1

---

<b>Tables</b>	<b>Page Numbers</b>
---------------	---------------------

---

Table ES-1: Planning Area Project Build-out Summary .....	ES-4
Table ES-2: Comparison Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project .....	ES-6
Table ES-3: Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures .....	ES-8
Table 2.0-1: Planning Area Project Build-out Summary .....	2.0-9
Table 2.0-2: Permitted and Conditionally Permitted Uses .....	2.0-10
Table 2.0-3 FEZ Development Requirements .....	2.0-11
Table 2.0-4 Required Off-Street Parking .....	2.0-13
Table 3.2-1: Summary comparison of Crop Values .....	3.2-1
Table 3.2-2: Soil Capability Classification.....	3.2-2
Table 3.2-3: Storie Index Rating System .....	3.2-3
Table 3.2-4: San Joaquin County Farmlands Summary and Change by Land Use Category .....	3.2-4
Table 3.2-5: Project Soils .....	3.2-6
Table 3.3-1: Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards .....	3.3-7
Table 3.3-2: State and National Attainment Status.....	3.3-8
Table 3.3-3 SJVAB Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data Summary - Ozone .....	3.3-9
Table 3.3-4 SJVAB Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data Summary - PM 2.5.....	3.3-9
Table 3.3-5: SJVAB Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data Summary - PM 10 .....	3.3-9
Table 3.3-6: Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data (Stockton – Hazelton Street).....	3.3-10
Table 3.3-7: Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data (Tracy – Airport) .....	3.3-10
Table 3.3-8: Operational Buildout Generated Emissions .....	3.3-20
Table 3.3-9: Construction Phase .....	3.3-24
Table 3.3-10: Off-road Equipment .....	3.3-24
Table 3.3-11: Construction Emissions (Unmitigated) .....	3.3-25
Table 3.3-12: CARB Minimum Separation Recommendations on Siting Sensitive Land Uses.....	3.3-29
Table 3.4-1: USDA Soil Series Information.....	3.4-4
Table 3.4-2: Distance to Downstream Resources .....	3.4-7
Table 3.4-3: Special-Status Plant Species Which May Occur in Project Area .....	3.4-8
Table 3.4-4: Special-Status Wildlife and Fish Species Which May Occur in Project Area.....	3.4-9
Table 3.4-5: Summary of USACE Delineated Features .....	3.4-30
Table 3.4-6: Summary of CDFW Delineated Features .....	3.4-30
Table 3.6-1: Project Site Soils .....	3.6-2
Table 3.6-2: Fault Activity Rating .....	3.6-3
Table 3.6-3: Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale for Earthquakes .....	3.6-4

Table 3.7-1: Construction GHG Emissions (Unmitigated Metric Tons/Yr) ..... 3.7-16

Table 3.7-2: Operational GHG Emissions 2020 (Unmitigated Metric Tons/Yr) ..... 3.7-18

Table 3.7-3: Operational GHG Emissions 2020 (Mitigated Metric Tons/Yr) ..... 3.7-18

Table 3.7-4: Operational GHG Emissions Business as Usual (Unmitigated Metric Tons/Yr).. 3.7-18

Table 3.7-5: Natural Gas Use and GHG Emissions by Land Use (Unmitigated)..... 3.7-20

Table 3.7-6: Natural Gas Use and GHG Emissions by Land Use (Mitigated) ..... 3.7-20

Table 3.7-7: Electricity Use and GHG Emissions by Land Use (Unmitigated)..... 3.7-21

Table 3.7-8: Electricity Use and GHG Emissions by Land Use (Mitigated) ..... 3.7-21

Table 3.8-1: USDA Soil Series Information ..... 3.8-2

Table 3.9-1. State of California Watershed Hierarchy Naming Convention ..... 3.9-2

Table 3.9-2: Soils Hydrologic Rating ..... 3.9-22

Table 3.10-1: Population Growth ..... 3.10-2

Table 3.10-2: Housing Unit Growth ..... 3.10-2

Table 3.10-3: Planning Area Project Build-out Summary ..... 3.10-6

Table 3.10-4: Permitted and Conditionally Permitted Uses ..... 3.10-7

Table 3.12-1: Typical Noise Levels ..... 3.12-3

Table 3.12-2: Predicted Existing Traffic Noise Levels ..... 3.12-5

Table 3.12-3: Railroad Noise Measurement Results ..... 3.12-5

Table 3.12-4: Approximate Distances to the Railroad Noise Contours (UPRR Line) ..... 3.12-6

Table 3.12-5: Existing Ambient Noise Monitoring Results..... 3.12-7

Table 3.12-6: Effects of Vibration on People and Buildings..... 3.12-11

Table 3.12-7: Existing Traffic Noise Levels vs. Existing Plus Project Traffic Noise Levels..... 3.12-14

Table 3.12-8: Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels vs Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Noise..... 3.12-14

Table 3.12-9: Cumulative + Project Transportation Noise Levels  
                   at Proposed Residential Uses ..... 3.12-15

Table 3.12-10: Estimated Noise Levels for Future Project Development Uses ..... 3.12-17

Table 3.12-11: Construction Equipment Noise ..... 3.12-18

Table 3.12-12: Vibration Levels for Varying Construction Equipment ..... 3.12-19

Table 3.13-1: Manteca Police Department Crime Statistics (2010-2012)..... 3.13-2

Table 3.13-2: Community/Specialty Park Facilities Inventory ..... 3.13-5

Table 3.13-3: Neighborhood Park Facilities Inventory ..... 3.13-6

Table 3.13-4: City of Manteca School Inventory ..... 3.13-7

Table 3.14-1: Inventory of At-Grade Railroad Crossings in Study Area ..... 3.14-3

Table 3.14-2: Intersection LOS Criteria ..... 3.14-3

Table 3.14-3: Freeway Level of Service Definitions ..... 3.14-5

Table 3.14-4: Intersection Operations – Existing Conditions ..... 3.14-7

Table 3.14-5: Peak Hour Signal Warrant Analysis – Existing Conditions ..... 3.14-8

Table 3.14-6: Freeway Operations – Existing Conditions ..... 3.14-8

Table 3.14-7: Phase 1 Project Trip Generation – AM and PM Peak Hour Conditions ..... 3.14-11

Table 3.14-8: Phase 1 Project Trip Generation – Daily Conditions..... 3.14-11

**TOC**      **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

Table 3.14-9: Status of Planned Improvements in Study Area ..... 3.14-15

Table 3.14-10: Intersection Operations – Existing + Project (Phase 1) ..... 3.14-18

Table 3.14-11: Peak Hour Signal Warrant Analysis – Existing + Project (Phase 1) ..... 3.14-19

Table 3.14-12: Freeway Operations – Existing + Project (Phase 1) Conditions ..... 3.14-19

Table 3.14-13: Freeway Operations – Existing + Project (Phase 1) Conditions  
with Planned Interchange Improvements..... 3.14-20

Table 3.14-14: Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions ..... 3.14-25

Table 3.14-15: Freeway Operations – Cumulative Conditions ..... 3.14-26

Table 3.14-16: Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions With Mitigation..... 3.14-29

Table 3.15-1: Typical Effluent Quality Prior to Phase III Expansion Project..... 3.15-2

Table 3.15-2: Comparison of Probable Future Water Quality Limitations Versus Effluent Quality  
Following Phase III Expansion Project ..... 3.15-3

Table 3.15-3: City of Manteca Total Water Demand Projection ..... 3.15-13

Table 3.15-4: Historical and Recent Potable Water Supply (1960-2013) for  
the City of Manteca 3.15-14

Table 3.15-5: South County Water Supply Program Water Allotments for  
Participating Cities ..... 3.15-13

Table 3.15-6: Projected Annual SCWSP Deliveries for Normal Hydrologic Year ..... 3.15-16

Table 3.15-7: SCWSP Surface Water Deliveries to the City of Manteca During Hydrologic Single- and  
Multiple-Dry Years ..... 3.15-17

Table 3.15-8: Summary of Projected Water Supply During Hydrologic Normal, Single-Dry, and  
Multi-Dry Years for City of Manteca ..... 3.15-17

Table 3.15-9: Projected Water Demand for the Family Entertainment Zone ..... 3.15-29

Table 3.15-10: Summary of Projected Water Supply During Hydrologic  
Normal, Single-Dry, and Multi-Dry Years for City of Manteca ..... 3.15-31

Table 3.15-11 City of Manteca Landfill Summary ..... 3.15-44

Table 3.15-12 City of Manteca Waste Disposal Rate Targets (Pounds/Day) ..... 3.15-44

Table 4.0-1: Population Projections ..... 4.0-2

Table 4.0-2: Existing Acreages and Population Potential<sup>1</sup> (City Limits, 10-year, 20-year) ..... 4.0-3

Table 4.0-3: Residential Land Uses – City Limits ..... 4.0-3

Table 4.0-4 Non-Residential Land Uses – City Limits ..... 4.0-4

Table 4.0-5 Residential Land Uses - 10-year ..... 4.0-4

Table 4.0-6 Potential Annexation Projects ..... 4.0-6

Table 4.0-7 Non-Residential Land Uses - 10-year ..... 4.0-5

Table 4.0-8 Residential Land Uses - 20-year ..... 4.0-7

Table 4.0-9 Non-Residential Land Uses - 20-year ..... 4.0-7

Table 4.0-10: Cumulative Traffic Noise Levels vs. Cumulative Plus  
Project Traffic Noise Levels ..... 4.0-21

Table 4.0-11: Cumulative + Project Transportation Noise Levels at Proposed Uses ..... 4.0-21

Table 4.0-12: Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions ..... 4.0-24

Table 4.0-13: Freeway Operations – Cumulative Conditions..... 4.0-25  
 Table 4.0-14: Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions With Mitigation..... 4.0-28  
 Table 5.0-1: Comparison of Alternative Project Impacts to the SLSP..... 5.0-23

<b>Figures</b>	<b>Page Numbers</b>
Figure 2-1. Regional Map .....	2.0-33
Figure 2-2. Vicinity Map .....	2.0-35
Figure 2-3. USGS Topographic Map .....	2.0-37
Figure 2-4. Aerial Photo .....	2.0-39
Figure 2-5. Assessor's Parcel Map .....	2.0-41
Figure 2-6. Land Use Map .....	2.0-43
Figure 2-7a. Planning Area Map .....	2.0-45
Figure 2-7b. Tentative Parcel Map .....	2.0-47
Figure 2-8. Great Wolf Lodge Site Plan .....	2.0-49
Figure 2-9a. Vehicle Circulation Plan .....	2.0-51
Figure 2-9b. Non Vehicle Circulation Plan.....	2.0-53
Figure 2-9c. Parking Plan.....	2.0-55
Figure 2-10. Water System.....	2.0-57
Figure 2-11. Sewer System.....	2.0-59
Figure 2-12. Storm Drainage System .....	2.0-61
Figure 2-13. Phasing Plan .....	2.0-63
Figure 3.2-1 Important Farmlands.....	3.2-15
Figure 3.2-2: Soils Map .....	3.2-17
Figure 3.3-1: Air Basins .....	3.3-31
Figure 3.4-1: Bioregions Map .....	3.4-39
Figure 3.4-2: Land Cover Types .....	3.4-41
Figure 3.4-3: Special Status Species: 1-Mile Radius.....	3.4-43
Figure 3.4-4: Special Status Species: 10-Mile Radius.....	3.4-45
Figure 3.4-5: US Jurisdictional Features.....	3.4-47
Figure 3.6-1: Earthquake Fault Map .....	3.6-19
Figure 3.8-1: Potentially Hazardous Sites .....	3.8-17
Figure 3.9-1: Watersheds.....	3.9-29
Figure 3.9-2: FEMA Flood Map .....	3.9-31
Figure 3.9-3: Dam Inundation Areas.....	3.9-33
Figure 3-10.1: Aerial Photo .....	3.10-25
Figure 3.10-2: Existing Land Use and Zoning Map.....	3.10-27
Figure 3.12-1: Noise Monitoring Sites .....	3.12-21
Figure 3.14-1 Project location .....	3.14-33
Figure 3.14-2 Existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities .....	3.14-35
Figure 3.14-3 Existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes.....	3.14-37

Figure 3.14-4 Expected Phase 1 project trip distribution ..... 3.14-39  
Figure 3.14-5 Existing plus project” traffic volumes..... 3.14-41  
Figure 3.14-6 Planned roadway improvements in the study area ..... 3.14-43  
Figures 3.14-7a Cumulative No Project traffic forecasts ..... 3.14-45  
Figures 3.14-7b Cumulative No Project traffic forecasts ..... 3.14-47  
Figure 3.14-8 Cumulative distribution of proposed project trips ..... 3.14-49  
Figures 3.14-9a Cumulative Plus Project traffic forecasts ..... 3.14-51  
Figures 3.14-9b Cumulative Plus Project traffic forecasts ..... 3.14-53  
Figure 3.14-10 Cumulative ADT forecasts ..... 3.14-55  
Figure 3.14-11 Phase 1 Access and Circulation Recommendations ..... 3.14-57

**Appendices**

---

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Comments – 1<sup>st</sup> Circulation
- Appendix B: Notice of Preparation and Comments – Recirculation
- Appendix C: Air Quality Modeling
- Appendix D: Wetland Delineation
- Appendix E: Cultural Resources Information (Confidential)
- Appendix F: Traffic Data
- Appendix G: Water Supply Assessment
- Appendix H: Noise Data

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Manteca has determined that the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ) is a "Project" within the definition of CEQA. CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approving any project, which may have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "Project" refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]).

The EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. This EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts. Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparing the analysis in this EIR.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### **Background**

Since 2010, the City of Manteca has been in the process of developing a plan for a comprehensive multipurpose public use zone called the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ). The plan is intended to encompass multiple projects and parcels that provide an extensive recreation complex featuring new and existing recreation, park, water, sports and other leisure amenities. The Project site is intended to be open and accessible to the general public, and to serve the state, region, and the Manteca community as a multipurpose recreation center and public park facility. The FEZ will feature a wide range of active and passive open space and developed uses that will support short term and longer term activities and community events for users ranging from local citizens, day and weekend regional visitors, as well as destination tourists.

The Master Plan for the FEZ was developed in cooperation with the two private sector developers who are proposing to design and build the facility. The Master Plan will provide the appropriate zoning designation for the FEZ as well as provide development standards to implement future development within the Project site.

Projects and uses in the FEZ may be constructed and operated through a series of third party agreements, concessions and/or licensing agreements which may include ground leases of up to 55 years, with some uses needing longer lease terms up to 99 years. Projects and uses may be constructed and operated through a series of private-public partnerships whereby private sector operators and vendors of various public facilities are selected to develop and operate components of the FEZ. These components may include: public active and passive recreation and park facilities and sports amenities, and various commercial operations that are ancillary to the foregoing public facilities.

The FEZ will include public active and passive recreation and sporting facilities to be operated by public agencies and/or private sector vendors or operators, including the addition of the ball fields associated with and adjacent to Big League Dreams (BLD) Park, as well as the addition of multi-purpose playfields, primarily for soccer.

Certain project components will be public visitor serving in support of the extended use of the various public recreation and sporting amenities (such as hotels, restaurants, retail, and conference centers). Proposed and future development projects will include recreation tourism facilities such as overnight lodging, conference/convention/ exhibition facilities and specialized recreation attractions such as an indoor water park available to overnight guests. The primary objective of such uses is to expand the access to current and future public sports and recreation facilities, and expand access for out-of-area public participation in tournaments and training camps. These features will enable and increase the number and duration of extended stay periods for visitors and help facilitate public access for broader uses such as special events and on-site educational activities. Certain components and phases of the FEZ may include commercial retail and restaurant uses that serve park facility patrons and tournament participants and spectators as well as local clientele.

### **Master Plan Overview**

The Master Plan will create an overlay zone to the existing zoning of Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). The Master Plan includes a comprehensive land plan with design standards and guidelines to guide the development of the 210.7 acres. The Master Plan provides for a multi-use development that offers a significant opportunity for the City of Manteca to attract recreation, entertainment, retail, restaurant, and commercial uses.

The Project site incorporates the existing approximate twenty-eight (28) acre Big League Dreams (BLD) facility and provides an additional twenty-five (25) acres to expand BLD and provide soccer fields. There is approximately sixty-two (62) acres identified for a potential mix of indoor and outdoor entertainment/recreational uses including a location for an outdoor stadium. The Project site provides approximately thirty-three (33) acres of commercial shopping that will generate approximately three hundred sixty thousand (360,000) square feet of retail and dining type uses. There is approximately twenty-nine (29) acres provided for a hotel/lodge, convention center and indoor water park. The balance of the Project site (33.7 acres) is used for roadway infrastructure.

The Master Plan is comprised of four basic design components: Retail and Restaurant, Recreation and Sports, Hotel, and Entertainment. Each is described below.

#### **RETAIL AND RESTAURANT**

The Destination Retail and Restaurant area provides an opportunity to attract job generation and economic development to the west side of Manteca. It is strategically located along the State Route 120 corridor to ensure project visibility for future end-users, and to provide access to the State Route 120 corridor. The relationship to the existing and proposed recreational facilities and the hotel provides for customer base.

## RECREATION AND SPORTS

The proposed recreational and sports uses serve to augment the existing and established success of Big League Dreams. This will serve as the integral part of the overall Project site providing passive and active open space, recreation areas, sports fields, stadiums, as well as gathering spaces for the community. Located throughout the Project site, the recreation areas will remain easily accessible to all users of the FEZ through a well-integrated and well-planned internal street network that encourages both bicycle and pedestrian use.

## HOTEL

The proposed hotel site will serve to provide lodging for users coming into town for the destination experience. It is to be a full service hotel with additional recreational and dining opportunities. A convention center shall be provided with the hotel and the hotel shall also provide recreation facilities that are complimentary to the FEZ, such as a water park.

## ENTERTAINMENT

The proposed entertainment areas serve to provide enjoyment for the whole family. Through thoughtful design this central piece of the FEZ will serve to bring people together to enjoy communal leisure time. It will be comprised of a variety of recreation and leisure activities which may include: miniature golf, golf cart racers, arcade games, and Laser-tag, among other things.

## Land Use Concept

The Master Plan provides a comprehensive land use planning tool that provides the framework for development of the approximately 210.7 acre Project site. The intent of the Master Plan is to ensure a quality built environment that integrates a mix of land uses under a single uniform set of design and development standards. The FEZ Master Plan intends to build upon the success of the Big League Dreams facility by providing additional sports and field recreation, hotel and tourism, entertainment, retail, commercial and restaurant uses along the highly visible State Route 120 corridor. Although the FEZ may develop in multiple phases as individual land use/planning areas, the Master Plan will help the separate phases come together and operate as a cohesive and integrated entertainment/recreational facility.

The Master Project site is divided into 16 Planning Areas (“PAs”) with five land use categories to group similar land uses: Retail and Restaurant, Entertainment, Hotel Resort, Recreation and Sport (fields), and Parking. Table ES-1 provides a summary of the planning areas.

It is to be noted that Planning Areas 1-15 and Planning Area 16 have distinct design concepts that are defined independently of each other through the Master Plan. Planning Areas 1-15 are to be developed with an ‘Early California’ architectural and landscape theme. Planning Area 16 is a ‘Natural Rustic’ architectural and landscape theme. These two distinct themes work together to create a dynamic Master Plan with integrated uses and an integrated theme of Early California and Natural Rustic with Daniels St. creating the transition between the two themes.

The Planning Areas serve as the basis for all of the land use and development recommendations contained in the FEZ Master Plan.

**TABLE ES-1: PLANNING AREA PROJECT BUILD-OUT SUMMARY**

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Projected Land use</i>	<i>Gross Land Area (acre)</i>
PA-1	Outdoor Sports Fields	11.68
PA-1a	New Baseball/Softball Field	3.08
PA-1b	New Baseball/Softball Field	2.61
PA-2	Outdoor Sports Fields	4.02
PA-2a	Outdoor Sports Fields	3.32
PA-3	Retail, Food & Beverage	2.94
PA-4	Main Street Retail	3.61
PA-5	Retail, Dining and Entertainment	27.33
PA-6	Future FEZ Expansion	12.63
PA-7	Adventure Zone	6.97
PA-8	Indoors Sports	3.55
PA-9	Family Entertainment	6.95
PA-10	Family Entertainment	5.25
PA-11	Stadium	12.44
PA-12	Speed Zone/Outdoor Sports	8.99
PA-13	Parking	3.06
PA-14	Parking	4.22
PA-15	Parking	3.19
PA-16	Hotel, Conference Center & Indoor Water Park	28.03
FEZ Planning Area Totals		153.87
Existing Big League Dreams Site		28.43
Roads / R.O.W.		27.89
McKinley Avenue R.O.W. Expansion		0.48
<b>Totals</b>		<b>210.67</b>

**Planning Areas and Summary**

A land use plan is shown in Figure 2-6. Figure 2-7a illustrates the planning areas and Figure 2-7b presents the tentative parcel map. It is envisioned that the FEZ Planning Areas will develop within four broader land use categories. The following is a brief overview of the potential land uses within the land use categories and Planning Areas.

**Retail and Restaurants – (PA-3, PA-4, and PA-5)**

- Open-air Retail, Dining, and Entertainment Village
  - Man-made lake / retention basin (see Section 4.3 – Infrastructure for a definition of the two options). If the lake option is selected, it is to be an amenity, with the potential of personal paddle craft and/or kayaks, but not a swimming facility
  - Lakeside/Basin edge boardwalk promenade with semi-pervious paving
  - Retail shops
  - Restaurants, cafes, bistros, coffee shops, micro-brewery
  - Small outdoor amphitheater
  - Outdoor entertainment / performance plaza

**Entertainment – (PA-6, PA-7, PA-9, PA-10, PA-12)**

- Family Entertainment

- Miniature golf, family arcade games, Laser-tag, Ball Crawl, etc.
- Rock-climbing wall, ropes course, Flow-rider, zip-line, hard surface skate park
- Outdoor Sports/ Speed Zone
  - BMX course
  - Electric motorized mini-car race course

***Hotel/Resort – (PA-16)***

- Resort:
  - This parcel is envisioned to be occupied by a destination hotel oriented toward tourism and leisure, primarily for families, but also to serve business conferences.
  - Indoor and outdoor water park
  - Conference center

***Recreation and Sports – (PA-1, PA-1a, PA-1b, PA-2, PA-2a, PA-8, PA-11)***

- Outdoor Regional Sports Zone
  - Existing Big League Dreams complex
  - Additional baseball fields for Big League Dreams
  - Multi-purpose/soccer fields in varying sizes
  - \* Note: Play fields are expected to be available for use as public open space prior to 4:30PM on weekdays.
- Indoor All-season Sports Center
  - Basketball, volleyball, cheerleading, gymnastics
- Championship Playfield
  - International-sized multi-purpose play field with fixed stadium seating.

***Parking – (PA-13, PA-14 and PA-15)***

- Parking Zones:
  - FEZ parking areas
  - Easements

## AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

This Draft EIR addresses environmental impacts associated with the proposed project that are known to the City of Manteca, were raised during the two Notice of Preparation (NOP) processes (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> review) or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. This Draft EIR discusses potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and population, mineral resources, noise, public services and recreation, transportation and circulation, and utilities.

During the NOP processes (1st and 2nd review), comments were received from the following: SJCOG, Inc. (February 7, 2014), Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (February 25, 2014), California Department of Transportation (March 3, 2014), San Joaquin County Public Works (March 3, 2014), San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (March 4, 2014), Native American Heritage Commission (November 24, 2014), Native American Heritage Commission (Amended December 5, 2014), Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (December 10, 2014),

Neighbors United (December 15, 2014), and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (December 15, 2014). These comments are addressed in the Draft EIR.

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project. Three alternatives to the proposed Project were developed based on input from City staff, the public during the NOP review period, and the technical analysis performed to identify the environmental effects of the proposed Project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following three alternatives in addition to the proposed Project.

- **No Build Alternative:** Under this alternative, development of the Project site would not occur, and the Project site would remain in its current condition.
- **Reduced Project Alternative:** Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the area utilized for the commercial uses would be reduced.
- **Agriculture Protection Alternative:** Under this alternative, the proposed Project would be developed in such a way to protect those lands currently identified as prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance.

Alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 5. Table ES-1 provides a comparison of the alternatives using a qualitative matrix that compares each alternative relative to the other. As shown in the table, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. However, as required by CEQA, when the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the environmentally superior alternative among the others must be identified. Therefore, the Reduced Project and Agricultural Alternatives both rank higher than the proposed Project. Comparatively, the Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less impact than the Reduced Project Alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the proposed Project. It should be noted that the Agricultural Protection Alternative and Reduced Project Alternative do not meet all of the project objectives.

**TABLE ES-2: COMPARISON SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE	REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE	AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Agricultural and Forest Resources	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Air Quality	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Biological Resources	Less (Best)	Less (2nd Best)	Less (3rd Best)
Cultural Resources	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Geology and Soils	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Land Use & Population	Equal (--)	Equal (--)	Equal (--)
Mineral Resources	Equal (--)	Equal (--)	Equal (--)

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE	REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE	AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE
Noise	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Public Services and Recreation	Greater (Worst)	Greater (3rd Worst)	Greater (2nd Worst)
Transportation and Circulation	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Utilities	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)

*GREATER = GREATER IMPACT THAN THAT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT*

*LESS = LESS IMPACT THAN THAT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT*

*EQUAL = NO SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IN IMPACT FROM THAT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT*

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR focuses on the significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines defines a significant effect as a substantial adverse change in the physical conditions which exist in the area affected by the FEZ. A less than significant effect is one in which there is no long or short-term significant adverse change in environmental conditions. Some impacts are reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures and/or compliance with regulations.

The environmental impacts of the FEZ, the impact level of significance prior to mitigation, the proposed mitigation measures and/or adopted policies and standard measures that are already in place to mitigate an impact, and the impact level of significance after mitigation are summarized in Table ES-3.

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**TABLE ES-3: PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES**

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>AESTHETICS</b>			
Impact 3.1-1: Project implementation may result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas (Less than Significant)	LS		--
Impact 3.1-2: Project implementation may result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character (Significant and Unavoidable)	PS		SU
Impact 3.1-3: Project implementation may substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway (Less than Significant)	LS		--
Impact 3.1-4: Project implementation may result in light and glare impacts (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.1-1:</b> A lighting plan shall be prepared prior to the approval of Site Plan Review for each individual phase of development, or a portion of an individual phase of development. The lighting plan shall demonstrate that the field lighting systems and other exterior lighting throughout the Project site have been designed to minimize light spillage onto adjacent properties to the greatest extent feasible. The lighting plan shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design of site lighting and exterior building light fixtures to reduce the effects of light pollution and glare off of glass and metal surfaces;</li> <li>• Lighting shall be directed downward and light fixtures shall be shielded to reduce upward and spillover lighting;</li> <li>• Where it is not feasible to fully shield light fixtures from light pollution, such as the field lights, the lighting shall be directed downward and of the minimum wattage and height suitable for illuminating the playing surfaces and immediately surrounding areas.</li> </ul>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting for each playfield, parking area, and structure shall have control boxes that allow operation of specific areas of lighting in order to only illuminate the field(s) and parking area(s) in use at any given time.</li> <li>Lights shall be turned off when the fields, parking areas, and structures are not in use.</li> </ul>	
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<p>Impact 3.2-1: The proposed project has the potential to result in the conversion of Farmlands, including Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses. (Significant and Unavoidable)</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each individual phase of development, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall participate in the City's agricultural mitigation fee program and the SIMSCP by paying the established fees on a per-acre basis for the loss of important farmland. Fees paid toward the City's program shall be used to fund conservation easements on comparable or better agricultural lands to provide compensatory mitigation.</p>	SU
<p>Impact 3.2-2: The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning or Williamson Act Contracts (no impact)</p>	--		--
<p>Impact 3.2-3: The proposed project has the potential to result in conflicts with adjacent agricultural lands or indirectly cause conversion of agricultural lands (less than significant)</p>	LS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2:</b> Prior to approval of improvement plans for each individual phase of development, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the Project proponent shall demonstrate that the Project site plans include adequate measures to buffer adjacent agricultural uses from urban uses on the Project site and to reduce adverse impacts to neighboring agricultural uses. Such measures shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project shall provide adequate and secure fencing at the interface of the Project site, or any individual phase of the Project, and adjacent agricultural uses.</li> <li>The Project shall provide buffers, which may include parking areas, roadways</li> </ul>	--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>			
Impact 3.3-1: Project operation has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	PS	<p>and streets, drainage channels, and landscaped corridors, to buffer adjacent agricultural uses from the Project, including any individual phase of the Project, from proposed urban uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project shall provide notifications to all operators of uses on the Project site that are adjacent or in the vicinity of existing agricultural land of the City's Right-to-Farm Ordinance.</li> </ul>	SU
		<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-1:</b> Prior to final approval for each individual phase of development, or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall submit an Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for District Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review (ISR) to obtain AIA approval from the District for the phase or portion of an individual phase of development that is to be constructed. Prior to the issuance of a building permit of each individual phase or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall incorporate mitigation measures into the proposed Project and demonstrate compliance with District Rule 9510 including payment of all fees.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-2:</b> Prior to the approval of improvement plans for each individual phase of development, or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall incorporate the following features into project plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus turnouts and transit improvements where requested by the San Joaquin RTD.</li> <li>Continuous public sidewalks adjacent to all proposed public streets.</li> <li>Pavement and striping for bike lanes/paths.</li> <li>Street lighting.</li> </ul>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian signalization, signage and safety designs at signalized intersections.</li> <li>• Shade trees to shade sidewalks in street-side landscaping areas.</li> <li>• Require low-VOC cleaning supplies to be used by businesses and cleaning services within the Project site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-3:</b> Prior to the approval of improvement plans for each individual phase of development, or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall prepare and implement a transportation demand management (TDM) plan that includes, but is not limited to, the following measures subject to the review and approval of the City of Manteca:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide secure bicycle parking in conjunction with each individual phase or project component.</li> <li>• Provide designated vanpool parking spaces within the parking lots.</li> <li>• Provide on-site amenities that encourage alternative transportation modes such as locker, shower, and secure bike storage facilities.</li> <li>• Coordinate SJCOG's Commute Connection Program</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-4:</b> Prior to the approval of a Building Permit for each individual phase or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall provide the City of Manteca with confirmation that they have met with the SJVAPCD to explore the potential of entering into a Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA) as a method to achieve emissions reductions in excess of District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) requirements and other mitigation measures required for the proposed Project. The City shall confirm that the project proponent has made a good-faith effort to reduce emissions through a VERA taking into consideration whether emissions reductions through a VERA can be accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time,</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.3-2: Project construction has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation	PS	<p>and taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-5:</b> Prior to the commencement of construction activities for each individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall prepare and submit a Dust Control Plan that meets all of the applicable requirements of APCD Rule 8021, Section 6.3, for the review and approval of the APCD Air Pollution Control Officer.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-6:</b> During all construction activities, the project proponent shall implement dust control measures, as required by APCD Rules 8011-8081, to limit Visible Dust Emissions to 20% opacity or less. Dust control measures shall include application of water or chemical dust suppressants to unpaved roads and graded areas, covering or stabilization of transported bulk materials, prevention of carryout or track out of soil materials to public roads, limiting the area subject to soil disturbance, construction of wind barriers, access restrictions to inactive sites as required by the applicable rules.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-7:</b> During all construction activities, the project proponent shall implement the following dust control practices identified in Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of the GAMAQI (San Joaquin Valley APCD, 2002):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.</li> <li>b. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.</li> <li>c. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall control fugitive dust emissions by application of water or by presoaking.</li> <li>d. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least six inches of freeboard space from the</li> </ul>	SU

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>top of the container shall be maintained.</p> <p>e. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.</p> <p>f. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.</p> <p>g. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; and</p> <p>h. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-8:</b> Architectural coatings applied to all structures on the Project site shall meet or exceed volatile organic compound (VOC) standards set in APCD Rule 4601. The ODS shall submit to the APCD a list of architectural coatings to be used and shall indicate how the coatings meet or exceed VOC standards. If the APCD determines that any architectural coatings do not meet VOC standards, the ODS shall replace the identified coatings with those that meet standards.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-9:</b> To reduce impacts from construction related exhaust emissions, the project proponent shall utilize off-road construction fleets that can achieve fleet average emissions equal to or cleaner than the Tier II emission standards, as set forth in §2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations. This can be achieved through any combination of uncontrolled engines and engines complying with Tier II and above engine standards.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.3-10:</b> Asphalt paving shall be applied in accordance with APCD Rule 4641. This rule applies to the manufacture and use of cutback asphalt, slow cure asphalt</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.3-3: The proposed project has the potential to have carbon monoxide hotspot impacts	LS	<i>and emulsified asphalt for paving and maintenance operations.</i>	--
Impact 3.3-4: The proposed project has the potential for public exposure to toxic air contaminants	LS		--
Impact 3.3-5: The proposed project has the potential for exposure to odors	PS		SU
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Impact 3.4-1: The proposed project has the potential to have a direct or indirect effect on special-status invertebrate species	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1:</b> Prior to commencement of any grading activities for each individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall seek coverage under the SJMSCP to mitigate for habitat impacts to covered special status species. (Note: Coverage is not needed for an individual phase, or portion of an individual phase, until grading or other disturbance activities are planned to commence.) Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. These fees are used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected as a result of the proposed project. There are a wide variety of incidental take avoidance and minimization measures contained in the SJMSCP that were developed in consultation with the USFWS, CDFW, and local agencies. The applicability of incidental takes avoidance and minimization measures are determined by SICOG on a project basis. The process of obtaining coverage for a project includes incidental take authorization (permits) under the Endangered Species Act Section 10(a) and California Fish and Game Code Section 2081. The Section 10(a) permit also serves as a special-purpose permit for the incidental take of</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.4-2: The proposed project has the potential to have direct or indirect effects on special-status reptile and amphibian species	PS	those species that are also protected under the MBTA. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on covered special-status species. The SJMSCP includes the implementation of an ongoing Monitoring Plan to ensure success in mitigating the habitat impacts that are covered. The SJMSCP Monitoring Plan includes an Annual Report process, Biological Monitoring Plan, SJMSCP Compliance Monitoring Program, and the SJMSCP Adaptive Management Plan SICOG.	LS
Impact 3.4-3: The proposed project has the potential to have direct or indirect effects on special-status bird species	PS	<p>Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1</b>.</p> <p>Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1</b>.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-2:</b> If construction activities occur during the avian breeding season (March 1 – August 31) then the project proponent shall conduct pre-construction surveys to prevent impacts to nesting birds. No more than 15 days prior to the start of construction a bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify any active nests within the project site or Offsite Infrastructure Corridor. If construction stops for a period of 15 days or more during the avian breeding season than an additional bird survey shall be conducted. The biologist will conduct a survey on the project site or Offsite Infrastructure Corridor, including the French Camp Outlet Canal and adjacent wetlands, for all special-status birds protected by the federal and state ESA, MBTA and CFGC, including but not limited to those that are documented within a ten-mile radius of the Project site and are known to nest in the region. The biologist shall map all nests that are within, and visible from, the Project site or Offsite Infrastructure Corridor. If nests are identified, the biologist shall develop buffer zones around active nests as deemed appropriate in coordination with the CDFW. Construction activity shall be prohibited within the buffer zones until the young have fledged or the nest fails. Nests shall be monitored at least twice per week and a report submitted to the City and CDFW monthly.</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.4-4: The proposed project has the potential to result in direct or indirect effects on special-status mammal species	PS	<b>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.</b>	LS
Impact 3.4-5: The proposed project has the potential for direct or indirect effects on candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant species	PS	<b>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.</b>	LS
Impact 3.4-6: Effects on Protected Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-3:</b> Prior to any construction activities that would disturb protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas on the project site, the appropriate state and federal authorizations (Streambed Alteration Agreement, Section 404 permit, Section 401 water quality certification) shall be obtained. All requirements of these authorizations shall be adhered to throughout the construction phase.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-4:</b> The project proponent shall compensate for any authorized disturbance to protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas to ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Compensation ratios shall be based on site-specific information and determined through coordination with state, federal, and local agencies as part of the permitting process for the project. Unless determined otherwise by the regulatory/permitting agency, the compensation shall be at a minimum ratio of 1 acre restored, created, and/or preserved for every 1 acre of protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas disturbed. Compensation may comprise onsite restoration/creation, off-site restoration, preservation, or mitigation credits (or a combination of these elements).</p> <p><b>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 through 3.4-4.</b></p>	LS
Impact 3.4-7: Adverse Effects on Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community	PS	<b>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 through 3.4-4.</b>	LS
Impact 3.4-8: Interference with the Movement of Native Fish or Wildlife Species or with Established Wildlife Corridors, or Impede the	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-5:</b> The project proponent shall implement the following nonstructural BMPs that focus on preventing pollutants from entering stormwater:	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Use of Native Wildlife Nursery Sites		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A spill response and prevention plan shall be developed as a component of (1) SWPPPs prepared for construction activities, (2) SWPPPs for facilities subject to the NPDES Stormwater Permit, and (3) spill prevention control and countermeasure plans for qualifying facilities.</li> <li>○ Streets and parking lots shall be swept at an interval acceptable to minimize pollution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Operation and Maintenance (O&amp;M) of Treatment Controls                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An Operation and Maintenance (O&amp;M) Plan shall be developed for the storm drainage facilities to ensure long-term performance. The O&amp;M plan shall incorporate the manufacturers' recommended maintenance procedures and include (1) provisions for debris removal, (2) guidance for addressing public health or safety issues, and (3) methods and criteria for assessing the efficacy of the storm drainage system. An annual report shall be submitted to the City certifying that maintenance of the facilities was conducted according to the O&amp;M plan.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-6:</b> The project proponent shall implement the following structural BMPs that focus on preventing pollutants from entering stormwater, or alternative BMPs approved by the City of Manteca:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extended Detention Facilities: Extended detention refers to the facilities proposed for the Project site that would detain and temporarily store stormwater runoff to reduce the peak rates of discharge to the storm drainage system. Detention of stormwater allows particles and other pollutants to settle</li> </ul>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>and thereby potentially reduce concentrations and mass loading of contaminants in the discharge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grassed Swales: A swale is a vegetated, open channel management practice designed to treat and attenuate stormwater runoff for a specified water quality volume. Stormwater runoff flowing through these channels is treated by being filtered through vegetation in the channel, through a subsoil matrix, and/or through infiltration into the underlying soils. Swales can be used throughout the proposed Project area where feasible in the landscape design to treat parking lot runoff.</li> <li>Proprietary Devices: There are a variety of commercially available stormwater treatment devices designed to remove contaminants from drainage once flows enter the conveyance systems. StormFilter™ units, or equivalent filtration-type systems, are recommended within the commercial and industrial areas as the main structural BMP for these areas. Bioswales are also recommended for streets and parking areas. Drop inlet filters should also be used to control drainage runoff water quality.</li> </ul>	
Impact 3.4-9: Conflict with an Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-1</b> .	LS
Impact 3.4-10: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-7:</b> Prior to the approval of grading plans for phase one, the project proponent shall provide a landscape plan that includes tree planting specifications established by the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060) for the replacement of the eight trees to be removed during Phase 1. Replacement shall be at a ratio of 1:1 and in accordance with the Tree Replacement Schedule as outlined in the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060). Replacement trees shall be planted on-site at a location that is agreeable to the City.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-8:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each individual</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.5-1: Project implementation has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical resource, as Defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5	PS	<p>phase (after phase 1), or a portion of each individual phase (after Phase 1), a tree survey shall be conducted by a qualified arborist to enumerate and evaluate all trees on the proposed project site that meet the standards in the applicable Manteca Municipal Code. Trees that are subject to protection but are proposed to be removed as a result of project implementation shall be replaced at a ratio of 1:1 and in accordance with the Tree Replacement Schedule as outlined in the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060). Replacement trees shall be planted on-site at a location in the general vicinity that is agreeable to the City.</p>	LS
Impact 3.5-2: Project implementation has the	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1:</b> If any cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic artifact, or other indications of archaeological resources are found during grading and construction activities for any individual phase, or portion of an individual phase of the project, all work shall be halted immediately within a 200-foot radius of the discovery until an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology, as appropriate, has evaluated the find(s). Construction activities beyond the 200-foot radius can proceed unless it is determined by the City and the archaeologist that additional areas require evaluation.</p> <p>Work cannot continue at the discovery site until the archaeologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially significant or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR; or 3) not a significant Public Trust Resource.</p> <p>If Native American resources are identified, a Native American monitor, following the Guidelines for Monitors/Consultants of Native American Cultural, Religious, and Burial Sites established by the Native American Heritage Commission, may also be required and, if required, shall be retained at the Applicant's expense.</p>	LS
Impact 3.5-2: Project implementation has the	PS	<b>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-1</b>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant archaeological resource, as Defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5			
Impact 3.5-3: Project implementation has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.5-2:</b> If paleontological resources are discovered during the course of construction for any individual phase, or portion of an individual phase of the project, work shall be halted immediately within 165 feet of the discovery, the City of Manteca shall be notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. If the paleontological resource is considered significant, it should be excavated by a qualified paleontologist and given to a local agency, State University, or other applicable institution, where they could be curated and displayed for public education purposes.	LS
Impact 3.5-4: Project implementation has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.5-3:</b> If human remains are discovered during the course of construction for any individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase of the project, work shall be halted at the site and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until he San Joaquin County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the remains are of Native American origin, either of the following steps will be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission in order to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner will make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, which may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains.</li> <li>The project proponent shall retain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance when any of the following conditions occurs:</li> </ul>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>			
Impact 3.6-1: The proposed project may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic related ground failure	LS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a descendant.</li> <li>o The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.</li> <li>o The City of Manteca or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.</li> </ul>	--
Impact 3.6-2: Implementation and construction of the proposed project may result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1:</b> For an individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase, the Project proponent, or their contractor, shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the RWQCB to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ amended by 2010-0014-DWQ &amp; 2012-0006-DWQ). The NOI shall be submitted prior to clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation. The NOI should only cover the area proposed for clearing, grading, and disturbance to the ground for the work to be performed at that time (i.e. it does not need to include the entire project or an entire phase). In accordance with the General Permit requirements, the Permittee can either close out the General Construction Permit once all work and requirements are completed, or amend the General Construction Permit to add additional areas for disturbance while closing out areas where work is completed.</p> <p>The SWPPP shall be designed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the RWQCB</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable  
 PS – potentially significant

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable  
 B – beneficial impact

LS – less than significant  
 SU – significant and unavoidable

**ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.6-3: The proposed project has the potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of project implementation, and potentially result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse	PS	<p>has deemed as effective at reducing erosion, controlling sediment, and managing runoff. These include: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. Sediment control BMPs, installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes; installing berms and other temporary run-on and runoff diversions. These BMPs are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. Final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by City of Manteca and the RWQCB. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-2: Prior to earthmoving activities for any individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase, a certified geotechnical engineer, or equivalent, shall be retained to perform a final geotechnical evaluation of the soils at a design-level for the area to be graded in the individual phase as required by the requirements of the California Building Code Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 18, Section 1803.1.1.2 related to expansive soils and other soil conditions. The evaluation shall be prepared in accordance with the standards and requirements outlined in California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 16, Chapter 17, and Chapter 18, which addresses structural design, tests and inspections, and soils and foundation standards. The final geotechnical evaluation shall include design recommendations to ensure that soil conditions do not pose a threat to the health and safety of people or structures. The grading and improvement plans, as well as any building plans shall be designed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the final geotechnical evaluation for that individual phase or a portion of an individual phase.</p>	LS
Impact 3.6-4: Potential for expansive soils to create substantial risks to life or property	PS	<p><b>Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-2</b></p>	LS
<b>GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b>			
Impact 3.7-1: Potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.7-1:</b> To reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Consumption, the project proponent shall institute measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable      LCC – less than cumulatively considerable      LS – less than significant  
 PS – potentially significant      B – beneficial impact      SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<p>indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases</p>		<p>unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, and maintenance/landscaping. As the individual phases, or portions of individual phases, are designed and undergo Design Review by the City of Manteca, there should be an explanation as to why certain measures were incorporated in the individual phases, or portions of individual phases and why other measures were dismissed. The following measures should be incorporated into the individual phases, or portions of individual phases, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase transit accessibility in the Plan Area by ensuring a minimum distance of 0.2 miles to transit stops</li> <li>• Ensure that the pedestrian network within the Plan Area connects to offsite pedestrian networks</li> <li>• Provide traffic calming measures on all street segments and intersections</li> <li>• Exceed Title 24 by 15% for energy and green building standards (using a baseline of 2015 Title 24 requirements)</li> <li>• Install high efficiency lighting and appliance within all buildings</li> <li>• Apply a water conservation strategy to achieve a 15% reduction in indoor/outdoor water usage (using a baseline of 2015 average water usage)</li> <li>• Install recycled water infrastructure within the outdoor landscaping areas, including medians, to make the project available for the use of reclaimed water. The City's reclaimed water system is anticipated in the reasonably foreseeable future, but to the extent that the City's reclaimed water system is not available to provide recycled water for irrigation irrigate outdoor landscaping of an individual phase, or portion of the individual phase, the project proponent must still install recycled water infrastructure such that it can be connected when the City's reclaimed water system becomes available.</li> <li>• Install low-flow faucets, toilets, and showers as applicable</li> <li>• Use water-efficient irrigation systems throughout the Plan Area</li> <li>• Institute Recycling and Composting Services to achieve a 50% reduction in waste disposal (compared to a baseline of a business as usual approach in 2015)</li> </ul>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
Impact 3.8-1: Potential to create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-1:</b> The project proponent shall hire a qualified consultant to perform a Phase 2 ESA prior to the issuance of grading permits or demolition permits for construction activities in the following areas that have been deemed to have potential hazardous conditions present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to grading activities in areas previously used for agricultural uses.</li> <li>• Prior to removal of the single-wide mobile home unit that was formerly used in conjunction with the Manteca Police Department shooting range.</li> <li>• Prior to grading activities on the shooting range site.</li> <li>• Prior to removal of the remnant construction and/or farming materials (i.e. remnant pipes, etc.) on the project site, most notably those located on the north-south farm-road that is located just north of the shooting range.</li> <li>• Prior to grading activities in the area on the western side of the project near McKinley that historically served as a farm yard for agricultural equipment, implements, etc.</li> </ul> <p>The intent of the Phase 2 ESA is to: 1) sample the soils for residual agrichemicals, 2) sample any areas that appear stained, and 3) investigate whether any of the buildings or facilities contain asbestos-containing materials and lead that could become friable or mobile during demolition activities. If toxic levels of residual agrichemicals are found, the contaminated soil shall be excavated from the site and disposed of at an off-site disposal facility designed to accept such waste. If any stained soils are found, the contaminated soil shall be excavated from the site and disposed of at an off-site disposal facility designed to accept such waste. If asbestos-containing materials and/or lead are found in the buildings, a Cal-OSHA certified ACBM and lead based paint contractor shall be retained to remove the asbestos-containing materials and lead in accordance with EPA and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) standards. In addition, all</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal/OSHA asbestos and lead worker construction standards. The ACBM and lead shall be disposed of properly at an appropriate offsite disposal facility.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-2:</b> A Soils Management Plan (SMP) shall be submitted and approved by the San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health prior to the issuance of a grading permit on lands that are determined to be contaminated after Phase 2 ESA (soils testing). The SMP shall be specific to the area that is contaminated and shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use history, including description and locations of known contamination;</li> <li>• An earthwork schedule;</li> <li>• The project proponent shall describe methods which will be used to properly handle and/or dispose of soil which may be classified as hazardous or contain contaminants at levels of potential concern, including the identification of legal discharge areas;</li> <li>• The SMP shall discuss, as necessary, the reuse of soil on site in accordance with applicable criteria to protect construction workers or future workers on site;</li> <li>• A SMP summary report, which includes all analytical data and other findings, must be submitted once the earthwork has been completed.</li> </ul> <p>The approved SMP shall be posted and maintained onsite during construction activities and all construction personnel shall acknowledge that they have reviewed and understand the plan.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.8-3:</b> Prior to the issuance of a business license that requires the use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials, the business owner shall submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) to San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department</p>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<i>(CUPA) for review and approval.</i>	
Impact 3.8-2: Potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school	LS		--
Impact 3.8-3: Potential to result in impacts from being included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5	LS		--
Impact 3.8-4: Potential for the project to result in a safety hazards for people residing or working on the project site as a result of public airport or public use airport	LS		--
Impact 3.8-5: Potential for the project to result in safety hazards for people residing or working on the project site as a result of a private airstrip	LS		--
Impact 3.8-6: Potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	LS		--
Impact 3.8-7: Potential to expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death from wildland fires	LS		--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*B – beneficial impact*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Impact 3.9-1: The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1</b>	LS
Impact 3.9-2: The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 and 3.4-6</b>	LS
Impact 3.9.3: The proposed project has the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge	LS		--
Impact 3.9-4: The proposed project has the potential to alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, or polluted runoff	LS		--
Impact 3.9.5 The proposed project has the potential to otherwise substantially degrade water quality	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 and Mitigation Measures 3.4-5 and 3.4-6</b>	LS
Impact 3.9.6 Place housing or structures that would impede/redirect flows 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	LS		--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 3.9.7 The proposed project has the potential to 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, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	LS		--
<b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>			
Impact 3.10-1: The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community	--		--
Impact 3.10-2: The proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect	LS		--
Impact 3.10-3: The proposed Project would not significantly conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan	LS		--
Impact 3.10-4: The proposed Project has the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area	LS		--
Impact 3.10-5: The proposed Project has the potential to displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing	LS		--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*PS – potentially significant*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*B – beneficial impact*

*LS – less than significant*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b>			
Impact 3.11-1: The project would result in the loss of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region	LS		--
Impact 3.11-2: The project would result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan	LS		--
<b>NOISE</b>			
Impact 3.12-1: The proposed project has the potential to expose people to, or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or otherwise cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (less than significant with mitigation)	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.12-1:</b> All hotel room windows located within 550 feet of the centerline of SR 120 shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38. As an alternative to this requirement, the project proponent may submit a detailed interior noise analysis outlining alternative noise control measures that would ensure compliance with the City of Manteca 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. This analysis should specify required sound ratings for glazing as well as any other modifications to be the building envelope used to meet the City's interior noise level standard. This analysis shall be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.12-2:</b> Prior to the development of each individual phase, or a portion of each individual phase of development, proposed uses which include extensive noise generating uses shall be reviewed by the City of Manteca to ensure that exterior noise levels would not exceed the applicable City of Manteca noise standards. The Table 3.12-10 data shall be used as a screening tool to determine which uses may exceed the City's standards. The City shall prohibit the approval of a use that would cause an exceedance of the noise standards at a sensitive receptor unless sufficient noise control measures are implemented in the project design. The specific development proposals within the project site shall be reviewed by the City of Manteca when the detailed information is available for the individual development/construction approvals, which may</p>	LS

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 3.12-2: The proposed project has the potential to have a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (less than significant)	LS	<i>occur during Architectural Design Review and/or Building Permit.</i>	--
Impact 3.12-3: The proposed project has the potential to expose people to, or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (less than significant)	LS		--
Impact 3.12-4: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports (no impact)	LS		--
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION</b>			
Impact 3.13-1: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of police department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts	LS		--
Impact 3.13-2: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of fire	LS		--

*CC – cumulatively considerable*

*LCC – less than cumulatively considerable*

*LS – less than significant*

*PS – potentially significant*

*B – beneficial impact*

*SU – significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts			
Impact 3.13-3: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of school facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts	LS		--
Impact 3.13-4: The proposed project has the potential to have effects on other public facilities	LS		--
Impact 3.13-5: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of park and recreational facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts	LS		--
Impact 3.13-6: Would 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	LS		--
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
Impact 3.14-1: The proposed project (Phase 1) would not cause significant impacts at intersections	LS		--
Impact 3.14-2: The proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway	PS		SU (in the short term), LS (in the

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
facilities			long term)
Impact 3.14-3: The proposed project (Phase 1) would adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-1:</b> The project proponent shall provide Class II bicycle lanes in each direction of Daniels Street westerly from its existing terminus to McKinley Avenue.	LS
Impact 3.14-4: The proposed project (Phase 1) would not adversely affect transit services or facilities	LS		--
Impact 3.14-5: The proposed project (Phase 1) could cause potentially significant impacts to at-grade rail crossings	LS		--
Impact 3.14-6: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would cause significant impacts at intersections	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-2:</b> The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost for each individual phase, or portion of individual phase of the development, toward the following improvements at the SR 120/Airport Way interchange:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocate the westbound ramp-terminal intersection approximately 180 feet south of its current location, which will increase the spacing to the Airport Way/Daniels Street intersection.</li> <li>• Construct loop on-ramps.</li> <li>• Widen overcrossing to include two northbound and three southbound lanes.</li> <li>• Widen SR 120 eastbound and westbound off-ramps to include two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes approaching Airport Way.</li> </ul> <p>The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-3:</b> The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost of adding</p>	SU

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<p>the following improvements to the Airport Way/Daniels Street intersection. Alternatively, the City could decide to include this improvement in its draft PPIP, with the City being responsible to construct the improvement when warranted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconfigure the southbound approach to add a third through lane.</li> <li>• Restripe the eastbound Daniels Street approach to include one left-turn, one shared left/through lane, and two right-turn lanes with right-turn overlap phasing.</li> </ul> <p>The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-4:</b> The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost of installing a traffic signal at the Airport Way/Wawona Street intersection. Alternatively, the City could decide to include this improvement in its draft PPIP, with the City being responsible to construct the improvement when warranted.</p> <p>The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-5:</b> The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost of adding the following improvements to the Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue intersection. Alternatively, the City could decide to include this improvement in its draft PPIP, with the City being responsible to construct the improvement when warranted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widen the eastbound and westbound Yosemite Avenue approaches to include dual left-turn lanes.</li> </ul>	

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
		<i>The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.</i>	
Impact 3.14-7: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-3.</b>	SU
Impact 3.14-8: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-2.</b>	LS
Impact 3.14-9: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would not adversely affect transit services or facilities	LS		--
Impact 3.14-10: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) could cause potentially significant impacts to at-grade rail crossings	LS		--
Impact 3.14-11: Under cumulative conditions, proposed project buildout could cause significant impacts at intersections and freeway facilities	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-6:</b> Each subsequent individual phase or portion of a subsequent individual phase of development shall be subject to additional traffic studies to analyze potentially significant transportation system impacts and identify mitigation measures that lessen their significance, including fair share costs.	SU
<b>UTILITIES</b>			
Impact 3.15-1: The proposed project has the potential to exceed wastewater treatment	LS		--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
<p>requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board</p> <p>Impact 3.15-2: The proposed project has the potential to result in a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider which serves or may serve the project that is does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments</p>	PS	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 3.15-1:</b> Prior to occupancy of any building that would require wastewater treatment services; the project proponent shall secure adequate wastewater treatment allocation through the City's allocation process.</p>	LS
<p>Impact 3.15-3: The proposed project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects</p>	LS		--
<p>Impact 3.15-4: The proposed project has the potential to require construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects</p>	LS		--
<p>Impact 3.15-5: The proposed project has the potential to have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources</p>	LS		--
<p>Impact 3.15-6: The proposed project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the</p>	LS		--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
construction of which could cause significant environmental effects			
Impact 3.15-7: The proposed project has the potential to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste	LS		--
<b>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</b>			
Impact 4.1: project implementation may substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.2: Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region	PS		CC and SU
Impact 4.3: project implementation may result in light and glare impacts	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.4: Cumulative Impact on Agricultural and Forest Resources	PS	<b>Mitigation Measure 3.2-1:</b> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each phase of development, the project applicant shall participate in the City's agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP by paying the established fees on a per-acre basis for the loss of important farmland. Fees paid toward the City's program shall be used to fund conservation easements on comparable or better agricultural lands to provide compensatory mitigation.	CC and SU
Impact 4.5: Cumulative Impact on the Region's Air Quality	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measures 3.3-1 through 3.3-10.</b>	CC and SU

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
Impact 4.6: Cumulative Loss of Biological Resources Including Habitats and Special Status Species	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.7: Cumulative Impacts on Known and Undiscovered Cultural Resources	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.8: Cumulative Impact on Geologic and Soils Resources	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.9: Cumulative Impact on Climate Change from Increased project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.10: Cumulative Impact Related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.11: Cumulative Increases in Peak Stormwater Runoff from the Project site	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.12: Cumulative Impacts Related to Degradation of Water Quality	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.13: Cumulative Impacts Related to Degradation of Groundwater Supply or Recharge	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.14: Cumulative Impacts Related to Flooding	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.15: Cumulative Impact on Communities and Local Land Uses	LS and LCC		--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

## ES EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</i>	<i>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION</i>	<i>MITIGATION MEASURE</i>	<i>RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</i>
Impact 4.16: Cumulative Impacts on Population and Housing	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.17: Cumulative Impacts Resulting in the Loss of a Known Mineral Resource	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.18: Cumulative Exposure of Existing and Future Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Increased Noise Resulting from Cumulative Development	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.19: Cumulative Impact on Other Public Services	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.20: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would cause significant impacts at intersections	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-2</b> through <b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-5</b>	CC and SU
Impact 4.21: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-2</b> .	CC and SU
Impact 4.22: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.23: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would not adversely affect transit services or facilities	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.24: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) could cause potentially significant impacts to at-grade rail	LS and LCC		--

CC – *cumulatively considerable*

LCC – *less than cumulatively considerable*

LS – *less than significant*

PS – *potentially significant*

B – *beneficial impact*

SU – *significant and unavoidable*

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITHOUT MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURE	RESULTING LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE
crossings			
Impact 4.25: Under cumulative conditions, proposed project buildout could cause significant impacts at intersections and freeway facilities	PS	Implement <b>Mitigation Measure 3.14-6</b> .	CC and SU
Impact 4.26: Cumulative Impact on Wastewater Utilities	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.27: Cumulative Impact on Water Utilities	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.28: Cumulative Impact on Stormwater Facilities	LS and LCC		--
Impact 4.29: Cumulative Impact on Solid Waste Facilities	LS and LCC		--

CC – cumulatively considerable

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable

LS – less than significant

PS – potentially significant

B – beneficial impact

SU – significant and unavoidable

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

## 1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

The City of Manteca, as lead agency, determined that the proposed Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ) is a "project" within the definition of CEQA. CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approving any project, which may have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "project" refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]).

An EIR must disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize environmental impacts of proposed development, and an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

The City of Manteca, as the lead agency, has prepared this Draft EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with an objective analysis of the potential environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project. The environmental review process enables interested parties to evaluate the proposed Project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and recommend methods to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project. This EIR will be used by the City of Manteca to determine whether to approve, modify, or deny the proposed Project and associated approvals in light of the Project's environmental effects. The EIR will be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate full development, all associated infrastructure improvements, and permitting actions associated with the proposed Project. All of the actions and components of the proposed Project are described in detail in Chapter 2.0, Project Description.

## 1.2 TYPE OF EIR

The State CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a Program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168; however, it includes a project-level analysis for Phase 1, the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal (FCOC), and infrastructure needed to serve Phase 1. The program-level analysis considers the broad environmental effects of the proposed Project as a whole. The EIR examines the planning, construction and operation of the Project. The program-level approach is appropriate for the proposed Project because it allows comprehensive consideration of the reasonably anticipated scope of the development plan; however, not all aspects of the future development phases (other than Phase 1, the undergrounding of the FCOC, and infrastructure needed to serve Phase 1) are known at this stage in the planning process. Subsequent development that requires further discretionary approvals will be examined in light of this EIR to determine whether additional environmental documentation must be prepared. This EIR includes

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

a project-level analysis of the Phase 1 Lodging Facility, which has current development applications filed with the City of Manteca. Subsequent phases do not have development applications filed.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 states that a program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

- 1) Geographically,
- 2) As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions,
- 3) In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or
- 4) As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.

### 1.3 KNOWN RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The term “Responsible Agency” includes all public agencies other than the Lead Agency that have discretionary approval power over the proposed Project or an aspect of the proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15381). The following agency is considered a Responsible Agency for the proposed Project, and may be required to issue permits or approve certain aspects of the proposed Project:

- South San Joaquin Irrigation District: Approval to underground the French Camp Outlet Canal.

For the purpose of CEQA, a “Trustee” agency has jurisdiction by law over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of the State of California (CEQA Guidelines Section 15386). The following agencies are considered Trustee Agencies for the proposed Project, and may be required to issue permits or approve certain aspects of the proposed Project:

- California Department of Fish and Game - Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code;
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approval prior to construction activities pursuant to the Clean Water Act,
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) – Water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) – Permitting of State jurisdictional areas, including isolated wetlands pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act;
- United States Army Corps Of Engineers – Permitting of federal jurisdictional areas pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act;
- San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG): Coverage/Incidental Take Authorization under the San Joaquin County Multi Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan

## 1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR has involved, or will involve, the following general procedural steps:

### NOTICE OF PREPARATION

---

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Public Circulation**

The City of Manteca circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed Project on February 4, 2014 to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, the State Clearinghouse, the Native American Heritage Commission, and the public. A public scoping meeting was held on February 20, 2014 to present the project description to the public and interested agencies, and to receive comments from the public and interested agencies regarding the scope of the environmental analysis to be included in the Draft EIR. The City received five NOP comments from the following agencies: California Department of Transportation, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Joaquin County Public Works Department, San Joaquin Council of Governments, and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP and comments received on the NOP by interested parties are presented in Appendix A.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Public Circulation (Recirculation)**

After the initial circulation of the NOP on February 4, 2014, the project boundary was reduced, more Project details became available, and the Project became more refined. Based on these changes the City determined that they should recirculate an NOP with the current Project Description as refined/modified. Subsequently, the City recirculated the NOP on November 14, 2014 to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, the State Clearinghouse, the Native American Heritage Commission, and the public. Also, a second public scoping meeting was held on December 3, 2014 to present the project description to the public and interested agencies, and to receive comments from the public and interested agencies regarding the scope of the environmental analysis to be included in the Draft EIR. The City received five NOP comments from the following agencies: Native American Heritage Commission, a second letter from the Native American Heritage Commission, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, Neighbors United, and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The entire updated Project Description is included in Appendix A.

### AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Environmental impacts associated with the proposed project that are known to the City of Manteca, were raised during the two Notice of Preparation (NOP) processes (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> review), or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR, include the following: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and population, mineral resources, noise, public services and recreation, transportation and circulation, and utilities. In

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

response to the issues raised, these environmental topics are addressed individually within a section of this Draft EIR.

### DRAFT EIR

---

This document constitutes the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR contains a description of the proposed Project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. This Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts. Comments received in response to the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> NOPs were considered in preparing the analysis in this EIR. Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the City of Manteca will file the Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period. Additionally, the City of Manteca will file the Notice of Availability with the County Clerk and have it published in a newspaper of regional circulation to begin the local public review period.

### PUBLIC NOTICE/PUBLIC REVIEW

---

The City of Manteca will provide a public notice of availability for the Draft EIR, and invite comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. Consistent with CEQA, the review period for this Draft EIR is forty-five (45) days. Public comment on the Draft EIR will be accepted in written form. All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Attn: Rochelle Henson, Senior Planner  
Manteca Community Development Department, Planning Division  
1001 West Center Street  
Manteca, CA 95337  
rhenson@ci.manteca.ca.us

### RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

---

Following the public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared. The Final EIR will respond to written comments received during the public review period and to oral comments received at a public hearing during such review period.

### CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

---

The City of Manteca will review and consider the Final EIR. If the City of Manteca finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete", the City of Manteca will certify the Final EIR in accordance with CEQA. The rule of adequacy generally holds that an EIR can be certified if:

- 1) The EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and

- 2) The EIR provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the proposed project in contemplation of environmental considerations.

Following review and consideration of the Final EIR, the City of Manteca may take action to approve, modify, or reject the proposed Project. A Mitigation Monitoring Program, as described below, would also be adopted in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the proposed Project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring Program will be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during project implementation, in a manner that is consistent with the EIR.

## 1.5 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE

Sections 15122 through 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines identify the content requirements for Draft and Final EIRs. An EIR must include a description of the environmental setting, an environmental impact analysis, mitigation measures, alternatives, significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. Discussion of the environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR was established through review of environmental and planning documentation developed for the proposed Project, environmental and planning documentation prepared for recent projects located within the City of Manteca, applicable local and regional planning documents, and responses to the Notice of Preparation (NOP).

This Draft EIR is organized in the following manner:

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This Executive Summary summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project, known areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, and provides a concise summary matrix of the proposed Project's environmental impacts and possible mitigation measures. This chapter identifies alternatives that reduce or avoid at least one significant environmental effect of the proposed Project.

### CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

---

Chapter 1.0 briefly describes the purpose of the environmental evaluation, identifies the lead, trustee, and responsible agencies, summarizes the process associated with preparation and certification of an EIR, and identifies the scope and organization of the Draft EIR.

### CHAPTER 2.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

Chapter 2.0 provides a detailed description of the proposed Project, including the location, intended objectives, background information, the physical and technical characteristics, including the decisions subject to CEQA, related infrastructure improvements, and a list of related agency action requirements.

### CHAPTER 3.0 - ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

Chapter 3.0 contains an analysis of environmental topic areas as identified below. Each subchapter addressing a topical area is organized as follows:

**Environmental Setting.** A description of the existing environment as it pertains to the topical area.

**Regulatory Setting.** A description of the regulatory environment that may be applicable to the proposed Project.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures.** Identification of the thresholds of significance by which impacts are determined, a description of project-related impacts associated with the environmental topic, identification of appropriate mitigation measures, and a conclusion as to the significance of each impact.

The following environmental topics are addressed in this section:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Population
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Utilities and Service Systems

### CHAPTER 4.0 – OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

---

Chapter 4.0 evaluates and describes the following CEQA required topics: impacts considered less-than-significant, significant and irreversible impacts, growth-inducing effects, cumulative, and significant and unavoidable environmental effects.

### CHAPTER 5.0 - ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

---

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the proposed Project and avoid and/or lessen any significant environmental effects of the proposed

Project. Chapter 5.0 provides a comparative analysis between the environmental impacts of the proposed Project and the selected alternatives.

## CHAPTER 6 - REPORT PREPARERS

---

This section lists all authors and agencies that assisted in the preparation of the EIR, by name, title, and company or agency affiliation.

## APPENDICES

---

This section includes all notices and other procedural documents pertinent to the EIR, as well as technical material prepared to support the analysis.

### 1.6 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION(S)

The City of Manteca received five written comment letters on the 1<sup>st</sup> NOP for the proposed Project and five written comment letters on the 2<sup>nd</sup> NOP. A copy of each letter is provided in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. A list of each commenting agency/citizen is provided below. The City also held a public scoping meeting on February 20, 2014 and on January 8, 2015. No written or verbal comments were provided at those scoping meetings.

- SJCOG, Inc. (February 7, 2014)
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (February 25, 2014)
- California Department of Transportation (March 3, 2014)
- San Joaquin County Public Works (March 3, 2014)
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (March 4, 2014)
- Native American Heritage Commission (November 24, 2014)
- Native American Heritage Commission (Amended December 5, 2014)
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (December 10, 2014)
- Neighbors United (December 15, 2014)
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (December 15, 2014)

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

## 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

### REGIONAL LOCATION

---

The Project site is located in the City of Manteca, San Joaquin County. More specifically, the Project site is located to the north and west of the Stadium Shopping Center, to the west of Milo Candini Drive, to the east of McKinley Avenue, to the south of the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF), and to the north of State Route 120. (Figure 2-1 and 2-2).

The project site is located on the Lathrop, California, USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle, Township 2 South, Range 6 East. The UTM coordinates for the center point of the project site are 652688.47536 W, 4183417.94368 N (zone 10N, NAD 83, meters). The Lat/Long coordinates are 37.7853 N, -121.2660 W (WGS 84, decimal degrees). (Figure 2-3)

The Project site is within the city limits and General Project site and has been identified by the City of Manteca to receive services from the City in the 2008 Municipal Services Review.

### EXISTING LAND USES

---

The Project site is within the city limits, currently has a General Plan Land Use designation “Public/Quasi-Public” (PQP), and a zoning designation of PQP. The land is owned entirely by the City of Manteca.

Big League Dreams ballpark is located on the eastern side of, and within, the Project site. The 28-acre site is fully developed with six replica ballparks, an indoor soccer facility, two restaurants and other supporting facilities all of which are open to the public and operated by private sector parties pursuant to ground leases. (Figure 2-4).

Topographic features include level agricultural fields, an irrigation canal, and wetland areas. Elevation ranges from approximately 20 feet to 25 feet above mean sea level (MSL). The site is currently under typical farming practices of row crops with irrigation and harvesting operations. Corn was the dominate crop during the summer of 2014. There is a network of dirt farm roads to access the fields. The irrigation water is supplied from two basins immediately north of the site which are filled with treated municipal waste water and process water. There is a South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) canal that runs diagonally through the site. The SSJID canal (French Camp Outlet Canal) is fed by Drain 7 and Drain 8. These are joint use facilities; used by SSJID during the summer to carry agricultural irrigation and drainage, and by the City of Manteca during the winter to convey storm drainage run-off.

The Project site includes all, or a portion of, the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN): 241-31-53, 241-31-44, 241-31-18, 241-31-32 and portions of APN 241-31-16, 241-30-48, 241-31-48, 241-30-62 and 241-30-61. (Figure 2-5).

The project site is a vacant area that is largely under agricultural use. The only structure located on the property is a single-wide mobile home unit that was formerly used in conjunction with the

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

Manteca Police Department shooting range, which was located on the site. The former shooting range is located approximately at the proposed intersection of the Wawona Street and the Loop Road, which is anticipated to be built in Phase 2 or 3.

There are several dirt farm-roadways that transect the project site. The north-south farm-road that is located just north of the former shooting range serves as a scrap yard for remnant construction and/or farming materials (i.e. remnant pipes, etc.). The area with the remnant construction and/or farming materials is located in an area that is anticipated to be built after Phase 4 (labeled as Future Phases in the Master Plan).

There is overhead transmission line that bisects the project site from the northeast to the southwest. Additionally, there is an irrigation canal that bisects the project site from the south to northwest. The irrigation canal is proposed to be undergrounded.

The project site is located on the fringe of development, with a commercial development and recreational facility located to the east, agricultural land to the northeast, a wastewater treatment plant to the north, a railroad to the northwest, and west, agricultural and rural residential land to the west, and SR 120 to the south.

### SURROUNDING LAND USES

---

**North:** The boundary on the north of the Project site is primarily occupied by the WQCF. The property to the north is zoned PQP (Public/Quasi-Public).

**East:** The parcels to the east of the Big League Dreams portion of the Project site, across Milo Candini Drive, are zoned M1 Light Industrial and PQP.

**South:** The Project site is bordered on the south by SR 120. There is some additional vacant land lying to the south of the westernmost portion of the site. The Project site that lies to the south of Big League Dreams is occupied by the Stadium Shopping Center, and is zoned CG (General Commercial).

**West:** To the west, the Project site is bounded by McKinley Avenue and the Union Pacific Railway right-of-way. The Union Pacific Railway represents the Sphere of Influence boundary for both Manteca and Lathrop. The parcels that are located west of the Union Pacific Railway are designated for Service Commercial and Limited Industrial Uses. There is a small area of land that is west of the Project site, but east of the Union Pacific Railway that is within the Manteca Sphere of Influence, but outside the city limits. This land is designated for Limited Industrial Uses.

The Project site has relatively flat terrain. The UPRR rail lines are located along the western boundary. High voltage power lines, within Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) power line easements, traverse portions of the Project site running northeast/southwest.

---

## ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

---

### Regional Access

The City is strategically located close to and within view of SR 120, which provides primary access to Yosemite from the San Francisco Bay area. The City also lies between two major north-south freeways, I-5 and State Route 99.

Regional access to the Project site is primarily anticipated to be via SR 120 at the Airport Way interchange that lies to the south and east of the property. In the future, an additional SR 120 interchange is planned to be constructed to the south and west of the property at McKinley Avenue. This proposed new interchange (Tier 1 improvement) would provide additional access to the property, particular for those traveling from the Bay Area and points to the west.

### Local Access

Locally, vehicular access will be achieved by public streets and roadways as follows: from Airport Way and then Daniels Street, which runs along the north side of the Stadium Shopping Center. Daniels Street will be extended from its current end point, in a westerly direction across to McKinley Avenue as part of the proposed project.

### Passenger Rail

In addition to vehicular access, regional rail service for commuters to San Jose and Silicon Valley is provided on the by Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), on the Union Pacific Railway Line, with a stop at the Lathrop/Manteca station, which lies to the northwest of the property. The ACE Rail system also has a bus connection to the Dublin/Pleasanton BART station at the Pleasanton stop.

## 2.2 PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ) Master Plan (hereinafter “FEZ”, “Master Plan”, or “Proposed Project”) has been prepared to provide a comprehensive planning document to guide and direct development of the 210.7 acre FEZ Project site. The Master Plan establishes the land uses, development concepts, guidelines and standards based on the goals and policies articulated in the City’s General Plan. The land uses, development standards and design establish the development vision and will facilitate implementation of consistent quality and character for the Project site. The Master Plan is intended to be more specific in guiding and directing development of the Project site.

The Master Plan will serve as the implementation tool for the City of Manteca with the following Goals:

- Enhance the City of Manteca’s Zoning Ordinance for the FEZ Project site
- Provide an opportunity for a multi-use development project

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

- Provide destination recreation, retail, hotel and accessory facilities with the opportunity to supplement existing City facilities and attract tax generation for the City of Manteca
- Establish a framework for development with streamlined implementation
- Provide for a viable phased extension of City infrastructure and services to the FEZ

The Master Plan outlines the following list of Objectives.

- To expand and improve public and community access to the City's existing and thriving investments in regional sports facilities to provide additional community-based facilities to extend the City's position as the primary destination for family-based community recreation, active recreation sports and passive recreation and amenities in Central California.
- To enhance and build upon the regional tourism and visitor-serving attractions providing supporting destination facilities such as hotels, indoor water park and convention/meeting/ exhibition facilities that will facilitate and support the frequency and duration of utilization of the recreation and sports facilities through the FEZ.
- To enhance Manteca's reputation as "The Family City".
- To position Manteca to serve what is projected to be a trend toward a younger population in the region by providing an excellent youth sports and entertainment destination with critical mass to ensure its success.
- To provide facilities that support what has been identified as a growing trend toward family vacations being centered on regional youth, adult, and master's tournaments, as well as league sporting events, that require multiple day stays and can be tied to a variety of visitor interests including special events, education seminars, private events such as conferences, weddings, other social and cultural expositions, all of which are available to the public and the visitors/users of the FEZ.
- Specifically, to capitalize on the success of the Big League Dreams' sports facilities (currently booked weekends, two years in advance), by creating additional critical mass in regional sports and active facilities.
- To provide additional food and beverage facility choices to serve visitors to Manteca and users of the various facilities developed within the boundaries of the FEZ.
- To add to the proven regional draw enjoyed by Woodward Soccer Fields, which further helps to define Manteca as a regional tournament sports destination.
- To accentuate the site's strategic location along SR 120, which serves as the primary vehicular corridor from the Bay Area to Yosemite National Park and the Central Sierra Nevada Mountain areas.

- To raise the City's visibility in the region, particularly for all residents and citizens driving through the region.
- To create a Yosemite/Central Sierra Nevada Visitors Information Center for travelers to utilize on their trip to the national park and nearby national forests.
- To create a business center facility that is available to all groups and can utilize and augment utilization of the various active and passive recreation and sports facilities as well as all ancillary concessions and operations such as support retail and dining facilities.
- To expand upon the thriving regional draw of Bass Pro Shops, which is located on the south side Highway 120 to the southeast.
- To provide a walkable, safe, and friendly leisure and recreation environment for the citizens of Manteca and the region.
- To provide quality indoor and outdoor community gathering spaces for socializing, dining, and entertainment.
- To expand and install a series of public improvements in support of the FEZ, including but not limited to, the east-west vehicular connection between McKinley Avenue and Airport Way, public parking facilities throughout the FEZ, and to facilitate improvements to the storm water drainage system shared by the City and the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID).
- To facilitate the City's economic development and jobs-creation goals and objectives.

## 2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### BACKGROUND

Since 2010, the City of Manteca has been in the process of developing a plan for a comprehensive multipurpose public use zone called the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ). The plan is intended to encompass multiple projects and parcels that provide an extensive recreation complex featuring new and existing recreation, park, water, sports and other leisure amenities. The Project site is intended to be open and accessible to the general public, and to serve the state, region, and the Manteca community as a multipurpose recreation center and public park facility. The FEZ will feature a wide range of active and passive open space and developed uses that will support short term and longer term activities and community events for users ranging from local citizens, day and weekend regional visitors, as well as destination tourists.

The Master Plan for the FEZ was developed in cooperation with the two private sector developers who are proposing to design and build the facility. The Master Plan will provide the appropriate zoning designation for the FEZ as well as provide development standards to implement future development within the Project site.

Projects and uses in the FEZ may be constructed and operated through a series of third party agreements, concessions and/or licensing agreements which may include ground leases of up to 55 years, with some uses needing longer lease terms up to 99 years. Projects and uses may be constructed and operated through a series of private-public partnerships whereby private sector operators and vendors of various public facilities are selected to develop and operate components of the FEZ. These components may include: public active and passive recreation and park facilities and sports amenities, and various commercial operations that are ancillary to the foregoing public facilities.

The FEZ will include public active and passive recreation and sporting facilities to be operated by public agencies and/or private sector vendors or operators, including the addition of the ball fields associated with and adjacent to Big League Dreams (BLD) Park, as well as the addition of multi-purpose playfields, primarily for soccer.

Certain project components will be public visitor serving in support of the extended use of the various public recreation and sporting amenities (such as hotels, restaurants, retail, and conference centers). Proposed and future development projects will include recreation tourism facilities such as overnight lodging, conference/convention/ exhibition facilities and specialized recreation attractions such as an indoor water park available to overnight guests. The primary objective of such uses is to expand the access to current and future public sports and recreation facilities, and expand access for out-of-area public participation in tournaments and training camps. These features will enable and increase the number and duration of extended stay periods for visitors and help facilitate public access for broader uses such as special events and on-site educational activities. Certain components and phases of the FEZ may include commercial retail and restaurant uses that serve park facility patrons and tournament participants and spectators as well as local clientele.

## MASTER PLAN OVERVIEW

---

The Master Plan will create an overlay zone to the existing zoning of Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). The Master Plan includes a comprehensive land plan with design standards and guidelines to guide the development of the 210.7 acres. The Master Plan provides for a multi-use development that offers a significant opportunity for the City of Manteca to attract recreation, entertainment, retail, restaurant, and commercial uses.

The Project site incorporates the existing approximate twenty-eight (28) acre Big League Dreams (BLD) facility and provides an additional twenty-five (25) acres to expand BLD and provide soccer fields. There is approximately sixty-two (62) acres identified for a potential mix of indoor and outdoor entertainment/recreational uses including a location for an outdoor stadium. The Project site provides approximately thirty-three (33) acres of commercial shopping that will generate approximately three hundred sixty thousand (360,000) square feet of retail and dining type uses. There is approximately twenty-nine (29) acres provided for a hotel/lodge, convention center and indoor water park. The balance of the Project site (33.7 acres) is used for roadway infrastructure.

The Master Plan is comprised of four basic design components: Retail and Restaurant, Recreation and Sports, Hotel, and Entertainment. Each is described below.

### **Retail and Restaurant**

The Destination Retail and Restaurant area provides an opportunity to attract job generation and economic development to the west side of Manteca. It is strategically located along the State Route 120 corridor to ensure project visibility for future end-users, and to provide access to the State Route 120 corridor. The relationship to the existing and proposed recreational facilities and the hotel provides for customer base.

### **Recreation and Sports**

The proposed recreational and sports uses serve to augment the existing and established success of Big League Dreams. This will serve as the integral part of the overall Project site providing passive and active open space, recreation areas, sports fields, stadiums, as well as gathering spaces for the community. Located throughout the Project site, the recreation areas will remain easily accessible to all users of the FEZ through a well-integrated and well-planned internal street network that encourages both bicycle and pedestrian use.

### **Hotel**

The proposed hotel site will serve to provide lodging for users coming into town for the destination experience. It is to be a full service hotel with additional recreational and dining opportunities. A convention center shall be provided with the hotel and the hotel shall also provide recreation facilities that are complimentary to the FEZ, such as a water park.

### **Entertainment**

The proposed entertainment areas serve to provide enjoyment for the whole family. Through thoughtful design this central piece of the FEZ will serve to bring people together to enjoy communal leisure time. It will be comprised of a variety of recreation and leisure activities which may include: miniature golf, golf cart racers, arcade games, and Laser-tag, among other things.

## **PLAN ADOPTION AND REGULATION**

The Master Plan is intended to be adopted by the City Council and to serve as a tool for the City of Manteca to implement. The Master Plan is to be used by designers, developers, builders, and planners, to guide development of the Project site. The land use, development standards, and design guidelines are provided to ensure that all proposed developments remain consistent with the vision established by the Master Plan as the Project is built over time. The Master Plan development concepts, design guidelines, and standards are in accordance with the City's General Plan, Municipal Ordinances, and City Standard Plans and Specifications. The Master Plan shall be used to review, process, and approve development proposals for the Project site including but not limited to site specific development applications and site improvement plans.

Formation of one or more Community Facilities Districts (CFD) is also anticipated for the FEZ. The objective in forming CFDs is to provide financing for public improvements associated with the project, which may supplement funds available from former redevelopment bond proceeds.

### LAND USE AND ARCHITECTURE

---

#### **Land Use Concept**

The Master Plan provides a comprehensive land use planning tool that provides the framework for development of the approximately 210.7 acre Project site. The intent of the Master Plan is to ensure a quality built environment that integrates a mix of land uses under a single uniform set of design and development standards. The FEZ Master Plan intends to build upon the success of the Big League Dreams facility by providing additional sports and field recreation, hotel and tourism, entertainment, retail, commercial and restaurant uses along the highly visible State Route 120 corridor. Although the FEZ may develop in multiple phases as individual land use/planning areas, the Master Plan will help the separate phases come together and operate as a cohesive and integrated entertainment/recreational facility.

The Master Project site is divided into 16 Planning Areas (“PAs”) with five land use categories to group similar land uses: Retail and Restaurant, Entertainment, Hotel Resort, Recreation and Sport (fields), and Parking. Table 2.0-1 provides a summary of the planning areas.

It is to be noted that Planning Areas 1-15 and Planning Area 16 have distinct design concepts that are defined independently of each other through the Master Plan. Planning Areas 1-15 are to be developed with an ‘Early California’ architectural and landscape theme. Planning Area 16 is a ‘Natural Rustic’ architectural and landscape theme. These two distinct themes work together to create a dynamic Master Plan with integrated uses and an integrated theme of Early California and Natural Rustic with Daniels St. creating the transition between the two themes.

The Planning Areas serve as the basis for all of the land use and development recommendations contained in the FEZ Master Plan. Table 2.0-2 below provides the Permitted, Conditionally Permitted and Not Permitted Use for each Planning Area. The uses shown as Permitted (P) are those uses which are deemed acceptable anywhere within that Planning Area. The Permitted uses are the land uses that, when developed in accordance with the FEZ Master Plan, will not require special requirements in order to address land use compatibility. The uses shown as Conditionally Permitted (C) require special consideration so they may be properly located and/or conditionally operated with respect to their effects on surrounding properties/land uses. Conditionally Permitted uses may require special conditions to make them acceptable at particular locations. To maintain the vision and purpose of the FEZ and to minimize incompatible characteristics, the Master Plan includes a list of Not Permitted (N) land uses per planning area.

**TABLE 2.0-1: PLANNING AREA PROJECT BUILD-OUT SUMMARY**

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Projected Land use</i>	<i>Gross Land Area (acre)</i>
PA-1	Outdoor Sports Fields	11.68
PA-1a	New Baseball/Softball Field	3.08
PA-1b	New Baseball/Softball Field	2.61
PA-2	Outdoor Sports Fields	4.02
PA-2a	Outdoor Sports Fields	3.32
PA-3	Retail, Food & Beverage	2.94
PA-4	Main Street Retail	3.61
PA-5	Retail, Dining and Entertainment	27.33
PA-6	Future FEZ Expansion	12.63
PA-7	Adventure Zone	6.97
PA-8	Indoors Sports	3.55
PA-9	Family Entertainment	6.95
PA-10	Family Entertainment	5.25
PA-11	Stadium	12.44
PA-12	Speed Zone/Outdoor Sports	8.99
PA-13	Parking	3.06
PA-14	Parking	4.22
PA-15	Parking	3.19
PA-16	Hotel, Conference Center & Indoor Water Park	28.03
FEZ Planning Area Totals		153.87
Existing Big League Dreams Site		28.43
Roads / R.O.W.		27.89
McKinley Avenue R.O.W. Expansion		0.48
<b>Totals</b>		<b>210.67</b>

**TABLE 2.0-2: PERMITTED AND CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USES**

Table 2.0.1 Permitted and Conditionally Permitted Uses																
FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PLANNING AREAS																
USES (see Appendix A)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1 Local public service and utilities	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
2 Temporary buildings and uses (1)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
3 Accessory uses (when located on the same parcel as the principal use and the principal use is conforming)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
4 Agricultural Tourism (2)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N
5 Community Garden	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N
6 Equestrian Facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N
7 Kennel, Dog Training Facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N
8 Hotel and Lodge including recreational facilities & conventional center	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
9 Assembly Uses	N	N	P	P	P	N	P	P	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	P
10 Indoor Amusement/Entertainment Facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
11 Indoor Fitness and Sports Facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
12 Outdoor Commercial Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
13 Outdoor Community Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	P
14 Park and Public Plaza	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	P
15 Recreational Vehicle Park	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N
16 Resource-Related Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N
17 School, Specialized Education and Training/Studio	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N
18 Theater/Auditorium	N	N	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	C	N	N	N	P
19 Parking Facility (3)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
20 Public Safety Facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
21 Child Day Care Center	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
22 Neighborhood Market	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
23 Office, Business and Professional	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
24 Personal Services	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
25 Restaurants, Cafes, Eating & Drinking Establishments	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
26 Drive-In & Drive-Through Use	N	N	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	N	N	N	N	N
27 Bar/Nightclub	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
28 Retail, General	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
29 Equipment Sales and Rental	N	N	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	N	N	N	N	N
30 Educational, cultural, institutional, and recreational uses serving the greater community	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
31 Auto & Vehicle Rental (4)	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
32 Residential	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
33 Broadcasting and Recording Studio	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
34 Wireless Telecommunication Facility- Major	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
34 Wireless Telecommunication Facility- Minor	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
35 Man-made Lake and recreational facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	P	P	N	P	N	N	N	N

P = Permitted  
 C = Conditionally Permitted  
 N = Not Permitted

Notes:

1. Temporary uses require a Temporary Use Permit per Manteca Zoning Ordinance.
2. See also following page for continued operation of Legal Non-conforming agricultural uses.
3. Parking Structures may be restricted in PA-13, PA-14 and PA-15.
4. Only if associated with specific recreational uses that take place as part of FEZ such as bicycles, paddle boats, etc.
5. Any outdoor storage that is integral to the operation of a permitted or conditionally permitted use shall be screened from view from public street. Refer to Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 17.80.
6. Number to left of uses corresponds to definitions in Appendix A.

Additionally, to help the FEZ develop with a cohesive design and appearance, the Master Plan provides development recommendations for the various Planning Areas within the FEZ. The

development standards are specific to PA-1 through PA-15, collectively, with separate development standards for PA-16. The development standards and guidelines are intended to work in conjunction with the City of Manteca’s Zoning Ordinance. In some cases the Master Plan standards may conflict with or may be more or less restrictive than the City’s Zoning Ordinance. In these circumstances, the Master Plan design recommendations shall be used. Any regulations not contained or illustrated in the Master Plan are deferred to the regulations contained in the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

**Development Requirements**

The FEZ Master Plan is an overlay zone and therefore provides its own zoning regulations and requirements. Below are the development requirements and recommendations for the individual FEZ planning areas. The development requirements and recommendations are intended to work in conjunction with the City of Manteca’s Zoning Ordinance. In some cases the FEZ Master Plan requirements may conflict with or may be more or less restrictive than the City’s Zoning Ordinance. In these circumstances, the FEZ Master Plan design requirements shall take precedence. Any regulations not contained or illustrated in the FEZ Master Plan are deferred to the regulations contained in the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Table 2.0-3 presents the development requirements for the different planning areas.

The restrictions associated with site planning, structure placement (clearances), landscape, etc. within this master plan area shall meet the requirements of the utility easements that traverse the Master Plan Area (existing and proposed) as described in Section 4 of the Master Plan. In all cases, development shall adhere to the requirements of this Master Plan and the utility easement restrictions.

**TABLE 2.0-3 FEZ DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

<b>HOTEL/RESORT</b>	<b>PA-16</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>	
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	45% If a parking structure is provided for PA-16 the allowable FAR may be increased up to an additional 10% with conditional approval upon site plan review. Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>	
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.
<b>Building Setbacks</b>	
Street setback	Any building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of twenty-five (25') feet.
Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)	There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.
<b>Building Massing</b>	
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be eighty-five (85') feet. The vertical distance from grade plane to the average height of the highest roof surface shall not exceed 85'. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures or for design and architectural

## 2.0

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

	elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.
<b>RETAIL AND RESTAURANT</b>	<b>PA-3, PA-4, PA-5</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>	
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	PA-3: 50% PA-4: 35% PA-5: 35% Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>	
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.
<b>Building Setbacks</b>	
Street setback	Any building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of ten (10') feet.
Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)	There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.
<b>Building Massing</b>	
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be thirty-five (35') feet. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures, or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.
<b>RECREATION AND SPORTS</b>	<b>PA-1, PA-2, PA-11</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>	
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	25% Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>	
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.
<b>Building Setbacks</b>	
Street setback	Any active sports field, building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of ten (10') feet.
Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)	There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.
<b>Building Massing</b>	
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be fifty-five (55') feet. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.
<b>ENTERTAINMENT</b>	<b>PA-6, PA-7, PA-8, PA-9, PA-10, PA-12</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>	

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	50% Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>	
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.
<b>Building Setbacks</b>	
Street setback	Any active sports field, building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of ten (10') feet.
Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)	There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.
<b>Building Massing</b>	
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be fifty-five (55') feet. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.

### Off-Street Parking Requirements

The Manteca Municipal Code Parking requirements, Title 17 Chapter 17.52, shall apply to the FEZ Master Plan except as modified in the Master Plan. The design of off-street parking facilities including drive aisles and parking stall dimensions shall comply with Manteca Municipal Code. Section 3 of the Master Plan provides off-street parking concepts and layouts. Off-street parking shall be provided for the primary use of each Planning Area. Table 2.0-4 shows the minimum off-street parking requirements for uses anticipated to locate in the FEZ. The Manteca Municipal Code shall be used for any use not specifically listed.

**TABLE 2.0-4 REQUIRED OFF-STREET PARKING**

Use (PA-13, PA-14, PA-15)	Required Parking Spaces
Assembly Uses	1 space per three (3) fixed seats, or if the assembly does not have fixed seats, 1 space per 50 square feet of primary assembly area
Indoor Amusement / Entertainment Facility	1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area
Indoor Fitness and Sports Facility	1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area
Outdoor Commercial Recreation	1 space per 500 square feet of active recreation area
Personal Services	1 space per 200 square feet of gross floor area
Resort Facility - including Hotel, Conference Center, Restaurants/Shops and Water Park	2.1 spaces per guest room
Restaurants, Cafes, Bars, and Other Eating and Drinking Establishments	7 spaces per 1000 square feet of gross floor area

Retail	1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area
Sports Fields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseball / Softball</li> <li>- Football</li> <li>- Soccer</li> </ul>	32 spaces per field 64 spaces per field 32 spaces per field
Sports Stadium with fixed seating	1 space per 96" bench seating (assume 24" seat)
Visitor Center	1 space per 50 square feet

### Landscape Requirements for Off-Street Parking Areas

Off-street parking areas will require landscaping per the standards established in the FEZ Master Plan Section 3.4 and 3.5 and by the Manteca Municipal Code (Section 17.48.050.K).

### Planning Areas and Summary

A land use plan is shown in Figure 2-6. Figure 2-7a illustrates the planning areas and Figure 2-7b presents the tentative parcel map. It is envisioned that the FEZ Planning Areas will develop within four broader land use categories. The following is a brief overview of the potential land uses within the land use categories and Planning Areas.

#### ***Retail and Restaurants – (PA-3, PA-4, and PA-5)***

- Open-air Retail, Dining, and Entertainment Village
  - Man-made lake / retention basin (see Section 4.3 – Infrastructure for a definition of the two options). If the lake option is selected, it is to be an amenity, with the potential of personal paddle craft and/or kayaks, but not a swimming facility
  - Lakeside/Basin edge boardwalk promenade with semi-pervious paving
  - Retail shops
  - Restaurants, cafes, bistros, coffee shops, micro-brewery
  - Small outdoor amphitheater
  - Outdoor entertainment / performance plaza

#### ***Entertainment – (PA-6, PA-7, PA-9, PA-10, PA-12)***

- Family Entertainment
  - Miniature golf, family arcade games, Laser-tag, Ball Crawl, etc.
  - Rock-climbing wall, ropes course, Flow-rider, zip-line, hard surface skate park
- Outdoor Sports/ Speed Zone
  - BMX course
  - Electric motorized mini-car race course

#### ***Hotel/Resort – (PA-16)***

- Resort:
  - This parcel is envisioned to be occupied by a destination hotel oriented toward tourism and leisure, primarily for families, but also to serve business conferences.
  - Indoor and outdoor water park
  - Conference center

#### ***Recreation and Sports – (PA-1, PA-1a, PA-1b, PA-2, PA-2a, PA-8, PA-11)***

- Outdoor Regional Sports Zone
  - Existing Big League Dreams complex
  - Additional baseball fields for Big League Dreams
  - Multi-purpose/soccer fields in varying sizes
  - \* Note: Play fields are expected to be available for use as public open space prior to 4:30PM on weekdays.
- Indoor All-season Sports Center
  - Basketball, volleyball, cheerleading, gymnastics
- Championship Playfield
  - International-sized multi-purpose play field with fixed stadium seating.

#### ***Parking – (PA-13, PA-14 and PA-15)***

- Parking Zones:
  - FEZ parking areas
  - Easements

#### **Architectural Design Recommendations (PA-1 through PA-15)**

The FEZ Design Recommendations for PA-1 through PA-15 provides architectural design parameters that are intended to deliver a cohesive appearance by establishing an overall design theme for this destination family entertainment, sports, retail/restaurant, and parking facility in Manteca. The purpose of these design recommendations is to promote aesthetic quality, and to document the selected architectural styles with enough information to permit developers and their design team to accurately present the preferred architectural style. The overall architectural theme for the FEZ is Early California. There are two complimentary architectural styles that will depict the Early California character: Monterey and Spanish Colonial. By showing examples of selected architectural styles and referencing the range of detailing within the styles, a historic context or style of architecture can be documented. This permits high quality architectural design to occur, while still considering current construction codes, and freedom to provide unique and inventive design solutions.

The Master Plan provides defined examples of Monterey and Spanish Colonial styles so that the developer/designer can see specific elements that differentiate the two styles so that one can be selected and more clearly defined in the design. The Master Plan also provides the specific recommendations for all of the Planning Areas 1-15 that must be met for approval, inclusive of either the Monterey or the Spanish Colonial style. Additionally, the Master Plan provides the recommendations associated with site planning and development.

In addition to the required design elements as provided in the Master Plan, all designs shall be consistent with current codes and the design review process associated with FEZ and the City of Manteca Site Plan Application review process.

#### ***Community Vision and Architectural Design Style***

The architectural style known as Early California is foundation for the theme of the built environment in this development project. The style is deeply rooted in the romance of centuries-old Spanish architectural vernacular and was developed as modern California history began to

unfold. The two types of styles that are generally associated with Early California are Spanish Colonial and Monterey styles

### ***Architectural Design***

The Master Plan includes general architectural design recommendations that apply to these planning areas, as well as specific design recommendations that apply to the Spanish Colonial and Monterey styles that will be developed in these planning areas. These recommendations cover the following:

- General
  - Building Form, Massing, and Scale
  - Roof Standards
  - Wall Standards
  - Material Standards
  - Color Standards
- Spanish Colonial and Monterey
  - Exterior Materials
  - Roofs
  - Windows
  - Design Features
  - Colors

### ***Site Planning Elements (PA-1 through PA-15)***

The Master Plan has a variety of site planning elements that are covered for these planning areas. These include the following:

- Entry Treatment
- Site Planning Parameters
- Building Orientation
- Pedestrian Orientation of Buildings
- Common Open Space
- Service Areas
- Easements

### **Architectural Design Recommendations for PA-16**

These Design Recommendations apply only to Planning Area PA-16 for the development of a hotel and Conference Center facility. Figure 2-8 presents a detailed site plan for the Hotel site (PA-16). The Master Plan provides a breakdown of required and recommended Architectural treatment for PA-16.

### ***Community Vision and Architectural Design Style for PA-16***

The architectural style known as Natural Rustic is to be the foundational influence for the theme of the built environment for PA-16. The hotel structure(s) shall be a marriage of organic yet simple-lined superstructure and classic mountain retreat detailing at a human scale. Iconic log exterior

details shall emulate the vernacular of a historic National Park lodge, while adjacent towers are to settle in as simple massing. The overall massing of the hotel is to be influenced by a more contemporary, simple, articulated facade, and the points of entry shall incorporate details influenced by structures such as the Grand Canyon Lodge.

### ***Architectural Design for PA-16***

The Master Plan includes general architectural design standards that apply to this planning area, as well as specific design standards that apply to the Natural Rustic style that will be developed in the planning area. These include standards cover the following:

- General
  - Building Form Massing and Scale
  - Building Material Standards
  - Roof Material Standards
  - Colors and Finishes - Standards
  - Accessory Elements and Screening - Standards
  - Trash Enclosures - Standards
  - Mechanical Equipment - Standards
  - Natural Gas Meters, Electrical meters, Site Utilities and Equipment
  - Exterior Architectural Lighting Standards

### ***Site Planning Recommendations for PA-16***

The Master Plan has a variety of site planning guidelines that are covered for this planning area. These include the following:

- Entry Treatment
- Building Orientation
- Pedestrian Orientation and Circulation

## **Other Design Recommendations**

The Master Plan includes a variety of other important recommendations to facilitate the desired design. These include: 1) Sustainable Development Guidelines and Environmental Considerations, and 2) Sign Regulations.

## **CIRCULATION AND PARKING**

---

### **Circulation Plan**

The Circulation Plan includes Circulation Standards, rights-of-way standards, roundabout standards, internal circulation standards, parking standards, public transit, and non-vehicular circulation, each of which is discussed in detail in the Master Plan. Figure 2-9a, 2-9b, and 2-9c depict the vehicle circulation, non-vehicle circulation, and parking plan.

The circulation network for FEZ consists of: two partial existing major collector roads, the provision of minor collector streets, bike lanes and pedestrian paths, and future public transportation routes. The primary goal of the FEZ circulation plan is to provide safe and efficient movement of

vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians within the Project site while also facilitating safe and efficient connections to the existing street and highway network.

Access to the Project site will be provided by Daniels Street which provides a direct link from the Project site to the existing South Airport Way interchange at State Route 120. South Airport Way also provides access to the heart of downtown Manteca. Milo Candini Drive will be extended in the future (under a separate project) to the north where it will intersect Yosemite Avenue that provides access to Manteca. Additionally, the Project is designed and planned so that as development of the McKinley Avenue/State Route 120 interchange to the west of the Project site occurs, there will be a connection from the Project site to State Route 120 in both the east and west directions.

Improvements within the Project site include the establishment of a new internal circulation network as well as the extension and enhancement of existing streets. The proposed vehicular circulation system will provide convenient and safe access to all locations within the Project site. The planned street network provides access to all planned uses from Daniels Street and its extension to McKinley Avenue, and Milo Candini Drive via two collector streets which link to a Loop Road central to the Project site.

All streets within the Project site are designed with sidewalks on both sides of the street, with the exception of the Buffer Street along the northern property boundary. A well-integrated street and sidewalk system and street landscaping along the streets coupled with both Class I bike paths and Class II bikeways along the roadways promotes pedestrian and bicycle use throughout the Project site.

Daniels Street, a partially existing right-of-way, is classified as a major collector road in the City of Manteca's General Plan Circulation Element and the portion of Daniels Street that is aligned through the Project site will be implemented as part of this Plan. New rights-of-way within the Project site are:

- Major Collectors:
  - 'A' Street - Daniels Street,
  - 'B' Street - Milo Candini Drive
  
- Minor Collectors:
  - Street 'B1' - Wawona Street
  - Street 'C1' - Connector Road/bikeway
  - 'C' Street - Loop Road,
  - 'D' Street - Buffer Road

### **Circulation Standards**

The Master Plan includes cross sections and a street layout, which will serve as roadway development standards and dimensions for the project. All streets within the FEZ must be lined with street trees and include sidewalks.

One of the central features of the circulation system is a roundabout that includes vehicular and pedestrian circulation, bike path and pedestrian crossings, and landscape. The requirements of the roundabout are as follows:

- Provide for safe and efficient vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation.
- Allow for clear views through and about the roundabout for all users to clearly see each other.
- Central landscape element that uses similar landscape treatment as the Loop Road. Include landscape up-lighting.
- Use of enhanced paving materials is encouraged and may include raised paving ‘tables’ at each pedestrian crossing location.
- Provide a 10’ wide mortared cobble rumble strip at edge of center island of roundabout.
- There shall be clear and code-compliant signage leading up to the roundabout for vehicles, pedestrians, and non-motorized vehicles to safely navigate the roundabout and the crossings. Signage shall be integrated into the roundabout, median, and parkway strip to allow for clear views while enhancing the overall aesthetic.

The secondary, smaller roundabouts are located at Wawona St. and Milo Candini Dr. and at Loop Road and Connector Road. They are also to be provided at Buffer Road and Milo Candini Dr. and Connector Road, but only to be installed when potential future north extensions of either of these streets are constructed. Right-of-way width must be provided for the construction of these future secondary roundabout locations.

The secondary roundabouts are designed to provide ease of circulation through the intersections with minimal conflicts. They consist of a raised mountable (or rolled) curbed circle in the middle of the intersection with minimum 8’ wide wet-set cobble (or other drive-over material) rumble strip, vertical raised curb, and planting in the center. There are small medians in the center of the streets as they lead up to the roundabouts to direct vehicular circulation in the counterclockwise rotation around. The medians may be planted, but are to have a minimum of wet-set cobble (or other drive-over material) and shall also provide a safety zone for pedestrians crossing. The requirements of the secondary roundabouts are the same as the primary roundabouts, but these are smaller in scale.

## INFRASTRUCTURE

The infrastructure for the planning areas was planned in accordance with the City of Manteca Standards, and in consultation with Manteca Public Works staff. All proposed improvements are consistent with the City’s adopted Master Plans, specifically: City of Manteca 2005 Water Master Plan (Kennedy/Jenks), City of Manteca 2012 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (NV5), and the City of Manteca 2013 Storm Drain Master Plan.

Generally, all proposed master utility infrastructure components will be constructed within proposed street rights-of-way. However, two major utility corridors (easements) are proposed within the Project site; one at the west and northwest boundary of the Project site and one that borders the west edge of the Big League Dreams complex. These corridors are anticipated to be approximately 50 feet wide to accommodate various utilities. There will also be three storm drainage storage facilities (basins and/or park/basins and a lake).

### **Water Master Plan**

The City of Manteca currently provides domestic water to its customers via a network of wells and transmission lines which draw groundwater and distribute throughout the City. The City also provides treated surface water via the South County Surface Water Supply Project (SCSWSP), a joint project with the South San Joaquin Irrigation District, the City of Lathrop, the City of Tracy, and the City of Escalon.

*Existing Facilities:* Existing distribution improvements in the vicinity of the FEZ include a 12" main in Daniels Street, extending from Airport Way to the west end of Daniels Street, and a 12" main in Milo Candini Drive extending from Daniels Street to the north limits of Big League Dreams. North of the project, there is an existing 12-inch line in Yosemite Avenue.

*Proposed Facilities:* The FEZ will receive water service by extending the existing distribution system through the proposed development. Specifically, a 12-inch distribution main will be installed within the proposed alignment of Milo Candini from its current northern terminal to Yosemite Avenue, providing a looped connection between Daniels Street and Yosemite Avenue. This system will be further extended through the development with 12-inch lines in the loop road and Wawona Street, as well as Daniels Street to McKinley Avenue. This will provide a reliable distribution network to serve the proposed uses within the project. Smaller water lines (not shown in the master plan) will be installed as needed to extend water from the 12-inch distribution mains to the proposed developments. No additional water supply (well) or storage (tank) will be required for the development of the project.

*Recycled Water:* The City has plans to develop a recycled water system that will provide landscape irrigation water to public parks, landscaping, etc., with recycled water from the City's Water Quality Control Facility (WQCF). The FEZ will be a natural recipient of this recycled water due to its close proximity to the WQCF and its large areas of open space/park. Proposed recycled water improvements within the Project site will include the installation of 12-inch distribution mains extending from the WQCF south along the west side of the WQCF to Wawona Street and then east to the proposed utility corridor west of Big League Dreams and then south to connect to the existing recycled water line in Daniels Street. These recycled water lines will be charged from the domestic system initially, but will ultimately be disconnected from the City's domestic system and isolated as a recycled water (purple pipe) system. This means that the project proponent will install recycled water infrastructure within the outdoor landscaping areas, including medians, to make the project available for the use of reclaimed water, even if it is not available at the time the landscape is installed. Figure 2-10 depicts both the existing and proposed master water distribution system components described above.

## **Sewer Master Plan**

*Existing Facilities:* The City of Manteca currently provides sanitary sewer service to its customers via a network of gravity and force main sewer lines. Several pump stations and lift stations located throughout the City augment this sewer line network. This conveyance system terminates at the City of Manteca Water Quality Control Facility (WQCF), located directly north of the Project site.

Properties south of SR 120 are served by the South Manteca Trunk line, which consists of a combination of gravity lines and force mains, and terminating into the Tara Park pump station, which conveys the sewer flows to the WQCF via an 18-inch force main that crosses under SR 120 and runs through the Project site just west of Big League Dreams. Both Big League Dreams and the commercial development southeast of the Project site connect into this force main with individual pump stations. An existing 12-inch sewer force main located on the west end of the Project site conveys industrial sewer flows to the WQCF. There is an existing 36-inch gravity effluent line that traverses the northwest portion of the Project site delivering irrigation water to City-owned agricultural fields in the project vicinity and privately-owned agricultural fields south of SR 120.

*Proposed Facilities:* The City of Manteca Wastewater Collection System Master Plan calls for a 48-inch to 54-inch diameter sewer trunk line through the Project site to replace the existing force main serving the southern portion of Manteca. This trunk line will extend from the existing 60-inch gravity line that has been stubbed just south of SR 120 to an existing 60-inch stub within the WQCF. This trunk line will be constructed with the development of land on the Project site inside the east utility corridor. Sanitary sewer generated by the FEZ will be conveyed to this trunk line via 8-inch gravity sewer lines located within proposed street rights-of-way.

The City has plans for an additional 36-inch gravity effluent line and one more 12-inch force main to be located along the western edge of the Project site. The existing 36-inch gravity effluent line will be relocated into the west utility corridor, and the new effluent lines will be installed alongside it. The existing 12-inch industrial waste force main will also be relocated into this utility corridor. Figure 2-11 depicts both the existing and proposed master sewer collection system components described above.

## **Storm Drain Master Plan**

The City of Manteca currently provides storm drainage via a system of gravity storm drain lines which terminate at detention or retention facilities. Existing detention facilities discharge into a network of open channel and underground pipes owned and maintained by the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID). SSJID facilities eventually drain into the French Camp Outlet Canal (FCOC).

The Project site is bisected by the FCOC and two SSJID drain lines that feed into it (Drain 7 and Drain 8). Drain 7 travels underground within a box culvert in Daniels St. and daylights into an open ditch at the west terminal of Daniels St. Drain 8 conveys agricultural drainage and storm-water runoff from properties south of Highway 120 and travels under the highway in a box culvert and lets out into an open ditch that travels north to its confluence with Drain 7 to form the FCOC. The FCOC travels northwest across the Project site and then follows the alignment of the Union Pacific

Railroad to the north. Storm drain runoff from all existing development within or near the FEZ (including Big League Dreams and the commercial development to the southeast) pump their runoff into this drain system. Big League Dreams maintains a storm drain basin on the west side of the Project site that will eventually be replaced with additional ball fields and other facilities as part of the Master Plan. When this development occurs, the storage volume lost by the development of this basin will be replaced with the development of the Lake.

Development of the FEZ will require the relocation of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8. It is proposed that each of these facilities ultimately be converted from an open water canal to an underground conveyance system, and that these facilities will be routed north through the east utility corridor (just west of Big League Dreams) to the northern property boundary, then west to the current FCOC canal next to the railroad. The ultimate undergrounding of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 may be completed in phases. It is anticipated that the first phase would include undergrounding the portions of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 that occur within the Planning Area 16 in association with the hotel resort facility (i.e. from the southern project boundary to a point just north of Daniels Road). The balance of the FCOC is anticipated to be relocated to the new north-south alignment from Daniels to the northern property boundary then west to the existing FCOC as shown Figure 2-12; however, this section may be temporarily left as an open water canal until such time that the Planning Areas north of Daniels are developed. It is also possible that portions of the realigned FCOC (i.e. the east-west segment located along the northern project boundary) could be left open water in perpetuity as a buffer between the project and the WQCF.

It is anticipated that The FCOC carries a peak flow of approximately 150 cubic feet per second (cfs). To accommodate this flow, the channel will be replaced with dual 60-inch pipes. Installation of this conveyance system is expected to occur with the first phase of infrastructure, along with the construction of the Daniel Street extension to McKinley Avenue.

The Project site is divided into three major watersheds (each consisting of two sub-sheds). Runoff from each watershed will be collected by a network of pipe systems and conveyed to a storage facility serving the watershed. The peak volume from the design storm will be retained in the storage facility and then emptied (pumped) into the FCOC off-peak (when capacity in the FCOC is available). The three watersheds are described below:

- Watershed A (80 acres): This watershed consists of the north (A2) and northwest (A1) portions of the project. Runoff from this watershed will be conveyed to a basin located along the north edge of the site, just east of Street C1. In order to reduce the size of this basin, the future parking lots under the power line easements will be designed to accommodate an average of 3 inches of storage above the pavement during the design storm.
- Watershed B (87 acres): This watershed consists of the retail commercial area located at the center of the project (B1) and Big League Dreams (B2). Runoff from this watershed will be stored in a detention facility central to the commercial area. Two options are being explored; 1) a detention pond and 2) a lake. If Option 1 is chosen, it will operate much like other basins in the project. However, if Option 2 is chosen, the water elevation in the lake

will be established to maintain approximately 24-inches freeboard that will serve as the storage area for peak runoff. Additionally, the Big League Dreams Parking lot will retain runoff during a peak storm to an average depth of 4 inches. Storage in the Lake will be pumped into the FCOC via a pump station and force main.

- **Watershed C (44 acres):** This watershed consists of PA-16 (C2&C3) and the Southwest (C1) portion of the project. Runoff from this watershed will be conveyed to dual basins located at the south side of PA-16. These basins will be hydraulically connected and will outfall into Drain 8 via a storm drain pump station. Additionally, the two large parking lots within PA-16 site will retain an average of 6 inches of storage above the pavement during the design storm.
- **OPTION:** The city is considering sending the runoff from sub-shed C-2 to Basin B instead of Basin C. Sub-shed C-2 may require a lift station and force main to access Basin B. If this option is selected, Basin B will increase in volume (the storage volume required for sub-shed C3), and Basin C will decrease in volume by this same amount. This option can only be chosen if Option 1 is not implemented as outlined above.

The proposed storm drain system will include water quality features designed in conformance with the standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region, the City of Manteca, and SSJID. Storm water regulations for construction projects using Best Management Practices will be incorporated into the design. Discharge flow rates from each detention facility into the FCOC will be in conformance with the requirements of the City of Manteca and the SSJID. Figure 2-12 depicts both the proposed storm drainage components described above.

### **Telephone Service**

Telephone service will be provided to the FEZ by Verizon Communications. Verizon currently owns and operates a telephone service network throughout the City of Manteca and will augment its existing facilities in the project vicinity and extend service into the Project site as necessary to serve the FEZ.

### **Electric Service**

Electricity will be provided to the FEZ by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). PG&E currently owns and operates an electric service network throughout the City of Manteca. It is anticipated that PG&E will augment its existing electric service facilities in the vicinity and extend service into the Project site in order to serve the FEZ.

### **Natural Gas**

Natural gas will be provided to the FEZ by PG&E. PG&E currently owns and operates a natural gas service network throughout the City of Manteca. It is anticipated that PG&E will augment its existing natural gas facilities in the vicinity and extend service into the Project site in order to serve the FEZ.

### **Cable Television**

Cable television will be provided to the FEZ by Comcast. Comcast currently owns and operates a cable television network throughout the City of Manteca. It is anticipated that Comcast will augment its existing cable television facilities in the vicinity and extend service into the Project site in order to serve the FEZ.

### **Supporting Public Service Facilities - Public Safety/Police and Fire Services**

The City of Manteca Police Department is the local law enforcement entity that would serve the FEZ. The Manteca Police Department currently operates on a four or five beat system, meaning the Police Department's service area is divided into four or five territories for police officer patrols. The Police Department evaluates and adjusts beats based on call volumes and the number of officers available for patrol.

The City of Manteca Fire Department provides services from any/all fire stations within the city, and is supplemented by mutual aid agreements with neighboring fire protection districts. Service to the Project site would be enhanced and increased at the discretion of the City of Manteca, based upon calls for service trends and special events.

## **LANDSCAPE AND OPEN SPACE**

---

### **Landscape Vision**

The Landscape Vision is inclusive of sport fields, parkways, bike lanes, lake, pedestrian-oriented open space, coordinated street tree network, entry features, signage, and buffer landscape spaces. The Master Plan includes Landscape Design Guidelines and Standards that cover the following topics:

- Entry Features
- Streetscape Landscape Features
- Pedestrian-Oriented Public Open Space
- Fencing
- Street Lighting
- Site Furniture
- Landscape and Irrigation System

## **ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION**

---

### **Implementation of the Plan**

The Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ) Master Plan is the mechanism to ensure that all future development within the Plan Area is consistent with the City of Manteca General Plan. The Master Plan will serve as a tool for the City of Manteca to implement the development of the Plan Area. Every effort has been made with the FEZ Master Plan to provide policies and regulations that are specific to the FEZ Plan Area.

If any situation arises in the implementation of the Master Plan that is not addressed by specific development regulations or guidelines or if an issue, condition, or situation arises that is not clearly addressed in the Master Plan, the Community Development Director (“Director”) shall provide an interpretation based on such City codes, goals, policies, plans and requirements as most closely related to the subject matter of the issue or situation to be interpreted.

In some cases the Master Plan standards may conflict with or be more restrictive than the City’s Zoning Ordinance. In these circumstances, the FEZ Master Plan standards and guidelines shall prevail. For any matters not specifically addressed by the Master Plan, the Manteca Municipal Code shall apply and shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of the FEZ Master Plan.

Subsequent to adoption of the Master Plan, individual project applications will be reviewed to determine consistency with the Master Plan, the FEZ Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and any other applicable City of Manteca regulatory documents. All future applications including but not limited to Site Plans, Tentative Subdivision Maps, and Use Permits within the Plan Area will be subject to the requirements of this Master Plan and EIR.

Development Applications will be submitted to the City of Manteca Community Development Department and subject to the Fee Schedule adopted by City Council. The Community Development Department will conduct an initial review of the application for completeness and consistency with the adopted Master Plan, the FEZ EIR as well as other ordinances and standards. The Community Development Director may require additional studies and/or analyses that may include but not limited to: traffic and infrastructure studies.

The Community Development Director, acting upon any application that is determined to be complete shall process each individual project subject to entitlement processing as defined in the City's Municipal Code, Title 17, Zoning.

If the City determines that an Amendment to the Master Plan is warranted, an Amendment to the Master Plan may be requested. The request must provide adequate justification.

### **Master Plan Phasing**

Development of the FEZ will depend on market conditions and demand for infrastructure. A conceptual phasing scenario was put together to illustrate potential phasing of the project (Figure 2-13); however, the conceptual phasing scenario is not intended to restrict development of later phases just because a phase has not built out. The real-world phasing will be based on market. Phase 1 is intended to develop immediately following project entitlements/approvals (estimated 2015/2016 construction start with an open for operation in 2016/2017). However, the market may desire the development of Phase 3 before Phase 2, or Phase 4 before Phase 3. As such, this Phasing scenario, other than Phase 1, should be viewed as a potential phasing scenario for conceptual purposes. The following is a description of a conceptual phasing scenario for the FEZ:

#### ***Phase 1:***

It is preliminarily envisioned that Phase 1 development will include:

- A 500 room hotel including 30,000 square feet of conference/meeting/exhibition facility with 37,500 square feet of restaurant (food and beverage) space, community space, general retail, party rooms and related game rooms. Also will include a 75,000 square foot indoor multi-level waterpark.
- The extension of Daniels Street, in a westerly direction to connect to McKinley Avenue in the “T” intersection. Daniels Street will extend from its current terminus at the southeast corner of the property, in a westerly direction, providing access to the proposed hotel and conference center site to the south, and to the Retail, Dining and Entertainment District of the FEZ to the north (PA-4 and PA-5).
- The service entrance to the northwest corner of the Stadium Shopping Center will be reconfigured to provide navigable truck turning movements into the rear of that parcel.
- Main Vehicular Entrance: The FEZ project will have its main vehicular entrance on Daniels Street, located northwest corner of the Stadium Shopping Center.
- A man-made lake or basin.

***Phase 2:***

- Partial construction of Buffer road and landscape along the northern edge of the overall property, north of Planning Areas 12 and 15.
- The extension of Wawona Street in a westerly direction, along the north side of the existing BLD complex, connecting to the FEZ loop road in a southwesterly direction, providing a view into the lake at the center of PA-5.
- PA-1: The development of 11.8 acre PA-1, with new multi-purpose turf playfields. The plan has been conceptualized such that three International Soccer Fields and two U-12 size fields would be provided, along with one U-8 size field at the northeast corner of the parcel. Alternately, the International Soccer Fields could be divided into two U-12 youth soccer fields, yielding a total of eight U-12 play fields, with the one U-8 size field. In addition, minor facilities for rest rooms, maintenance, storage and administrative offices may be provided in the parcel. PA-1 would be provided vehicular access by the extension of Milo Candini Dr. from its current terminus at the NE corner of Big League Dreams to the NE corner of FEZ (straight North).
- PA-15: Parking for the play fields would be offered through the build-out of a parking lot in PA-15, a 3.1-acre area, located in the PG&E right-of-way.
- PA-2, a 7.6-acre parcel lying to the west of PA-1, would provide additional multi-purpose playfields: two U-12 and two U-13 sized youth soccer fields.
- PA-14: A portion of the PA-14 parking lot would be constructed at this time, to serve parking needs of players and guests.

- PA-1a and PA-1b: The construction of two new ball fields to the west of the existing Big League Dreams complex.

**Phase 3:**

- PA-3, including the following:
  - The FEZ entry archway that spans across Daniels Street, under which vehicles will drive to access the FEZ.
  - Food and beverage enterprises that frame an east-west walkway that is aligned on axis with the existing Big League Dreams complex, extending in a westerly direction, toward the center of the FEZ. This serves as a vital connection between the existing sports facilities and the FEZ. Buildings are expected to be one to two stories tall.
  - The FEZ loop road starting north of Daniels Street situated east of PA-5 to the proposed roundabout at Wawona Street.
  - Additional restaurants at the northeast corner of Daniels Street and a new loop road that will wrap around the core of the FEZ.
  - Shared surface parking that may serve retail/restaurants in PA-3 and the two new BLD ball fields (PA-1a and PA-1b, included in Phase 1 description above).

**Phase 4:**

- PA-4, including the following:
  - “Main Street Retail” framing a pedestrian plaza and walkway that runs in a north-south direction, providing a visual and pedestrian connection to PA-16 that lies to the south.
  - Additional restaurants at the northeast corner of Daniels Street and a new loop road that will wrap around the core of the FEZ.
- PA-5, including the following:
  - Initial partial build out of the Dining, Retail and Entertainment Village. Leasable space is envisioned to include stores, small shops, cafes, restaurants, and bistros.
  - The FEZ loop road will frame PA-5 like a “horseshoe” on its east, north, and west sides.

**Future Phases:**

- PA-6 occupies the southwestern most parcel, abutting residential lots to its west, and vacant land to its south. This parcel is intended to serve as expansion for the family entertainment offerings.
- PA-6 (portion) occupies the southwest corner of the street connection to McKinley Avenue. It is envisioned that a tourism and visitor center would be provided along with a

potential relocation site for the Manteca Convention and Visitors Bureau, as well as a small bus terminal and temporary bus parking for tours connecting to Yosemite and the Sierras.

- PA-7 flanks Daniels Street, to its northeast. It also flanks the FEZ loop road, to its west.
- PA-8 incorporates an Indoor All-season Sports and Exhibition Center, and will be located to the north of the FEZ loop road, between Parcels 2 and 7. It is bordered by the PG&E power line right-of-way to its north.
- PA-9 is also bordered by the PG&E power line right-of-way to its north. It abuts McKinley Avenue to its west, and is slated for FEZ expansion.
- PA-10 is a continuation of FEZ expansion, and it's situated to the north of PA-9, to the north of the PG&E power line right-of-way.
- PA-11 is situated on a northwest axis from the heart of the FEZ, the lake, and is situated in the far northwest corner of the property, to the north of the PG&E power line right-of-way.
- PA-12 is also located to the north of the PG&E power line right-of-way. It spans the majority of the northern boundary of the overall property, abutting a boundary road with a set-aside landscape buffer, and then the WQCF to the north. The property is envisioned to serve as an outdoor sports zone.
- PA-13, PA-14, and PA-15 comprise the PG&E right-of-way that stretches diagonally across the property in a west/southwest- east/northeast direction. These planning areas are reserved strictly for shared parking for the entire FEZ property. Setbacks will be established to protect the PG&E towers.
- The North buffer road with access to Milo Candini Drive shall be in place prior to the development of PA's 11 and 12, or an alternative vehicle exit shall be provided north of the power lines that is acceptable to the Fire Department.

### ***Build Out and Phasing:***

Construction will have several phases, depending on market conditions and the availability of financing. It is currently anticipated that the timeframe for the construction is 8-12 years. Infrastructure extensions will be made, as needed, to service the constructed portions of the Project site.

### **Master Plan Compliance and Enforcement**

The Community Development Director is responsible for enforcing the provisions of the Master Plan. The regulatory elements of the Master Plan are enforceable pursuant to the enforcement requirements of the Manteca Municipal Code.

### ***Landscape Maintenance***

The public landscape components of the FEZ are critical elements of the community vision and feel. The maintenance of all common outdoor recreation space and public open space, as well as landscape easements will be funded through an Association established by the FEZ master developer and/or the City of Manteca. The establishment and preservation of a long term, viable maintenance plan is a key component for the FEZ; therefore, the City will maintain the right to assume landscape maintenance responsibilities in the case of neglect or default by, or at the request of, the FEZ Association. If the City assumes the maintenance responsibility, the property owners shall be responsible for all costs associated with said maintenance. Funding shall be provided by the property owners through the establishment of a Community Facilities District or other financing mechanism and shall include funds for administration along with replacement costs. The final method of maintenance financing mechanism shall be approved by City of Manteca.

Formation of one or more Community Facilities Districts (CFD) is also anticipated for all phases of the FEZ. The objective in forming CFDs is to provide financing for public improvements associated with the Project, which may supplement funds available from former redevelopment bond proceeds.

## **PROJECT ENTITLEMENTS**

---

The project consists of the following components:

- 1) Approve the FEZ Master Plan.
- 2) Rezone of all parcels, APN's 241-31-53, 241-31-44, 241-31-18, 241-31-32 and portions of APN 241-31-16, 241-30-48, 241-31-48, 241-30-62 and 241-30-61 (Figure 2-5) from Public/Quasi Public (PQP) to Master Plan (MP).
- 3) Large Lot Tentative Parcel Map, to promote the various phases of development on the 210.7 acre site will be subdivided into large lots available for individual development. The large lot map will include approximately 19 parcels, which will roughly resemble the layout of the Planning Areas. Some land within the project site is located on legal parcels that extend beyond the project boundary (i.e. WQCF parcel is on same legal parcel as the northern portion of the project site) and will be parceled off to create a tentative parcel map for the entire project site without any development on the remainder parcel that extends beyond the project site.
- 4) Site Plan Review for Phase 1 of the project.
- 5) Conditional Use Permit for the LED sign associated with the Hotel facility.
- 6) Development Agreement
- 7) Lease Agreement

- 8) Formation of Communities Facilities District (or other finance district)
- 9) Management Agreement

### 2.5 USES OF THE EIR AND REQUIRED AGENCY APPROVALS

The City of Manteca will be the Lead Agency for the proposed project, pursuant to the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15050.

This EIR will be used by the City of Manteca to take the following actions:

- Certification of the EIR
- Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- Approval of the Master Plan.
- Approval of a Rezone of all parcels from Public/Quasi Public (PQP) to Master Plan (MP).
- Approval of a Large Lot Tentative Parcel Map.
- Site Plan Review for Phase 1 of the project.
- Approval of the Conditional Use Permit for the LED sign associated with the Hotel facility.
- Various Agreements: Development Agreement, Lease Agreement, Management Agreement, etc.
- Formation of Communities Facilities District (or other finance district)

The following agencies may be required to issue permits or approve certain aspects of the proposed project:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife - Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code;
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) – Encroachment permits if any infrastructure boring is necessary under SR 120 or in association with the SSJID’s French Camp Outlet Canal undergrounding.
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) approval prior to construction activities pursuant to the Clean Water Act,
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) – Permitting of State jurisdictional areas, including isolated wetlands pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act;


- 
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) – Water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.
  - San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) - Approval of construction-related air quality permits pursuant to SJVAPCD rules and regulations.
  - SJCOG, Inc. (SJCOG) – Issuance of incidental take under the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP).
  - South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) – Approval to underground French Camp Outlet Canal.
  - United States Army Corps. Of Engineers – Permitting of federal jurisdictional areas pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act;

*This page left intentionally blank.*




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 2-1: Regional Location




Data source: California Spatial Information Library Map date: June 11, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 2-2: Project Vicinity




Data sources: California Spatial Information Library, ESRI StreetMap North America, San Joaquin County GIS. Map date: November 5, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 2-3: USGS Topographic Map



Data sources: ArcGIS Online USA Topo Maps. Map date: November 5, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 2-4: Aerial Photo


Data sources: ArcGIS Online Basemap Imagery with Transportation. Map date: November 5, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**


Figure 2-5: Assessor's Parcel Map



De Novo Planning Group  
 A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

Data sources: San Joaquin County GIS. Map date: November 5, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 2-6: Land Use Map

De Novo Planning Group  
 A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

Map date: April 2, 2015


*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**  
**Figure 2-7a: Planning Area Map**

De Novo Planning Group  
 A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**  
**Figure 2-7b: Tentative Parcel Map**

De Novo Planning Group  
 A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

*This page left intentionally blank.*

MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE


Figure 2-8: Great Wolf Lodge Resort Site Plan

**SITE PLAN INFO:**


APN: 241-310-53  
 PARCEL SIZE: 1,326,686 S.F., 30.33 AC.  
 ZONING: POP (PUBLIC/QUASIPUBLIC)  
 SITE AREA: 1,262,349 S.F., 28.98 ACRES  
 PROJECT AREA: 1,262,349 S.F., 28.98 ACRES (100%)  
 PROPOSED BUILDING SPACE: 202,995 S.F. (16.0%)  
 PROPOSED LANDSCAPE AREA: 545,408 S.F. (43.1%)  
 PROPOSED PAVED AREA: 516,546 S.F. (40.9%)  
 20 HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE STALLS  
 1,063 VEHICLE PARKING STALLS  
 4 EXTERIOR DOCKS  
 1 DRIVE-IN/DOORS  
 4 TRAILER POSITIONS

**CONSTRUCTION NOTES:**

- ① RESTRICTED ACCESS
- ② 10' SETBACK
- ③ EXISTING VARIABLE WIDTH SSJID EASEMENT
- ④ 50' UTILITY CORRIDOR
- ⑤ FEZ MONUMENT SIGN PARCEL
- ⑥ FUTURE DANIELS STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY
- ⑦ EXISTING PROPERTY LINE
- ⑧ PROPOSED 30' SSJID EASEMENT
- ⑨ 26' WIDE ACCESS EASEMENT
- ⑩ NEW ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT
- ⑪ NEW GRASSY SWALE
- ⑫ NEW ADA COMPLIANT ACCESSIBLE RAMP
- ⑬ NEW P.C.C. SIDEWALK
- ⑭ EXISTING CURB REMOVAL
- ⑮ NEW PARKING LOT LIGHTING
- ⑯ PYLON SIGN
- ⑰ ENTRY SIGN



*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**


**Figure 2-9a: Vehicle Circulation Map**

De Novo Planning Group  
A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

*This page left intentionally blank.*




*This page left intentionally blank.*



MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE  
 Figure 2-9c: Parking Map

De Novo Planning Group  
 A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



*This page left intentionally blank.*



MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE

Figure 2-10: Water System



*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

**Figure 2-11: Sanitary Sewer**


*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

**Figure 2-12: Storm Drainage**

*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 2-13: Phasing Plan

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section provides an overview of the visual character, scenic resources, views, scenic highways, and sources of light and glare that are encountered on the Project site and the vicinity. This section concludes with an evaluation of the impacts and recommendations for mitigating impacts. There were no comments received during the NOP scoping process related to this environmental topic.

### 3.1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### REGIONAL SCENIC RESOURCES

---

Visual resources are generally classified into two categories: scenic views and scenic resources. Scenic views are elements of the broader viewshed such as mountain ranges, valleys, and ridgelines. They are usually mid-ground or background elements of a viewshed that can be seen from a range of viewpoints, often along a roadway or other corridor. Scenic resources are specific features of a viewing area (or viewshed) such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. They are specific features that act as the focal point of a viewshed and are usually foreground elements.

Aesthetically significant features occur in a diverse array of environments within the region, ranging in character from urban centers to rural agricultural lands to natural water bodies. Features of the built environment that may also have visual significance include individual or groups of structures that are distinctive due to their aesthetic, historical, social, or cultural significance or characteristics. Examples of the visually significant built environment may include bridges or overpasses, architecturally appealing buildings or groups of buildings, landscaped freeways, and a location where a historic event occurred.

#### SCENIC HIGHWAYS AND CORRIDORS

---

Scenic highways and corridors make major contributions to the quality of life enjoyed by the residents of a region. The development of community pride, the enhancement of property values, and the protection of aesthetically-pleasing open spaces reflecting a preference for the local lifestyle are all ways in which scenic corridors are valuable to residents.

Scenic highways and corridors can also strengthen the tourist industry. For many visitors, highway corridors will provide their only experience of the region. Enhancement and protection of these corridors ensures that the tourist experience continues to be a positive one and, consequently, provides support for the tourist-related activities of the region's economy.

#### **Scenic Highways**

A scenic highway is generally defined by Caltrans as a public highway that traverses an area of outstanding scenic quality, containing striking views, flora, geology, or other unique natural attributes. A highway may be designated scenic depending upon how much of the natural landscape can be seen by travelers, the scenic quality of the landscape, and the extent to which development intrudes upon the traveler's enjoyment of the view.

The status of a proposed state scenic highway changes from eligible to officially designated when the local governing body applies to Caltrans for scenic highway approval, adopts a Corridor Protection Program, and receives notification that the highway has been officially designated a Scenic Highway.

### **Scenic Corridors**

A scenic corridor is the view from the road that may include a distant panorama and/or the immediate roadside area. A scenic corridor encompasses the outstanding natural features and landscapes that are considered scenic. It is the visual quality of the man-made or natural environments within a scenic corridor that are responsible for its scenic value. Commonly, the physical limits of a scenic corridor are broken down into foreground views (zero to one quarter mile) and distant views (over one quarter mile). In addition to distinct foreground and distant views, the visual quality of a scenic corridor is defined by special features, which include:

- Focal points - prominent natural or man-made features which immediately catch the eye.
- Transition areas - locations where the visual environment changes dramatically.
- Gateways - locations which mark the entrance to a community or geographic area.

### **San Joaquin County Scenic Highways/Corridors**

Only one highway section in San Joaquin County is listed as a Designated Scenic Highway by the Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System; the segment of State Route 580 from Interstate 5 to State Route 205. This route traverses the edge of the Coast Range to the west and Central Valley to the east. The City of Manteca and the Project site are not visible from this roadway segment.

As identified in the Open Space Element of the San Joaquin County General Plan, designated scenic routes in the county include Interstate 5 from the Sacramento County line south to Stockton. The City of Manteca is located south of Stockton, and neither the City nor the Project site is visible from this segment of Interstate 5.

## **SCENIC WATER RESOURCES AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS**

---

Water resources are important visual resources that draw tourists to the area for recreational opportunities. The most visually significant water body in the region is the San Joaquin River.

### **Wild and Scenic Rivers**

Federal agencies have jurisdiction, under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, to designate rivers or river sections to “be preserved in free-flowing condition and protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.”

The San Joaquin River is not designated as Wild and Scenic River under the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

---

## PROJECT SITE

---

The Project site is located on the western edge of the City, to the north of SR 120 and the Stadium Shopping Center, between McKinley Avenue on its west and Airport Way on its east. Downtown Manteca lies to the north and east of the project site. The project site encompasses approximately 210.7 acres of land, including approximately 28 acres of developed sports park facilities (Big League Dreams Manteca). Big League Dreams ballpark is located on the eastern side of the Project site. The 28-acre site is fully developed with six replica ballparks, an indoor soccer facility, two restaurants and other supporting facilities all of which are open to the public and operated by private sectors parties pursuant to ground leases.

The Project site has relatively flat terrain (Figure 2-3). The UPRR rail lines are located along the western boundary. High voltage power lines, within Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) power line easements, traverse portions of the Project site running northeast/southwest. The 182.2-acre vacant land portion of the site is currently farmed with row crops and is used for land application of recycled water from the Water Quality Control Facility (WQCF) located immediately north of the Project site.

The French Camp Outlet Canal traverses the western portion of the Project site in a general north-south direction. The French Camp Outlet Canal is an open channel with raised levee banks on either side. There is limited naturalized vegetation along the banks of the canal. Limited areas of wetlands exist in the southern portion of the Project site, adjacent to the eastern bank of the French Camp Outlet Canal.

As a result of site disturbance associated with agricultural operations/farming and the existing sports park facilities on the eastern portion of the site, limited natural scenic areas can be found within the Project site. There is little native vegetation or naturalized habitat located on the site, and the flat topography of the site renders the site essentially void of prominent natural visual features other than open agricultural land.

Much of the Project site is active agricultural land. While this land is disturbed from its natural condition, developed agricultural land can provide visual relief to a passerby/viewer from common manmade structures and visual obstructions found in an urban environment. Agricultural lands provide a sense of openness that is common in natural environments. Throughout the year agricultural operations would result in the land evolving from an environment that appears lush with vegetation (green crops) to an environment that appears bare and infertile (recently tilled). Agricultural land in California's Great Central Valley is generally accepted as an important visual resource.

The Project site is surrounded by a variety of existing land uses. The parcels to the east of the Big League Dreams portion of the Project site, across Milo Candini Drive, are zoned M1 Light Industrial and PQP. The Project site is bordered on the south by SR 120. There is some additional vacant land lying to the south of the westernmost portion of the site. The Project site that lies to the south of Big League Dreams is occupied by the Stadium Shopping Center, and is zoned CG (General Commercial). To the west, the Project site is bounded by McKinley Avenue and the Union Pacific

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

Railway right-of-way. The parcels located to the west of those right-of-ways are outside of the City of Manteca boundary.

There are no Officially Designated Scenic Highways located through or adjacent to the Project site. The only Officially Designated Scenic Highway in San Joaquin County is I-580 from I-5 to SR 205 located approximately 12 miles southwest of the Project site. This scenic highway is not visible from the Project site.

There are minimal existing light sources on the undeveloped portion of the Project site. The Big League Dreams portion of the Project site includes a lighted parking lot, lighted concession and viewing areas, and stadium lighting for nighttime sporting events. Other existing lighting in the vicinity of the Project site includes roadway lighting on SR 120, commercial area lighting on lands to the southeast, and lighting from the Water Quality Control Facility to the north of the Project site.

### 3.1.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### STATE

---

##### **California Scenic Highway Program**

The intent of the California Scenic Highway Program is “to protect and enhance California’s natural scenic beauty and to protect the social and economic values provided by the State’s scenic resources.” Caltrans administers the program, which was established in 1963 and is governed by the California Streets and Highways Code §260 et seq. The goal of the program is to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from changes that would diminish the aesthetic value of the adjacent land. Caltrans has compiled a list of state highways that are designated as scenic and county highways that are officially designated or eligible for designation as scenic. Scenic highway designation can provide several types of benefits to the region. Scenic areas are protected from encroachment of inappropriate land uses, free of billboards, and are generally required to maintain existing contours and preserve important vegetative features. Only low density development is allowed on steep slopes and along ridgelines on scenic highways, and noise setbacks are required for residential development.

#### LOCAL

---

The City of Manteca General Plan identifies visual and scenic resources within the city and recommends measures to protect these resources.

##### **City of Manteca General Plan**

The City of Manteca General Plan identifies the importance of visual characteristics in establishing community identity. Attractive new land uses along the major highways, new landmarks visible from several vantage points throughout the city, and new gateway features along the highways and other major roads at city boundaries can contribute significantly to establishing a strong

positive identity for Manteca. Below are the relevant General Plan Policies presented in the General Plan EIR to protect the visual resources of the community.

***Resource Conservation Policies***

RC-P-17 New development shall maximize the potential for open space and visual experiences.

RC-P-15 Provide public and private open space within urbanized parts of Manteca, in order to provide visual contrast with the built environment and to provide for the recreational needs of residents.

***Community Design Policies***

CD-P-47 Allow pockets of agricultural activity to remain within the urban areas of the city where such uses are compatible with the surrounding urban use.

CD-P-48 Allow use of small under-utilized or undeveloped portions of parcels for temporary, seasonal agricultural activity, such as truck farms, strawberries, and small orchards.

CD-P-49 In order to establish a visual character that retains the agricultural heritage, the city will permit the use of orchard trees (or similar non-fruiting species) in landscape corridors along major streets adjacent to residential neighborhoods, in-lieu of formalized landscape. In such landscapes, the groundcover may be limited to bare earth and weed control and/or groundcovers compatible with the orchard characteristics.

CD-P-44: Provide minimal levels of street, parking, building, site, and public area lighting to meet safety standards and provide direction.

CD-P-45 Provide directional shielding for all exterior lighting to minimize the annoyance of direct or indirect glare.

CD-P-46 Provide automatic shutoff or motion sensors for lighting features in newly developed areas. The City shall adopt light and glare standards that minimize the creation of new light source and the annoyance of direct and indirect glare.

**City of Manteca Zoning Ordinance**

Chapter 17.48, Landscaping, of the City Zoning Ordinance contains standards and provisions related to landscaping design requirements that would apply to the proposed Project. The primary intent of Chapter 17.48, Landscaping, is to require water efficient landscaping and to promote water conservation. However, this chapter also includes provisions related to landscape design that would apply to the proposed Project. These applicable provisions include parking lot landscaping design standards, setback area landscaping standards, and landscaping standards adjacent to fences and walls.

Chapter 17.50, Lighting, of the City Zoning Ordinance contains standards and provisions related to exterior lighting. The primary purpose of this chapter is to regulate lighting to balance the safety and security needs for lighting with the City's desire to preserve dark skies and to ensure that light trespass and glare have negligible impacts on surrounding property (especially residential) and

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

roadways. Section 17.50.060(l) contains provisions applicable to sports fields and outdoor activity areas. This section states, “*where playing fields or other special activity areas are to be illuminated, lighting fixtures shall be mounted, aimed, and shielded so that the light falls within the primary playing area and no significant off-site light trespass is produced. Additionally, the lights shall be turned off within one hour after the end of the event.*” Section 17.50.070 requires the preparation of an outdoor lighting plan as part of each Site Plan and Design Review application. At a minimum, the outdoor lighting plan shall include the following:

1. Manufacturer specifications sheets, cut sheets, and other manufacturer-provided information for all proposed outdoor light fixtures to show fixture diagrams and outdoor light output levels.
2. The proposed location, mounting height, and aiming point of all outdoor lighting fixtures.
3. If building elevations are proposed for illumination, drawings of all relevant building elevations showing the fixtures, the portions of the elevations to be illuminated, the illumination level of the elevations, and the aiming point for any remote light fixture.
4. Photometric data including a computer-generated photometric grid showing foot-candle readings every 10 feet within the property or site and 10 feet beyond the property lines.

### 3.1.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on aesthetics if it will:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings;
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

##### **Impact 3.1-1: Project implementation may result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas (Less than Significant)**

The project site is not designated as a scenic vista by the City of Manteca General Plan or the San Joaquin County General Plan, nor does it contain any unique or distinguishing features that would qualify the site for designation as a scenic vista. As such, this is a **less than significant** impact, and no mitigation is required.

### **Impact 3.1-2: Project implementation may result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character (Significant and Unavoidable)**

#### ***Background***

Development of the proposed Project would convert the site from its existing use as primarily agricultural land to a developed comprehensive multi-purpose public use zone called the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ). The Plan will encompass multiple projects and parcels that in the aggregate will provide an extensive park and recreation complex featuring 210.7 acres of new and existing recreational, park, water, sports, hotel, retail, and other leisure amenities.

The Plan Area incorporates the existing approximate twenty-eight (28) acre Big League Dreams (BLD) facility and provides an additional twenty-five (25) acres to expand BLD and provide soccer fields. There is approximately sixty-two (62) acres identified for a potential mix of indoor and outdoor entertainment/recreational uses including a location for an outdoor stadium. The Plan Area provides approximately thirty-three (33) acres of commercial shopping that will generate approximately three hundred sixty thousand (360,000) square feet of retail and dining type uses. There is approximately twenty-nine (29) acres provided for a hotel/lodge, convention center and indoor water park.

The FEZ Master Plan is comprised of five basic design components: Retail and Restaurant, Recreation and Sports, Hotel/Resort, Entertainment, and Parking. There are 16 plan areas within the FEZ that fall into these five categories, each of which is described below with a picture that is intended to illustrate the type of use/activities that would result.

#### RETAIL AND RESTAURANT



The Destination Retail and Restaurant area provides an opportunity to attract job generation and economic development to the west side of Manteca. It is strategically located along the Highway 120 corridor to ensure project visibility for future end-users, and to provide access to the Highway 120 corridor. The relationship to the existing and proposed recreational facilities and the hotel provides for customer base.

#### RECREATION AND SPORTS



The proposed recreational and sports uses serve to augment the existing and established success of Big League Dreams. This will serve as the integral part of the overall Plan Area providing both passive and active open space, recreation areas, sports fields, stadiums, as well as gathering spaces for the community. Located throughout the project, the recreation areas will remain easily accessible to all users of the FEZ through a well-integrated and well-planned internal street network that encourages both bicycle and pedestrian use.

## HOTEL/RESORT



The proposed hotel/resort site will serve to provide lodging for users coming into town for the destination experience. It is to be a full-service hotel with additional recreational and dining opportunities. A convention center shall be provided with the hotel and the hotel shall also provide recreation facilities that are complimentary to the FEZ, such as a water park.

## ENTERTAINMENT



The proposed entertainment areas serve to provide enjoyment for the whole family. Through thoughtful design this central piece of the FEZ will serve to bring people together to enjoy communal leisure time. It will be comprised of a variety of recreation and leisure activities which may include: miniature golf, golf cart racers, arcade games, and Laser-tag, among other things.

## PARKING



While parking is an integral component throughout the Plan Area, the land that is under the High Voltage power lines that traverse the site has been dedicated to supporting the parking needs of the entire Plan Area. These parking areas provide ease of access to the main element of the Plan Area.

The FEZ planning area will be open and accessible to the general public, and will be designed to serve the state, region, and the Manteca community as a multipurpose recreation center and public park facility. The FEZ will feature a wide range of active and passive open space and developed uses that will support short term and longer-term activities and community events for users ranging from local citizens, day and weekend regional visitors, as well as destination tourists.

***Land Use Concept***

The intent of the Master Plan is to ensure a quality built environment that integrates a mix of land uses under a single uniform set of design and development standards. The FEZ Master Plan intends to build upon the success of the Big League Dreams facility by providing additional sports and field recreation, hotel and tourism, entertainment, retail, commercial and restaurant uses along the highly visible State Route 120 corridor. The Master Project site is divided into 16 Planning Areas (“PAs”). Table 3.1-1 provides a summary of the planning areas.

**TABLE 3.1-1: PLANNING AREA PROJECT BUILD-OUT SUMMARY**

Planning Area	Projected Land use	Gross Land Area (acre)
PA-1	Outdoor Sports Fields	11.68
PA-1a	New Baseball/Softball Field	3.08
PA-1b	New Baseball/Softball Field	2.61
PA-2	Outdoor Sports Fields	4.02
PA-2a	Outdoor Sports Fields	3.32
PA-3	Retail, Food & Beverage	2.94
PA-4	Main Street Retail	3.61
PA-5	Retail, Dining and Entertainment	27.33
PA-6	Future FEZ Expansion	12.63
PA-7	Adventure Zone	6.97
PA-8	Indoors Sports	3.55
PA-9	Family Entertainment	6.95
PA-10	Family Entertainment	5.25
PA-11	Stadium	12.44
PA-12	Speed Zone/Outdoor Sports	8.99
PA-13	Parking	3.06
PA-14	Parking	4.22
PA-15	Parking	3.19
PA-16	Hotel, Conference Center & Indoor Water Park	28.03
FEZ Planning Area Totals		153.87
Existing Big League Dreams Site		28.43
Roads / R.O.W.		27.89
McKinley Avenue R.O.W. Expansion		0.48
<b>Totals</b>		<b>210.67</b>

It is to be noted that Planning Areas 1-15 and Planning Area 16 have distinct design concepts that are defined independently of each other through the Master Plan. Planning Areas 1-15 are to be developed with an ‘Early California’ architectural and landscape theme. Planning Area 16 is a ‘Natural Rustic’ architectural and landscape theme. These two distinct themes work together to create a dynamic Master Plan with integrated uses and an integrated theme of Early California and Natural Rustic with Daniels St. creating the transition between the two themes.

### ***Development Requirements***

The FEZ Master Plan is an overlay zone and therefore provides its own zoning regulations and requirements. Below are the development requirements and recommendations for the individual FEZ planning areas. The development requirements and recommendations are intended to work in conjunction with the City of Manteca’s Zoning Ordinance. In some cases the FEZ Master Plan requirements may conflict with or may be more or less restrictive than the City’s Zoning Ordinance. In these circumstances, the FEZ Master Plan design requirements shall take precedence. Any regulations not contained or illustrated in the FEZ Master Plan are deferred to the regulations contained in the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Table 3.1-2 presents the development requirements for the different planning areas.

The restrictions associated with site planning, structure placement (clearances), landscape, etc. within this master plan area shall meet the requirements of the utility easements that traverse the Master Plan Area (existing and proposed) as described in Section 4 of the Master Plan. In all cases,

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

development shall adhere to the requirements of this Master Plan and the utility easement restrictions.

**TABLE 3.1-2 FEZ DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

<b>HOTEL/RESORT</b>	<b>PA-16</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>	
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	45% If a parking structure is provided for PA-16 the allowable FAR may be increased up to an additional 10% with conditional approval upon site plan review. Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>	
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.
<b>Building Setbacks</b>	
Street setback	Any building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of twenty-five (25') feet.
Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)	There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.
<b>Building Massing</b>	
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be eighty-five (85') feet. The vertical distance from grade plane to the average height of the highest roof surface shall not exceed 85'. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.
<b>RETAIL AND RESTAURANT</b>	
<b>PA-3, PA-4, PA-5</b>	
<b>Building Coverage</b>	
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	PA-3: 50% PA-4: 35% PA-5: 35% Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>	
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.
<b>Building Setbacks</b>	
Street setback	Any building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of ten (10') feet.
Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)	There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.
<b>Building Massing</b>	
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be thirty-five (35') feet. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures, or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.

<b>RECREATION AND SPORTS</b>		<b>PA-1, PA-2, PA-11</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>		
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	25%	Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>		
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.	
<b>Building Setbacks</b>		
Street setback	Any active sports field, building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of ten (10') feet.	
<b>Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)</b>		There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.	
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.	
<b>Building Massing</b>		
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be fifty-five (55') feet. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.	
<b>ENTERTAINMENT</b>		<b>PA-6, PA-7, PA-8, PA-9, PA-10, PA-12</b>
<b>Building Coverage</b>		
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum	50%	Parking structure is not to be calculated as part of the FAR.
<b>Lot Configuration</b>		
Lot area	There shall be no minimum lot area requirements.	
<b>Building Setbacks</b>		
Street setback	Any active sports field, building or structure shall have a minimum street setback of ten (10') feet.	
<b>Interior / Side Yard Setback (non-street)</b>		There shall be no interior side yard requirements.
Rear Yard Setback	There shall be no rear yard requirements.	
Distance Between Buildings (for buildings on same parcel)	Shall comply with required building code, otherwise there shall be no distance between building requirement.	
<b>Building Massing</b>		
Building Height	The maximum height of any occupied structure shall be fifty-five (55') feet. There shall be no height requirements for non-occupied structures or for design and architectural elements provided they meet Fire Code requirements and CBC Table 503.	

**Planning Areas and Summary**

A land use plan is shown in Figure 2-6. Figure 2-7a illustrates the planning areas and Figure 2-7b presents the tentative parcel map. It is envisioned that the FEZ Planning Areas will develop within

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

four broader land use categories. The following is a brief overview of the potential land uses within the land use categories and Planning Areas.

### RETAIL AND RESTAURANTS – (PA-3, PA-4, AND PA-5)

- Open-air Retail, Dining, and Entertainment Village
  - Man-made lake / retention basin (see Section 4.3 – Infrastructure for a definition of the two options). If the lake option is selected, it is to be an amenity, with the potential of personal paddle craft and/or kayaks, but not a swimming facility
  - Lakeside/Basin edge boardwalk promenade with semi-pervious paving
  - Retail shops
  - Restaurants, cafes, bistros, coffee shops, micro-brewery
  - Small outdoor amphitheater
  - Outdoor entertainment / performance plaza

### ENTERTAINMENT – (PA-6, PA-7, PA-9, PA-10, PA-12)

- Family Entertainment
  - Miniature golf, family arcade games, Laser-tag, Ball Crawl, etc.
  - Rock-climbing wall, ropes course, Flow-rider, zip-line, hard surface skate park
- Outdoor Sports/ Speed Zone
  - BMX course
  - Electric motorized mini-car race course

### HOTEL/RESORT – (PA-16)

- Resort:
  - This parcel is envisioned to be occupied by a destination hotel oriented toward tourism and leisure, primarily for families, but also to serve business conferences.
  - Indoor and outdoor water park
  - Conference center

### RECREATION AND SPORTS – (PA-1, PA-1A, PA-1B, PA-2, PA-2A, PA-8, PA-11)

- Outdoor Regional Sports Zone
  - Existing Big League Dreams complex
  - Additional baseball fields for Big League Dreams
  - Multi-purpose/soccer fields in varying sizes
  - \* Note: Play fields are expected to be available for use as public open space prior to 4:30PM on weekdays.
- Indoor All-season Sports Center
  - Basketball, volleyball, cheerleading, gymnastics
- Championship Playfield
  - International-sized multi-purpose play field with fixed stadium seating.

### PARKING – (PA-13, PA-14 AND PA-15)

- Parking Zones:
  - FEZ parking areas
  - Easements

***Existing Site Character***

The project site is highly visible from State Route 120. Implementation of the proposed project would change the existing visual character of the site from a primarily agricultural site to an urbanized site made up of the uses described in the conceptual site plan above. Impacts related to a change in visual character are largely subjective and very difficult to quantify. People have different reactions to the visual quality of a project or a project feature, and what is considered “attractive” to one viewer may be considered “unattractive” to other viewers. The Project site currently consists primarily of agricultural lands. Agricultural lands provide visual relief from urban and suburban developments, and help to define the character of a region. The loss of agricultural lands can have a cumulative impact on the overall visual character and quality of a region.

As described above, Project implementation would introduce numerous park and recreational facilities and visitor-serving uses, including a hotel, restaurants, and other related uses and supporting infrastructure into an area that is currently undeveloped and primarily agricultural in nature and appearance. Implementation of the proposed Project would introduce developed urban land uses into an area that is currently undeveloped and largely void of structures and impervious surfaces.

Additionally, the Project would result in the visual elimination of the existing French Camp Outlet Canal, which is currently an open channel visible from the Project site and areas immediately adjacent to the site. Water features, including man-made water features, are often considered to be aesthetically pleasing, since they provide visual relief, vegetative variety, and habitat for wildlife. Project implementation would result in the under-grounding and culverting of the French Camp Outlet Canal, which would remove this visual feature from the Project site permanently. The project would also result in the fill/removal of two wetlands adjacent to the French Camp Outlet Canal near the Costco building in the southeastern portion of the project site.

***Future Visual Character of Planning Area 1 through 15***

The project would include beneficial visual components that would assist in enhancing the appearance of the urban development. The proposed Project includes Architectural Design Standards and Guidelines as described below:

**ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS (PA-1 THROUGH PA-15)**

The FEZ Design Recommendations for PA-1 through PA-15 provides architectural design parameters that are intended to deliver a cohesive appearance by establishing an overall design theme for this destination family entertainment, sports, retail/restaurant, and parking facility in Manteca. The purpose of these design recommendations is to promote aesthetic quality, and to document the selected architectural styles with enough information to permit builders and their design team to accurately present the preferred architectural style. The overall architectural theme for the FEZ is Early California. There are two complimentary architectural styles that will depict the Early California character: Monterey and Spanish Colonial. By showing examples of selected architectural styles and referencing the range of detailing within the styles, a historic context or style of architecture can be documented. This permits high quality architectural design to occur, while still considering current construction codes, and freedom to provide unique and inventive design solutions.

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

The Master Plan provides defined examples of Monterey and Spanish Colonial styles so that the builders/designer can see specific elements that differentiate the two styles so that one can be selected and more clearly defined in the design. The Master Plan also provides the specific recommendations for all of the Planning Areas 1-15 that must be met for approval, inclusive of either the Monterey or the Spanish Colonial style. Additionally, the Master Plan provides the recommendations associated with site planning and development.

In addition to the required design elements as provided in the Master Plan, all designs shall be consistent with current codes and the design review process associated with FEZ and the City of Manteca Site Plan Application review process.

### COMMUNITY VISION AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STYLE

The architectural style known as Early California is foundation for the theme of the built environment in this development project. The style is deeply rooted in the romance of centuries-old Spanish architectural vernacular and was developed as modern California history began to unfold. The two types of styles that are generally associated with Early California are Spanish Colonial and Monterey styles

### ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

The Master Plan includes general architectural design recommendations that apply to these planning areas, as well as specific design recommendations that apply to the Spanish Colonial and Monterey styles that will be developed in these planning areas. These recommendations cover the following:

- General
  - Building Form, Massing, and Scale
  - Roof Standards
  - Wall Standards
  - Material Standards
  - Color Standards
- Spanish Colonial and Monterey
  - Exterior Materials
  - Roofs
  - Windows
  - Design Features
  - Colors

### SITE PLANNING ELEMENTS (PA-1 THROUGH PA-15)

The Master Plan has a variety of site planning elements that are covered for these planning areas. These include the following:

- Entry Treatment
- Site Planning Parameters
- Building Orientation
- Pedestrian Orientation of Buildings

- Common Open Space
- Service Areas
- Easements

### ***Future Visual Character of Phase 1 (Planning Area 16)***

#### ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PA-16

These Design Recommendations apply only to Planning Area PA-16 for the development of a hotel and Conference Center facility. Figure 2-8 presents a detailed site plan for the Hotel site (PA-16). The Master Plan provides a breakdown of required and recommended Architectural treatment for PA-16.

#### COMMUNITY VISION AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STYLE FOR PA-16

The architectural style known as Natural Rustic is to be the foundational influence for the theme of the built environment for PA-16. The hotel structure(s) will be a marriage of organic yet simple-



lined superstructure and classic mountain retreat detailing at a human scale. Iconic log exterior details shall emulate the vernacular of a historic National Park lodge, while adjacent towers are to settle in as simple massing. The overall massing of the hotel is to be influenced by a more contemporary, simple, articulated facade, and the points of entry shall incorporate details influenced by structures such as the Grand Canyon Lodge as represented in the above image.

#### GENERAL ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (PA-16)

***Building Form, Massing, and Scale:*** The design theme and character for PA-16 is unique to the remainder of the FEZ to set it apart as an independent facility within the overall FEZ framework. While the Natural Rustic theme of the hotel and conference center is unique it blends well with the overall Early California architectural theme of the rest of the FEZ.

True to the essence of Natural Rustic, the canopy and vestibule structures of the hotel lobby and conference center shall project monumental scale elements with enhanced detail against the backdrop of natural architectural surface tones which are applied to the hotel tower and water park façades, creating a consistent backdrop. Consistent architectural features and embellishments shall be carried throughout the entire building(s) and site amenities. The hotel, conference center, and water park structure is intended to be a large structure, or grouping of structures. Several images of structures are presented below to try to convey architectural design form and styles that are anticipated in Phase 1.

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

### Requirements:

- The building massing is to be articulated with pedestrian and ‘human’ scale materials and forms at the building entries, but designed at a large, monumental scale – primarily at the main lobby entry (portico) and the conference center entry, but also at the hotel tower entries.



- The building masses shall be simple, asymmetrical, rectangular forms with irregular massing.
- There shall be either steeply pitched or mansard roofs for the hotel.
- Sloped roofs to utilize timber and log structural and decorative elements sized appropriately for the size of the roof mass shall be used for building entries.
- Entry portals shall be encased in tumbled stone pilasters from which timbers emerge.



*Conceptual Architecture to show form/style*

- Linear portions of the hotel (exterior wall plane) shall offer relief by stepping back or forward from the main line of the building envelope. The offset dimension will be adequate to provide relief and articulation based on the scale of the building. Alternate means of meeting the architectural step-back or projection or enhancement of step-back requirement may be met through the use of materials or other architectural features if deemed acceptable by the Community Development Director.
- Any side of the building that exceeds 160’ in length shall have recesses or pop-outs of adequate depth to provide relief and articulation sufficient to the scale of the building, with no single face of building longer than 80’ without a step in the building and/or

material/finish difference (see alternate means allowance described above).

- There shall be articulation in the roofline and extension of the eaves to correspond to the recesses in the face of the building.
- Sunshades may also be used to provide articulation along the face of the building.




*Conceptual Architecture to show form/style*



- Secondary entries such as at the hotel and conference center from the parking lots shall utilize materials similar to the main entries and to a scale that is appropriate to the height and scale of the overall building.
- Color shall also be used to further define the articulation of the building recess – vertical and horizontal color transition.
- Along the water park and guest unit portions of the resort, the rhythmic placement of sun shade structures over windows and/or balconies shall be used to create shadow, articulation, and scale in addition to the recesses in the building.

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES



*The example photos above and to the left shows the concepts of sunshades being placed in conjunction with architectural forms and window pattern to provide articulation and shadow treatment on the building.*

### *Recommendations:*

- An iconic sculptural element that evokes the character and theme of the resort may also be included at or near the entry portals.
- Steeply pitched, heavily timbered porte-cochere and vestibule roof structures should be used to reinforce the theme.

### *Building Material Requirements*

- Durable, high quality materials and finishes shall be the basis of design for PA-16. These include; but are not limited to the following materials listed in B through D. Other materials may be acceptable if they enhance and/or compliment the design requirements. The following is a sampling of acceptable materials:
  - Stucco style Exterior Insulation Finish System (EIFS)
  - Pre-cast Concrete
  - Rough Hewn timbers
  - Manufactured Stone
  - Painted Concrete (back areas)

- Standing Metal Screen Panels

#### *Roof Form and Material Requirements*

- Primarily flat, with 6:12 slopes at one and two story building elements and key building entries. 4:12 at wider building masses to maintain balance between building mass and roof mass. 10:12 - 12:12 at shorter building mass projections.
- Standing Seam Metal Panels, Asphaltic shingles
- Skylights, Dark Bronze finish
- Rakes - Typically 24" with 36" near peaks of gabled roofs. Wider as required at special framing conditions. Wide rustic appearing fascias.
- Eaves - Typically 24". Wider as required at special framing conditions. Wide rustic appearing fascias.

#### *Colors and Finishes Requirements*

- Walls - EIFS, manufactured stone veneer, and manufactured or real logs used in varying patterns to accentuate key building elements.
- Elevations - Timber and log structural and decorative elements utilized at one and two story building elements.
- Entry Doors - Entry doors to be wood with full vision lites and trimmed to provide a heavy hand built appearance to the door construction.
- Earth tone blend of caramel, grey-green, adobe and dark red shall applied at specific building masses to further accentuate their vertical nature.
- Stone details of mixed river stone tones
- Rough hewn and log members medium tone clear stain
- Window, door and storefront trim - dark bronze tall and narrow proportion at one and two story building elements with square or rectangular punched openings at tall building elements.
- Trim - Sills utilized at stone finishes and manufactured or real logs at log finishes. Minimal trim utilized at EIFS walls.
- Metal sunshades installed at tall building masses in a random pattern to provide additional articulation.
- Tapered stone piers at ends of tall building masses. Synthetic carved stone columns at primary building entries.

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

*Site and Mechanical Equipment Requirements:* The following are the requirements associated with accessory site facilities, equipment, utilities, and lighting.

### Accessory Elements and Screening

- Entries - Articulated through the use of log or timbered porticos to accentuate the sense of arrival. Portico to be sized according to its function.
- Accessory structures shall be designed to look like a continuation of extension of the nearby structures. They shall have architectural detailing, materials, color and landscaping similar to the primary structure.
- Accessory structures shall be screened from public view by berms, landscaping, fences or ornamental screening.
- Loading zones shall be partially roofed to dampen sound, and screened from pedestrian view of the area.

### Trash Enclosures

- Refuse Collection areas shall be located in areas that are convenient for access for disposal and collection, but in areas that are less visible to the general public and guests of the facility. Refuse enclosures that must be located in more visible areas shall be screened from view by the use of walls, fences and landscape. These areas are to be screened from public and guest room view.
- Trash enclosures shall be constructed of concrete masonry units finished similar to buildings in the development. Trash enclosures and other service elements shall be screened from view through the use of solid walls or fences compatible with the building architecture.
- All trash enclosures shall have opaque gates designed to be consistent with the development. The color of the gate shall match the color of the adjacent trash enclosure wall or be of a compatible accent color.
- Trash enclosure shall have lighted access to meet federal accessibility standards
- Trash enclosures shall be located such that collection vehicles have thorough access within ten feet of the enclosure.

### Mechanical Equipment

- Roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened by parapet or integral architectural elements
- Equipment within standing seam metal roofing shall be finished to match adjacent color
- Ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view by walls or fences

compatible with the building architecture and located away from pedestrian paths and project amenities

Natural Gas Meters, Electrical meters, Site Utilities and Equipment:

- All utility meters and equipment shall be screened from view

Exterior Architectural Lighting

- The style of exterior lighting fixtures shall be consistent with the architectural style of surrounding buildings
- The extent of lighting fixtures and the level of exterior architectural lighting shall comply with city ordinances and codes
- Energy conservation shall be emphasized when designing the lighting systems.
- Care shall be taken to specify lighting that does not spill into existing, or potential future residential properties adjacent to the site

*Site Planning Recommendations for PA-16*

- The following recommendations shall be taken into consideration with the design of all projects within Planning Area 16. At least half (50%) of the following applicable recommendations are to be incorporated into the design of PA-16. Each bullet in A-C below signifies one recommendation – 50% shall be required. The appropriateness of each of the following guidelines shall be determined by the Community Development Director of the City of Manteca. For additional Site Planning of the parking lot and driveway areas see Section 3.4 and 3.5.

Entry Treatments

- For safety, accessibility and visual interest, the ground floor should be articulated with entries, windows, and other types of articulation.
- Main focal entry statements, through the use of entry canopies should be incorporated to add a sense of orientation for the motorist and pedestrian with relation to building massing.

Building Orientation

- Buildings should be oriented to emphasize public spaces, with entryways that are clearly visible from key locations.
- Consideration should be given to building footprint configuration to provide clear and defined access from street and parking lots, visibility from the street and hierarchy of spaces, security, service truck loading and screening, and commercial viability.

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

### *Pedestrian Orientation and Circulation*

- Site Planning should be designed to allow for the safe and convenient movement of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles with pedestrian taking the priority.
- Pedestrian connections should provide a network of on-site walkways that are a minimum of five feet wide, to and from building entrances.
- Pedestrian connections should be provided to each building entrance. Additional development requirements and recommendations regarding pedestrian circulation are covered in Section 3.

The main access from the FEZ to the front door of the facility (lobby) is to line up on axis with the center of the lake/basin. Walkway is not required to be a straight line connection along the axis, but there is to be a strong visual connection from the front door to the center of the lake/basin.

### **Landscape and Open Space**

The Landscape Vision is inclusive of sport fields, parkways, bike lanes, lake, pedestrian-oriented open space, coordinated street tree network, entry features, signage, and buffer landscape spaces. Figure 3.1-1 illustrates the Landscape and Open Space Plan. The Master Plan also includes a fencing plan that incorporates buffers for the railroad, WQCF, and Caltrans facilities, as well as stadium fencing (Figure 3.1-2).

The Master Plan includes Landscape Design Requirements and Recommendations that cover the following topics:

- Entry Features
- Streetscape Landscape Features
- Pedestrian-Oriented Public Open Space
- Fencing
- Street Lighting
- Site Furniture
- Landscape and Irrigation System

### ***Other Design Recommendations***

The Master Plan includes a variety of other important recommendations to facilitate the desired design. These include: 1) Sustainable Development Guidelines and Environmental Considerations, and 2) Sign Regulations. A concept signage plan is provided to illustrate the locations for primary entry features, freeway pylon signs, secondary entry features, and directory signage (Figure 3.1-3).

### ***Conclusion***

The project would result in the conversion of the land from agricultural uses, which would contribute to changes in the regional landscape and visual character of the area. In order to reduce visual impacts, future development projects within the Project site are required to be consistent with the FEZ Master Plan. The Master Plan will include design requirements in order to ensure quality and cohesive design of future components of the Project site. Design requirements would

include specifications for building height, massing, and orientation; building facades and exterior finish materials; roof and window design standards; exterior lighting standards and specifications; and landscaping standards. Implementation of the FEZ Master Plan design requirements would ensure quality design throughout the Project site, and result in an attractive recreational and visitor-serving development project.

The loss of the visual appearance of the existing agricultural land on the site will change the visual character of the project area. Implementation of the design requirements in the FEZ Master Plan, and compliance with Chapter 17.48, Landscaping, of the City Zoning Ordinance would reduce visual impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, regardless of the quality of design implemented on the Project site, Project implementation would permanently remove the existing agricultural land and French Camp Outlet Canal visual resources on the Project site, and convert the site to urbanized uses. This is considered a **significant and unavoidable** impact. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

### **Impact 3.1-3: Project implementation may substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway (Less than Significant)**

There are no designated State Scenic Highways in the vicinity of the Project site. Only one highway section in San Joaquin County is listed as a Designated Scenic Highway by the Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System; the segment of Interstate 580 from Interstate 5 to State Route 205. This Designated Scenic Highway is located approximately 12.5 miles southwest of the Project site and is not visible from the Project site. This route traverses the edge of the Coast Range to the west and Central Valley to the east. The City of Manteca and the Project site are not visible from this roadway segment. As identified in the Open Space Element of the San Joaquin County General Plan, designated scenic routes in the county include Interstate 5 from the Sacramento County line south to Stockton. The City of Manteca is located south of Stockton, and neither the City nor the Project site is visible from this segment of Interstate 5. Additionally, there are no “eligible” highway segments in the project vicinity that may be included in the State Scenic Highway system. As such, this is a **less than significant** impact, and no mitigation is required.

### **Impact 3.1-4: Project implementation may result in light and glare impacts (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Implementation of the proposed Project would introduce new sources of light and glare into the Project area. New sources of glare would occur primarily from the windshields of vehicles travelling to and from the project site and from vehicles parked at the site. There is also the potential for reflective building materials and windows to result in increases in daytime glare.

The master plan design recommendations will include standards for exterior building materials and window treatments, which preclude the use of highly reflective materials and exterior finishes. The introduction of new parking areas within the Project site would not result in significant increases in daytime glare above existing conditions in the Project vicinity. For instance, there are existing large parking lots located immediately east of the project site (Costco, north of SR 120, and vehicles

## 3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

---

parked there have not been known to cause significant glare impacts to motorists travelling along SR 120. The same is anticipated for vehicles parked at the resort facility parking lot adjacent to the SR 120. Nevertheless, compliance with the master plan design recommendations, and installation of parking lot landscaping, as required by Chapter 17.48 of the Manteca Zoning Ordinance would ensure that potential glare impacts are **less than significant**.

The project would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting, which may result in increased nighttime lighting in the project vicinity. A detailed lighting plan has not been prepared for the project, but for the purposes of this analysis, it has been conservatively assumed that nighttime field lighting and outdoor recreational lighting will be installed throughout most areas of the Project site. It is assumed that security lighting will be installed within the various parking areas and the visitor-serving commercial use areas. It is also assumed that exterior security lighting will be installed throughout the future expansion zone when that phase of the project is developed.

Light sources from the proposed development may have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding areas, by introducing nuisance light into the area and decreasing the visibility of nighttime skies. Additionally, on-site light sources may create light spillover impacts on surrounding land uses in the absence of mitigation.

Chapter 17.50, Lighting, of the City Zoning Ordinance contains standards and provisions related to exterior lighting. The primary purpose of this chapter is to regulate lighting to balance the safety and security needs for lighting with the City's desire to preserve dark skies and to ensure that light trespass and glare have negligible impacts on surrounding property (especially residential) and roadways. Section 17.50.060(I) contains provisions applicable to sports fields and outdoor activity areas. This section states, "*where playing fields or other special activity areas are to be illuminated, lighting fixtures shall be mounted, aimed, and shielded so that the light falls within the primary playing area and no significant off-site light trespass is produced. Additionally, the lights shall be turned off within one hour after the end of the event.*" Section 17.50.070 requires the preparation of an outdoor lighting plan as part of each Site Plan and Design Review application. At a minimum, the outdoor lighting plan shall include the following:

1. Manufacturer specifications sheets, cut sheets, and other manufacturer-provided information for all proposed outdoor light fixtures to show fixture diagrams and outdoor light output levels.
2. The proposed location, mounting height, and aiming point of all outdoor lighting fixtures.
3. If building elevations are proposed for illumination, drawings of all relevant building elevations showing the fixtures, the portions of the elevations to be illuminated, the illumination level of the elevations, and the aiming point for any remote light fixture.
4. Photometric data including a computer-generated photometric grid showing foot-candle readings every 10 feet within the property or site and 10 feet beyond the property lines.

The increase of nighttime lighting in the project area is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 would reduce impacts associated with nighttime lighting and light spillage onto adjacent properties to a **less than significant** level.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.1-1:** *A lighting plan shall be prepared prior to the installation of the project's lighting for each individual phase of development, or a portion of an individual phase of development. The lighting plan shall demonstrate that the field lighting systems and other exterior lighting throughout the Project site have been designed to minimize light spillage onto adjacent properties to the greatest extent feasible. The lighting plan shall include the following:*

- *Design of site lighting and exterior building light fixtures to reduce the effects of light pollution and glare off of glass and metal surfaces;*
- *Lighting shall be directed downward and light fixtures shall be shielded to reduce upward and spillover lighting;*
- *Where it is not feasible to fully shield light fixtures from light pollution, such as the field lights, the lighting shall be directed downward and of the minimum wattage and height suitable for illuminating the playing surfaces and immediately surrounding areas.*
- *Lighting for each playfield, parking area, and structure shall have control boxes that allow operation of specific areas of lighting in order to only illuminate the field(s) and parking area(s) in use at any given time.*
- *Lights shall be turned off when the fields, parking areas, and structures are not in use.*

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

**Figure 3.1-1: Landscape and Open Space Map**

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

- Legend**
- █ RAILROAD BUFFERSCREEN - Chain link fence with dense perimeter landscape
  - █ WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT BUFFER - Chain link or masonry fence with densely landscaped berm
  - █ SPORTS FIELD SECURITY FENCING - Upgraded perimeter security fencing
  - █ Existing perimeter fencing at Big League Dreams
  - █ CAL TRANS FENCING - City of Manteca Public Works Standard ST36
  - █ STADIUM CENTER BUFFER AGRICULTURAL BUFFER



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

**Figure 3.1-2: Fencing Exhibit**

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*



*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

This section provides an overview of the agricultural crops in San Joaquin County, agricultural capability of the soils on the Project site, and existing site conditions. This section concludes with an evaluation of the impacts related to agricultural resources and recommendations for mitigating impacts as needed. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to a non-agricultural use. Information in this section is derived primarily from the *California Important Farmlands Map* (California Department of Conservation, 2012), *California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Status Report* (California Department of Conservation, 2010), *the San Joaquin County Agricultural Report* (San Joaquin County Agricultural Commissioner 2012), and NRCS Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2014).

There are no forest resources located on the Project site or in the City of Manteca, thus this CEQA topic is not relevant to the proposed project and will not be addressed further in this EIR.

### 3.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AGRICULTURE

The San Joaquin Valley has rich alluvial soils and is the location of most of the intensive agriculture. The County’s Agricultural Commissioner’s most recent published Agricultural Report (2012) contains the following information about agriculture in the County.

#### **Agricultural Value**

San Joaquin County has a total land area of 1,400 square miles of which 737,503 acres are in 3,624 farms in 2007. Total acreage planted with crops in 2012 was 799,480, including 508,000 acres of field crops, 1,180 acres of seed crops, 253,000 acres of fruit and nut crops, and 55,300 acres of vegetable crops.

The estimated gross value of agricultural production in San Joaquin County for 2012 is estimated at \$2,869,472,000. Table 3.2-1 lists the top eight commodities in San Joaquin County in 2012.

**TABLE 3.2-1: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF CROP VALUES**

<i>PRODUCT</i>	<i>2012</i>
Field Crops	\$329,973,000
Vegetable Crops	\$265,568,000
Fruit and Nut Crops	\$1,640,372,000
Nursery Products	\$87,957,000
Livestock and Poultry	\$97,151,000
Livestock and Poultry Products	\$423,279,000
Seed Crops	\$3,562,000
Apiary Products	\$21,610,000

*SOURCE: SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AGRICULTURAL REPORT, 2012*

#### AGRICULTURAL CAPABILITY

The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies lands that have agriculture value and maintains a statewide map of these lands called the

## 3.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Important Farmlands Inventory (IFI). IFI classifies land based upon the productive capabilities of the land, rather than the mere presence of ideal soil conditions.

The suitability of soils for agricultural use is just one factor for determining the productive capabilities of land. Suitability is determined based on many characteristics, including fertility, slope, texture, drainage, depth, and salt content. A variety of classification systems have been devised by the state to categorize soil capabilities. The two most widely used systems are the Capability Classification System and the Storie Index. The Capability Classification System classifies soils from Class I to Class VIII based on their ability to support agriculture with Class I being the highest quality soil. The Storie Index considers other factors such as slope and texture to arrive at a rating. The IFI is in part based upon both of these two classification systems.

### Soil Capability Classification System

The Soil Capability Classification System takes into consideration soil limitations, the risk of damage when soils are used, and the way in which soils respond to treatment. Capability classes range from Class I soils, which have few limitations for agriculture, to Class VIII soils that are unsuitable for agriculture. Generally, as the rating of the capability classification increases, yields and profits are more difficult to obtain. A general description of soil classifications, as defined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is provided in Table 3.2-2 below.

**TABLE 3.2-2: SOIL CAPABILITY CLASSIFICATION**

<i>CLASS</i>	<i>DEFINITION</i>
I	Soils have slight limitations that restrict their use.
II	Soils have moderate limitations that restrict choice plants or that require moderate conservation practices.
III	Soils have severe limitations that restrict the choice of plants or that require special conservation practices, or both.
IV	Soils have very severe limitations that restrict the choice of plants or that require very careful management, or both.
V	Soils are not likely to erode but have other limitations; impractical to remove that limits their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat.
VI	Soils have severe limitations that make them generally unsuited to cultivation and limit their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat.
VII	Soils have very severe limitations that make them unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat.
VIII	Soils and landforms have limitations that preclude their use for commercial plans and restrict their use to recreation, wildlife habitat, water supply, or aesthetic purposes.

*SOURCE: USDA SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE.*

### Storie Index Rating System

The Storie Index Rating system ranks soil characteristics according to their suitability for agriculture from Grade 1 soils (80 to 100 rating) which have few or no limitations for agricultural production, to Grade 6 soils (less than 10) which are not suitable for agriculture. Under this system, soils deemed less than prime can function as prime soils when limitations such as poor drainage, slopes, or soil nutrient deficiencies are partially or entirely removed. The six grades, ranges in index rating, and definition of the grades, as defined by the NRCS, are provided below in Table 3.2-3.

**TABLE 3.2-3: STORIE INDEX RATING SYSTEM**

<i>GRADE</i>	<i>INDEX RATING</i>	<i>DEFINITION</i>
1	80 - 100	Few limitations that restrict their use for crops
2	60 – 80	Suitable for most crops, but have minor limitations that narrow the choice of crops and have a few special management needs
3	40 – 60	Suited to a few crops or to special crops and require special management
4	20 – 40	If used for crops, severely limited and require special management
5	10 – 20	Not suited for cultivated crops, but can be used for pasture and range
6	Less than 10	Soil and land types generally not suited to farming

*SOURCE: USDA SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, SOIL SURVEY OF YOLO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, 1972.*

In addition to soil suitability, other factors for determining the agricultural value of land include whether soils are irrigated, the depth of soil, water-holding capacity, and physical and chemical characteristics. Areas considered to have the greatest agricultural potential are designated as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

**Important Farmlands**

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) is a farmland classification system administered by the California Department of Conservation. Important farmland maps are based on the Land Inventory and Monitoring criteria, which classify a land’s suitability for agricultural production based on both the physical and chemical characteristics of soils, and the actual land use. The system maps five categories of agricultural land, which include important farmlands (prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, unique farmland, and farmland of local importance) and grazing land, as well as three categories of non-agricultural land, which include urban and built-up land, other land, and water area.

**IMPORTANT FARMLANDS IN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY**

Data from the Department of Conservation indicates that approximately 11,647 acres of Prime Farmland in the County was developed for other uses between 2008 and 2010, resulting in an existing total of 385,337 acres of Prime Farmland (51% of agricultural land). The remaining agricultural land is comprised of Farmland of Statewide Importance (11%), Unique Farmland (9%), Farmland of Local Importance (10%), and Grazing Land (18%). The types and acreages of farmland in 2008 and 2010 are shown below in Table 3.2-4.

## 3.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

**TABLE 3.2-4: SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FARMLANDS SUMMARY AND CHANGE BY LAND USE CATEGORY**

LAND USE CATEGORY	2008-10 ACREAGE CHANGES							
	TOTAL ACREAGE INVENTORIED				ACRES LOST	ACRES GAINED	TOTAL	NET
	2008		2010		(-)	(+)	ACREAGE CHANGED	ACREAGE CHANGED
	Acres	Percent	Acres	percent				
Prime Farmland	396,984	44%	385,337	42%	12,570	923	13,493	-11,647
Farmland of Statewide Importance	86,297	9%	83,307	9%	3,202	212	3,414	-2,990
Unique Farmland	66,621	7%	69,481	8%	1,590	4,450	6,040	2,860
Farmland of Local Importance	65,788	7%	76,869	8%	3,644	14,725	18,369	11,081
IMPORTANT FARMLAND SUBTOTAL	615,690	67%	614,994	67%	21,006	20,310	41,316	-696
Grazing Land	142,460	16%	139,235	15%	3,341	116	3,457	-3,225
AGRICULTURAL LAND SUBTOTAL	758,150	83%	754,229	83%	24,347	20,426	44,773	-3,921
Urban and Built-up Land	90,529	10%	91,929	10%	127	1,527	1,654	1,400
Other Land	52,141	6%	54,662	6%	838	3,359	4,197	2,521
Water Area	11,773	1%	11,773	1%	0	0	0	0
TOTAL AREA INVENTORIED	912,593	100%	912,593	100%	25,312	25,312	50,624	0

SOURCE: CA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION TABLE A-30, 2012

### EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

The current uses on the Project site are predominantly agricultural (182.2 acres) and undeveloped, with an approximately 28.5-acre portion of the Project site developed with the Big League Dreams baseball complex. The agricultural lands on the Project site have been used historically for intensive agricultural purposes such as farming and crop production but are not under a Williamson Act contract or conservation easement.

### Surrounding Land Uses

The Project site is surrounded by a variety of existing land uses. Agricultural land, rural residential uses, and vacant/undeveloped land is located west of the Project site. The northwest portion of the Project site is bordered by the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. South of the Project site is the SR 120, with single family residential development, vacant/undeveloped land, and agricultural uses south of SR 120. Daniels Street and the Stadium Shopping Center are located southeast of the Project site. Milo Cardini Drive and vacant/undeveloped and agricultural land uses are to the east. The Wastewater Quality Control Facility and agricultural uses are located north of the site. Figure 3.10-1 provides an aerial view of the site.

### Project Site Farmland Characteristics

The State of California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and San Joaquin County GIS data were used to identify the farmland characteristics for the Project

site. Farmlands on the Project site are identified in Figure 3.2-1. The farmland classifications for the site and surrounding area are described below.

#### PRIME FARMLAND

Prime farmland is farmland with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.

Prime Farmland is located in two portions of the site: an area immediately west of the Big League Dreams complex and an area located in the southern portion of the site adjacent SR 120 and the Stadium Shopping Center. Prime Farmland on the Project site totals approximately 6.6 acres. Prime Farmlands are also located west of the Project site, west of McKinley Avenue and the UPRR right-of-way.

#### FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE

Farmland of Statewide Importance is farmland with characteristics similar to those of prime farmland but with minor shortcomings, such as greater slopes or less ability to store soil moisture. Land must have been used for irrigated agricultural production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.

The majority of agricultural land, approximately 175.6 acres, is designated Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on Figure 3.2-1. Farmland of Statewide Importance is also located in the general vicinity of the Project site to the northeast, east, and west.

#### UNIQUE FARMLAND

Unique farmland is farmland of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state's leading agricultural crops. This land is usually irrigated, but may include non-irrigated orchards or vineyards as found in some climatic zones in California. Land must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.

There is no land within the Project site, or in the immediately vicinity, that is designated Unique Farmland.

#### FARMLAND OF LOCAL IMPORTANCE

Farmland of Local Importance is land of importance to the local agricultural economy, as determined by each county's board of supervisors and a local advisory committee.

There is no Farmland of Local Importance on the Project site. Areas designated Farmland of Local Importance is located to the west of the Project site and to the east.

## 3.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

### URBAN AND BUILT-UP LAND

Land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. This land is used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes.

The Big League Dreams complex on the Project site and land immediately adjacent the complex is designated Urban and Built-Up Land. The WQCF to the north and Stadium Shopping Center to the south of the Project site are also designated Urban and Built-Up Land.

### OTHER LAND

Other Land is not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land. The Other Land categories include:

- Rural Residential Land
- Semi-Agricultural and Rural Commercial Land
- Vacant or Disturbed Land
- Confined Animal Agriculture
- Nonagricultural or Natural Vegetation

Other Land is not located on the Project site, but Rural Residential Land and Vacant or Disturbed Land are in the general vicinity of the Project as shown on Figure 3.2-1.

### Soils and Farmland Characteristics

A Custom Soil Survey was completed for the Project site using the NRCS Web Soil Survey program. Table 3.2-5 identifies the soils found in the Plan Area. The NRCS Soils Map is provided as Figure 3.2-2.

**TABLE 3.2-5: PROJECT SOILS**

MAP #	UNIT SYMBOL	NAME	PERCENT OF AOI	STORIE INDEX (GRADE)
1	142	Delhi loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes, MLRA 17	4%	65 (2)
2	109	Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes	66%	30 (4)
3	254	Timor loamy sand, 0-2% slopes	9%	43 (3)
4	255	Tinnin loamy coarse sand, 0-2% slopes	17%	57 (3)
5	266	Veritas fine sandy loam, 0-2% slopes	3%	57 (3)

SOURCE: NRCS CUSTOM SOIL SURVEY, 2014; SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SOIL SURVEY, 1992

**Delhi loamy sand.** This very deep, somewhat excessively drained, nearly level soil was formed in wind-modified alluvium. Permeability is rapid in this soil. Runoff is slow, and the hazard of water

erosion is slight. This unit is suited to irrigated pasture. The main limitations are the low available water capacity and the high water table. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, orchard, and vineyard crops. The main limitation is the low available water capacity.

**Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained.** This very deep, poorly drained, nearly level soil formed in alluvium. Permeability is rapid in this soil. Runoff is very slow, and the hazard of water erosion is slight. This unit is suited to irrigated pasture. The main limitations are the low available water capacity and the high water table.

**Timor loamy sand.** This moderately well drained, nearly level soil is on low fan terraces. It is deep to a hardpan. It formed in alluvium derived from granitic rock sources. Runoff is slow, and the hazard of water erosion is slight. The main limitations to agricultural production are the low available water capacity and depth to hardpan. This soil unit is suited to irrigated pasture.

**Tinnin loamy coarse sand.** This very deep, well drained, nearly level soil is on alluvial fans. It formed in alluvium derived from granitic rock surfaces. Permeability is rapid and available water capacity is low. Runoff is slow, and the hazard of water erosion is slight. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, orchard, and vineyard crops. The main limitation is the low available water capacity.

Veritas fine sandy loam. This moderately well drained, nearly level soils is on low fan terraces. It is deep to a hardpan. This soil formed in alluvium derived from mixed rock sources. Runoff is slow and the hazard of water erosion is slight. This unit is suited to irrigated row, field, orchard, and vineyard crops. The main limitation is depth to the hardpan.

## 3.2.2 REGULATORY SETTING

### FEDERAL

---

#### **Farmland Protection Policy Act**

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) is intended to minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. It ensures that, to the extent practicable, federal programs are compatible with state and local units of government as well as private programs and policies to protect farmland. Projects are subject to FPPA requirements if they may irreversibly convert farmland (directly or indirectly) to nonagricultural use and are completed by a federal agency or with assistance from a federal agency. For the purpose of the FPPA, farmland includes prime farmland, unique farmland, and land of statewide or local importance. Farmland subject to FPPA requirements does not have to be currently used for crop production. In fact, the land can be forest land, pastureland, cropland, or other land but does not include water bodies or land developed for urban land uses (i.e., residential, commercial, or industrial uses).

The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) administers the Farmland Protection Program. NRCS uses a land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) system to establish a farmland conversion impact rating score on proposed sites of federally funded and assisted projects. This score is used

as an indicator for the project sponsor to consider alternative sites if the potential adverse impacts on the farmland exceed the recommended allowable level. The assessment is completed on form AD-1006, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating. The sponsoring agency completes the site assessment portion of the AD-1006, which assesses non-soil related criteria such as the potential for impact on the local agricultural economy if the land is converted to non-farm use and compatibility with existing agricultural use.

### STATE

---

#### **Williamson Act**

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly known as the Williamson Act, was established based on numerous State legislative findings regarding the importance of agricultural lands in an urbanizing society. Policies emanating from those findings include those that discourage premature and unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to urban uses and discourage discontinuous urban development patterns, which unnecessarily increase the costs of community services to community residents.

The Williamson Act authorizes each County to establish an agricultural preserve. Land that is within the agricultural preserve is eligible to be placed under a contract between the property owner and County that would restrict the use of the land to agriculture in exchange for a tax assessment that is based on the yearly production yield. The contracts have a 10-year term that is automatically renewed each year, unless the property owner requests a non-renewal or the contract is cancelled. If the contract is cancelled the property owner is assessed a fee of up to 12.5 percent of the property value.

The Project site is not under a Williamson Act contract, nor is any of the parcels that are located adjacent to the Project site.

#### **Farmland Security Zones**

In 1998 the state legislature established the Farmland Security Zone (FSZ) program. FSZs are similar to Williamson Act contracts, in that the intention is to protect farmland from conversion. The main difference however, is that the FSZ must be designated as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance. The term of the contract is a minimum of 20 years. The property owners are offered an incentive of greater property tax reductions when compared to the Williamson Act contract tax incentives; the incentives were developed to encourage conservation of prime farmland through FSZs. The non-renewal and cancellation procedures are similar to those for Williamson Act contracts.

The Project site and the adjacent parcels are not within the FSZ program.

#### **California Government Code Section 560643**

This section of the Government Codes defines “Prime agricultural land” as follows:

- Prime agricultural land means an area of land, whether a single parcel or contiguous parcels, that has not been developed for a use other than an agricultural use and that meets any of the following qualifications:
  - Land that qualifies, if irrigated, for rating as class I or class II in the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service land use capability classification, whether or not land is actually irrigated, provided that irrigation is feasible.
  - Land that qualifies for rating 80 through 100 Storie Index Rating.
  - Land that supports livestock used for the production of food and fiber and that has an annual carrying capacity equivalent to at least one animal unit per acre as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture in the National Range and Pasture Handbook, Revision 1, December 2003.
  - Land planted with fruit or nut-bearing trees, vines, bushes, or crops that have a nonbearing period of less than five years and that will re-turn during the commercial bearing period on an annual basis from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production not less than four hundred dollars (\$400) per acre.
  - Land that has returned from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant products an annual gross value of not less than four hundred dollars (\$400) per acre for three of the previous five calendar years.

## LOCAL

---

### City of Manteca General Plan

The Project site is designated as Public/Quasi-Public by the City's General Plan. The General Plan Resources Conservation Element provides a goal and policy framework for the preservation and conservation of agricultural resources. General Plan agricultural policies and implementation measures applicable to the Project are identified below:

**RC-P-19.** The City shall support the continuation of agricultural uses on lands designated for urban use, until urban development is imminent.

**RC-P-20.** The City shall provide an orderly and phased development pattern so that farmland is not subjected to premature development pressure.

**RC-P-21.** In approving urban development near existing agricultural lands, the City shall take actions so that such development will not unnecessarily constrain agricultural practices or adversely affect the viability of nearby agricultural operations.

**RC-P-23.** Protect designated agricultural lands, without placing an undue burden on agricultural landowners.

**RC-P-24.** Provide buffers at the interface of urban development and farmland; in order to minimize conflicts between these uses.

**RC-P-25.** The City shall ensure, in approving urban development near existing agricultural lands, that such development will not unnecessarily constrain agricultural practices or adversely affect the economic viability of nearby agricultural operations.

**RC-P-28.** The City shall not extend water and sewer lines to premature urban development that would adversely affect agricultural operations.

**RC-P-30.** The City of Manteca will participate in a county-wide program to mitigate the conversion of Prime Farmland and Farmlands of Statewide Importance to urban uses.

**RC-I-30.** Apply the following conditions of approval where urban development occurs next to farmland.

- Require notifications in urban property deeds that agricultural operations are in the vicinity, in keeping with the City's right-to-farm ordinance.
- Require adequate and secure fencing at the interface of urban and agricultural use.
- Require phasing of new residential subdivisions; so as to include an interim buffer between residential and agricultural use.

### **City of Manteca Agricultural Mitigation Fee Program**

Chapter 13.42 of the Municipal Code establishes the City's Agricultural Mitigation Fee Program, which authorizes the collection of development impact fees to offset costs associated with the loss of productive agricultural lands converted for urban uses within the City. Agricultural mitigation fees are required to be paid prior to issuance of any building permit. Fees are used to protect agricultural lands planned for agricultural use. Fees collected under Chapter 13.42 may be used as fair compensation for farmland conservation easements or farmland deed restrictions that conserve existing agricultural land.

### **City of Manteca Right to Farm Ordinance**

Chapter 8.24 of the Municipal Code establishes the City's "Right to Farm" ordinance, which is intended to protect agricultural uses in the City. The ordinance establishes the City's policy to preserve, protect and encourage the use of viable agricultural land for the production of food and other agricultural products. Chapter 8.24 identifies that when nonagricultural land uses extend into or approach agricultural areas, conflicts may arise between such land uses and agricultural operations that often result in the involuntary curtailment or cessation of agricultural operations, and discourage investment in such operations.

Chapter 8.24 of the City's Municipal Code is intended to reduce the occurrence of such conflicts between nonagricultural and agricultural land uses within the City through requiring the transferor of any property in the City to provide a disclosure statement describing that the City permits agricultural operations, including those that utilize chemical fertilizers and pesticides. The

disclosure statement notifies the purchaser that the property being purchased may be located close to agricultural lands and operations and that the purchaser may be subject to inconvenience or discomfort arising from the lawful and proper use of agricultural chemical and pesticides and from other agricultural activities, including without limitation, cultivation, plowing, spraying, irrigation, pruning, harvesting, burning of agricultural waste products, protection of crops and animals from depredation, and other activities which occasionally generate dust, smoke, noise and odor. In addition, prior to issuance of a city building permit for construction of a residential building, the owner of the property upon which the building is to be constructed is required to file a disclosure statement acknowledging the proximity of agricultural operations and the potential for inconvenience or nuisance associated with those uses.

### **San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP)**

The SJMSCP provides comprehensive measures for compensation and avoidance of impacts on various biological resources, which includes ancillary benefits to agricultural resources. For instance, many of the habitat easements that are purchased or facilitated by the SJMSCP program are targeted for the protection of Swainson's hawk or other sensitive species habitat that are dependent on agricultural lands (i.e. alfalfa and row crops). The biological mitigation for these species through the SJMSCP includes the purchase of certain conservation easements for habitat purposes; however, the conservation easements are placed over agricultural land, such as alfalfa and row crops (not vines or orchards). As such, SJMSCP fees paid to SJCOG as administrator of the SJMSCP will result in the preservation of agricultural lands in perpetuity.

## **3.2.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on agricultural resources if it will:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Important Farmlands), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;
- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

**Impact 3.2-1: The proposed project has the potential to result in the conversion of Farmlands, including Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses. (Significant and Unavoidable)**

Development of the proposed Project as a whole would result in the permanent conversion of 182.2 acres of Important Farmland (Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance), as shown on Figure 3.2-1, to nonagricultural use. The loss of Important Farmland as classified under the FMMP is considered a potentially significant environmental impact.

The City's agricultural mitigation fee program requires that future development pay the agricultural mitigation fee, currently \$2,511.67 per acre but subject to annual increases, to mitigate the conversion of agricultural land to urban use. The City then uses these funds to purchase conservation easements or deed restrictions on agricultural land to ensure that the land remains in agricultural use in perpetuity. Each individual component of the proposed Project would be subject to the agricultural mitigation fee beginning with the development proposed in Phase 1 of the Master Plan.

In addition to the City's agricultural mitigation fee program, the SJMSCP requires development to pay fees on a per-acre basis for impacts to agricultural lands that function as habitat for biological resources. SJCOG then uses these funds to purchase the conservation easements on agricultural and habitat lands in the project vicinity. The compensation results in the purchase of conservation easements that are placed over agricultural land, such as alfalfa and row crops. As such, the Project fees paid to SJCOG as administrator of the SJMSCP will result in the preservation of agricultural lands in perpetuity. Each individual component of the proposed Project would be subject to the SJMSCP mitigation fee beginning with the development proposed in Phase 1 of the Master Plan.

The purchase of conservation easements and/or deed restrictions through the City agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP allows the landowners to retain ownership of the land and continue agricultural operations, and preserves such lands in perpetuity.

The General Plan EIR anticipated development of the Project site consistent with the Land Use Map as part of the overall evaluation of the build out of the City. The General Plan EIR addressed the conversion and loss of agricultural land that would result from the build out of the General Plan (General Plan 2023 Draft EIR, pp. 4-13 through 4-15). The General Plan EIR determined that even with the implementation of mitigation measure AG-1.1, which identifies General Plan goals, policies, and implementation measures LU-P-41, LU-I-1 Goal RC-9, RC-P-18, and RC-P-19, and AG-1.2 which directs the major growth area to the Primary Urban Service boundary in a manner that avoids Prime Farmlands where feasible, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Each individual phase, beginning with Phase 1, will contribute fees toward the purchase of conservation easements on lands through the City's agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP program as required by Mitigation Measure 3.2-1; however, those fees and conservation easements would not result in the creation of new farmland to offset the loss that would occur with Project implementation. As such, the loss of Important Farmland in each individual phase, and collectively as a whole project, would be a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

#### MITIGATION MEASURE

**Mitigation Measure 3.2-1:** *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each individual phase of development, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall participate in the City's agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP by paying the established fees on a per-acre basis for the loss of important farmland. Fees paid toward the City's program shall be used to fund conservation easements on comparable or better agricultural lands to provide compensatory mitigation.*

#### **Impact 3.2-2: The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning or Williamson Act Contracts (no impact)**

The Project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract and is not zoned for agricultural use. There are no parcels in the immediate vicinity of the Plan Area that are under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, implementation of each individual phase (and collectively as a whole project) would have **no impact** relative to this topic and no mitigation is required.

#### **Impact 3.2-3: The proposed project has the potential to result in conflicts with adjacent agricultural lands or indirectly cause conversion of agricultural lands (less than significant)**

Agricultural land located outside the project boundary, including Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, is located adjacent to the western, northern, and eastern boundaries of the Project site as shown on Figure 3.2-1. A variety of recreational and visitor-serving uses would be developed in each individual phase of the project and all farmland within the Project site will be eventually be converted to an urban use as the project builds out.

While the City's General Plan anticipates that lands to the north, east, south, and southwest of the Project site would develop with urban uses, much of the land is used for agricultural production currently. Further, the San Joaquin County General Plan designates a portion of the lands west and northwest of the site for agricultural uses. While the UPRR buffers agricultural lands in San Joaquin County that are to the northwest of the Project site, agricultural lands that are located adjacent to the Project site west of McKinley Avenue and to the northeast and east of the Project site may be impacted by the increased human presence on the Project site. Land within the project site located closest to these adjacent agricultural uses is designated for development in "Future Phases" (i.e. after Phase 4), meaning the greatest potential for a conflict will occur later in the development horizon of the Master Plan. However, with the development of each phase of the project the potential for conflict with these adjacent agricultural lands will become increasingly present.

## 3.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

---

The City's Right-to-Farm Ordinance reduces the potential for conflict between existing agricultural lands and adjacent uses for each phase of development. The notification procedures in the ordinance serves to inform landowners and developers of non-agricultural uses of what the expectations are in the area with regard to agricultural activities and reduce complaints.

The General Plan 2023 EIR identifies that the location or nature of the General Plan could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use and identified Mitigation Measure AG-3.1, which included General Plan Policies RC-P-20, RC-P-23, RC-P-24, RC-P-25, and RC-P-27 and Implementation Measure RC-I-30. It is noted that some of these policies are re-numbered in the General plan as adopted. The General Plan 2023 EIR determined that the impact would be less than significant if the mitigation was implemented to maintain agricultural use adjacent to non-agricultural uses (General Plan 2023 Draft EIR, pp. 4-18 and 4-19).

General Plan Policy RC-P-24 requires buffers at the interface of urban development and farmland in order to minimize conflicts between the uses. Policy RC-P-25 requires that the City, in approving urban development near existing agricultural lands, ensures that such development will not constrain nearby agricultural practices. Implementation measure RC-I-30 requires urban development next to farmland to provide notifications in keeping with the Right-to-Farm Ordinance and include adequate and secure fencing at the interface of urban and agricultural uses.

Development of the phases located in the "Future Phases" has the greatest potential to cause conflict with adjacent uses by placing recreation and visitor-serving uses adjacent to existing agricultural uses. Phase 1 of the proposed project, however, would have the least potential have cause a conflict because it is farthest away from an adjacent agricultural use. Regardless of the distance between phases of the development to adjacent agricultural uses, Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 is presented here to ensure that the design review process for individual components of the proposed project includes adequate measures to buffer urban uses from adjacent agricultural uses to reduce adverse effects on neighboring agricultural uses. Consistent with the General Plan 2023 EIR, implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 would reduce potential impacts to **less than significant**.


**Mitigation Measure 3.2-2:** *Prior to approval of improvement plans for each individual phase of development, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the Project proponent shall demonstrate that the Project site plans include adequate measures to buffer adjacent agricultural uses from urban uses on the Project site and to reduce adverse impacts to neighboring agricultural uses. Such measures shall include, but not be limited to:*

- *The Project shall provide adequate and secure fencing at the interface of the Project site, or any individual phase of the Project, and adjacent agricultural uses.*
- *The Project shall provide buffers, which may include parking areas, roadways and streets, drainage channels, and landscaped corridors, to buffer adjacent agricultural uses from the Project, including any individual phase of the Project, from proposed urban uses.*
- *The Project shall provide notifications to all operators of uses on the Project site that are adjacent or in the vicinity of existing agricultural land of the City's Right-to-Farm Ordinance.*



- Prime Farmland
- Farmland of Statewide Importance
- Farmland of Local Importance
- Vacant or Disturbed Land
- Rural Residential Land
- Urban and Built-Up Land

N



1:9,000


**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

Figure 3.2-1: Important Farmlands

De Novo Planning Group  
A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

Data sources: State of California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Joaquin County, 2010; San Joaquin County GIS; ArcGIS Online, aerial image map service. Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*









 Project Boundary

**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

Figure 3.2-2: Soil Map

**NRCS Soil Description**

-  1: Delhi loamy sand, 0-2% slopes, MLRA 17
-  2: Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0-2% slopes
-  3: Timor loamy sand, 0-2% slopes
-  4: Tinnin loamy coarse sand, 0-2% slopes
-  5: Veritas fine sandy loam, 0 -2% slopes



Data sources: USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey San Joaquin County, California, v7, November 2013.  
Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

This section describes the regional air quality, current attainment status of the air basin, local sensitive receptors, emission sources, and impacts that are likely to result from Project implementation. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to urban uses. Following this discussion is an assessment of consistency of the proposed Project with applicable policies and local plans. The Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change analysis is located in Section 3.7. This section is based in part on the following technical studies: *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (California Air Resources Board 2007), *Guide for Assessing and Mitigation Air Quality Impacts* (SJVAPCD 2002), *DRAFT -Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts - 2012* (SJVAPCD 2012), *CalEEMod (v.2013.2.2)* (California Air Resources Board 2007). An NOP comment was provided by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

### 3.3.3 EXISTING SETTING

#### SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR BASIN

---

The San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) consists of eight counties, stretching from Kern County in the south to San Joaquin County in the north. The SJVAB is bounded by the Sierra Nevada in the east, the Coast Ranges in the west, and the Tehachapi mountains in the south. Figure 3.3-1 illustrates the location of the County within the SJVAB.

The surrounding topographic features restrict air movement through and out of the basin and, as a result, impede the dispersion of pollutants from the basin. Inversion layers are formed in the SJVAB throughout the year. (An inversion layer is created when a mass of warm dry air sits over cooler air near the ground, preventing vertical dispersion of pollutants from the air mass below). During the summer, the San Joaquin Valley experiences daytime temperature inversions at elevations from 2,000 to 2,500 feet above the valley floor. During the winter months, inversions occur from 500 to 1,000 feet above the valley floor (SJVAPCD 1998).

The pollution potential of the San Joaquin Valley is very high. Surrounding elevated terrain in conjunction with temperature inversions frequently restrict lateral and vertical dilution of pollutants. Abundant sunshine and warm temperatures in summer are ideal conditions for the formation of photochemical oxidant, and the Valley is a frequent scene of photochemical pollution.

#### **Climate**

The SJVAB has an inland Mediterranean climate with warm, dry summers and cooler winters. The average daily maximum temperature in the Basin is 65° F, with temperature highs of 95° F in July. Average daily minimum temperature is 48° F, with temperature lows of 45° F in January. Normal rainfall level is approximately nine inches per year, and occurs mainly in the winter months from November to April. Thunderstorms occur on approximately 3 to 4 days in the spring, on average.

The Stockton area has warm, dry days and relatively cool nights, with clear skies and limited rainfall. Winters are mild with light rains and frequent heavy fog from December to January. The

average daily temperature in Stockton is 74° F. Annual rainfall is 13 inches in Stockton, 8 inches in Tracy and 16 inches in Lodi.

### **Air Movement**

Marine air comes into the basin from the Sacramento River–San Joaquin River Delta, although most air movement is restricted by the surrounding mountains. Winds from the Bay Area flow northeasterly into the Sacramento Valley and southward into San Joaquin County. This results in weak winds from the north and northeast, with an average speed of seven miles per hour.

Wind speed and direction determine the dispersion of air pollutants. During the summer, wind from the north flows south and southeasterly through the Valley, through the Tehachapi Pass and into the Southeast Desert Air Basin. Thus, emissions from the San Francisco Bay Area and the Broader Sacramento air basins are transported into San Joaquin County and the Valley. Emissions in the San Joaquin Valley are then transported to the Southeast Desert and Great Basin Valley Air Basins. In late fall and winter, cold air from the mountains flows into the Valley. This results in winds from the south that flow north and northwesterly. Some emissions from San Joaquin County are transported to the Broader Sacramento air basin during these times. But the winds are relatively light, limiting the dispersion of CO and other pollutants. Thus, high concentrations of CO remain in the Valley.

### **Seasonal Pollution Variations**

Carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter, and lead particulate concentrations in the late fall and winter are highest when there is little interchange of air between the valley and the coast and when humidity is high following winter rains. This type of weather is associated with radiation fog, known as tule fog, when temperature inversions at ground level persist over the entire valley for several weeks and air movement is virtually absent.

Pollution potential in the San Joaquin County area is relatively high due to the combination of air pollutant emissions sources, transport of pollutants into the area and meteorological conditions that are conducive to high levels of air pollution. Elevated levels of particulate matter (primarily very small particulates or PM<sub>10</sub>) and ground-level ozone are of most concern to regional air quality officials.

Local carbon monoxide “hot spots” are important to a lesser extent. Ground-level ozone, the principal component of smog, is not directly emitted into the atmosphere but is formed by the reaction of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) (known as ozone precursor pollutants) in the presence of strong sunlight. Ozone levels are highest in San Joaquin County during late spring through early fall, when weather conditions are conducive and emissions of the precursor pollutants are highest.

Surface-based inversions that form during late fall and winter nights cause localized air pollution problems (PM<sub>10</sub> and carbon monoxide) near the emission sources because of poor dispersion conditions. Emission sources are primarily from automobiles. Conditions are exacerbated during drought-year winters.

## Sunlight

The presence and intensity of sunlight are necessary prerequisites for the formation of photochemical smog. Under the influence of the ultraviolet radiation of sunlight, certain original or “primary” pollutants (mainly reactive hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen) react to form “secondary” pollutants (primarily oxidants). Since this process is time dependent, secondary pollutants can be formed many miles downwind from the emission sources. Because of the prevailing daytime winds and time delayed nature of photochemical smog, oxidant concentrations are highest in the inland areas of the San Joaquin Valley.

## Temperature Inversions

A temperature inversion is a reversal in the normal decrease of temperature as altitude increases. In most parts of the country, air near ground level is warmer than the air above it. Semi-permanent systems of high barometric pressure fronts establish themselves over the basin, deflecting low-pressure systems that might otherwise bring cleansing rain and winds. The height of the base of the inversion is known as the “mixing height” and controls the volume of air available for the mixing and dispersion of air pollutants.

The interrelationship of air pollutants and climatic factors are most critical on days of greatly reduced atmospheric ventilation. On days such as these, air pollutants accumulate because of the simultaneous occurrence of three favorable factors: low inversions, low maximum mixing heights and low wind speeds. Although these conditions may occur throughout the year, the months of July, August and September generally account for more than 40 percent of these occurrences.

The potential for high contaminant levels varies seasonally for many contaminants. During late spring, summer and early fall, light winds, low mixing heights and sunshine combine to produce conditions favorable for the maximum production of oxidants, mainly ozone. When strong surface inversions are formed on winter nights, especially during the hours before sunrise, coupled with near-calm winds, carbon monoxide from automobile exhausts becomes highly concentrated. The highest yearly concentrations of carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen are measured during November, December and January.

## CRITERIA POLLUTANTS

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) uses six "criteria pollutants" as indicators of air quality, and has established for each of them a maximum concentration above which adverse effects on human health may occur. These threshold concentrations are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Each criteria pollutant is described below.

**Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)** is a photochemical oxidant and the major component of smog. While O<sub>3</sub> in the upper atmosphere is beneficial to life by shielding the earth from harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun, high concentrations of O<sub>3</sub> at ground level are a major health and environmental concern. O<sub>3</sub> is not emitted directly into the air but is formed through complex chemical reactions between precursor emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) in the presence of sunlight. These reactions are stimulated by sunlight and temperature so that peak O<sub>3</sub>

levels occur typically during the warmer times of the year. Both VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> are emitted by transportation and industrial sources. VOCs are emitted from sources as diverse as autos, chemical manufacturing, dry cleaners, paint shops and other sources using solvents.

The reactivity of O<sub>3</sub> causes health problems because it damages lung tissue, reduces lung function and sensitizes the lungs to other irritants. Scientific evidence indicates that ambient levels of O<sub>3</sub> not only affect people with impaired respiratory systems, such as asthmatics, but healthy adults and children as well. Exposure to O<sub>3</sub> for several hours at relatively low concentrations has been found to significantly reduce lung function and induce respiratory inflammation in normal, healthy people during exercise. This decrease in lung function generally is accompanied by symptoms including chest pain, coughing, sneezing and pulmonary congestion.

**Carbon monoxide (CO)** is a colorless, odorless and poisonous gas produced by incomplete burning of carbon in fuels. When CO enters the bloodstream, it reduces the delivery of oxygen to the body's organs and tissues. Health threats are most serious for those who suffer from cardiovascular disease, particularly those with angina or peripheral vascular disease. Exposure to elevated CO levels can cause impairment of visual perception, manual dexterity, learning ability and performance of complex tasks.

**Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)** is a brownish, highly reactive gas that is present in all urban atmospheres. NO<sub>2</sub> can irritate the lungs, cause bronchitis and pneumonia, and lower resistance to respiratory infections. Nitrogen oxides are an important precursor both to ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and acid rain, and may affect both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. The major mechanism for the formation of NO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is the oxidation of the primary air pollutant nitric oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>). NO<sub>x</sub> plays a major role, together with VOCs, in the atmospheric reactions that produce O<sub>3</sub>. NO<sub>x</sub> forms when fuel is burned at high temperatures. The two major emission sources are transportation and stationary fuel combustion sources such as electric utility and industrial boilers.

**Sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)** affects breathing and may aggravate existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease in high doses. Sensitive populations include asthmatics, individuals with bronchitis or emphysema, children and the elderly. SO<sub>2</sub> is also a primary contributor to acid deposition, or acid rain, which causes acidification of lakes and streams and can damage trees, crops, historic buildings and statues. In addition, sulfur compounds in the air contribute to visibility impairment in large parts of the country. This is especially noticeable in national parks. Ambient SO<sub>2</sub> results largely from stationary sources such as coal and oil combustion, steel mills, refineries, pulp and paper mills and from nonferrous smelters.

**Particulate matter (PM)** includes dust, dirt, soot, smoke and liquid droplets directly emitted into the air by sources such as factories, power plants, cars, construction activity, fires and natural windblown dust. Particles formed in the atmosphere by condensation or the transformation of emitted gases such as SO<sub>2</sub> and VOCs are also considered particulate matter.

Based on studies of human populations exposed to high concentrations of particles (sometimes in the presence of SO<sub>2</sub>) and laboratory studies of animals and humans, there are major effects of concern for human health. These include effects on breathing and respiratory symptoms,

aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease, alterations in the body's defense systems against foreign materials, damage to lung tissue, carcinogenesis and premature death.

**Respirable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>)** consists of small particles, less than 10 microns in diameter, of dust, smoke, or droplets of liquid which penetrate the human respiratory system and cause irritation by themselves, or in combination with other gases. Particulate matter is caused primarily by dust from grading and excavation activities, from agricultural uses (as created by soil preparation activities, fertilizer and pesticide spraying, weed burning and animal husbandry), and from motor vehicles, particularly diesel-powered vehicles. PM<sub>10</sub> causes a greater health risk than larger particles, since these fine particles can more easily penetrate the defenses of the human respiratory system.

**Fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)** consists of small particles, which are less than 2.5 microns in size. Similar to PM<sub>10</sub>, these particles are primarily the result of combustion in motor vehicles, particularly diesel engines, as well as from industrial sources and residential/agricultural activities such as burning. It is also formed through the reaction of other pollutants. As with PM<sub>10</sub>, these particulates can increase the chance of respiratory disease, and cause lung damage and cancer. In 1997, the EPA created new Federal air quality standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

The major subgroups of the population that appear to be most sensitive to the effects of particulate matter include individuals with chronic obstructive pulmonary or cardiovascular disease or influenza, asthmatics, the elderly and children. Particulate matter also soils and damages materials, and is a major cause of visibility impairment.

**Lead (Pb)** exposure can occur through multiple pathways, including inhalation of air and ingestion of Pb in food, water, soil or dust. Excessive Pb exposure can cause seizures, mental retardation and/or behavioral disorders. Low doses of Pb can lead to central nervous system damage. Recent studies have also shown that Pb may be a factor in high blood pressure and subsequent heart disease.

## ODORS

Typically odors are regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. However, manifestations of a person's reaction to foul odors can range from psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, or anxiety) to physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache).

With respect to odors, the human nose is the sole sensing device. The ability to detect odors varies considerably among the population and overall is quite subjective. Some individuals have the ability to smell minute quantities of specific substances; others may not have the same sensitivity but may have sensitivities to odors of other substances. In addition, people may have different reactions to the same odor; in fact, an odor that is offensive to one person (e.g., from a fast-food restaurant) may be perfectly acceptable to another.

It is also important to note that an unfamiliar odor is more easily detected and is more likely to cause complaints than a familiar one. This is because of the phenomenon known as odor fatigue,

in which a person can become desensitized to almost any odor and recognition only occurs with an alteration in the intensity.

Quality and intensity are two properties present in any odor. The quality of an odor indicates the nature of the smell experience. For instance, if a person describes an odor as flowery or sweet, then the person is describing the quality of the odor. Intensity refers to the strength of the odor. For example, a person may use the word “strong” to describe the intensity of an odor. Odor intensity depends on the odorant concentration in the air.

When an odorous sample is progressively diluted, the odorant concentration decreases. As this occurs, the odor intensity weakens and eventually becomes so low that the detection or recognition of the odor is quite difficult. At some point during dilution, the concentration of the odorant reaches a detection threshold. An odorant concentration below the detection threshold means that the concentration in the air is not detectable by the average human.

### SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

---

A sensitive receptor is a location where human populations, especially children, seniors, and sick persons, are present and where there is a reasonable expectation of continuous human exposure to pollutants. Examples of sensitive receptors include residences, hospitals and schools.

### AMBIENT AIR QUALITY

---

Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. These ambient air quality standards represent safe levels of contaminants that avoid specific adverse health effects associated with each pollutant.

The federal and California state ambient air quality standards are summarized in Table 3.3-1 for important pollutants. The federal and state ambient standards were developed independently, although both processes attempted to avoid health-related effects. As a result, the federal and state standards differ in some cases. In general, the California state standards are more stringent. This is particularly true for ozone and particulate matter between 2.5 and 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>).

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency established new national air quality standards for ground-level ozone and for fine particulate matter in 1997. The 1-hour ozone standard was phased out and replaced by an 8-hour standard of 0.075 PPM. Implementation of the 8-hour standard was delayed by litigation, but was determined to be valid and enforceable by the U.S. Supreme Court in a decision issued in February of 2001.

**TABLE 3.3-1: FEDERAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

POLLUTANT	AVERAGING TIME	FEDERAL PRIMARY STANDARD	STATE STANDARD
Ozone	1-Hour	--	0.09 ppm
	8-Hour	0.075 ppm	0.070 ppm
Carbon Monoxide	8-Hour	9.0 ppm	9.0 ppm
	1-Hour	35.0 ppm	20.0 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual	0.053 ppm	0.03 ppm
	1-Hour	0.100 ppm	0.18 ppm
Sulfur Dioxide	Annual	0.03 ppm	--
	24-Hour	0.14 ppm	0.04 ppm
	1-Hour	75 ppb	0.25 ppm
PM10	Annual	--	20 µg /m <sup>3</sup>
	24-Hour	150 µg /m <sup>3</sup>	50 µg /m <sup>3</sup>
PM2.5	Annual	12 µg /m <sup>3</sup>	12 µg /m <sup>3</sup>
	24-Hour	35 µg /m <sup>3</sup>	--
Lead	30-Day Avg.	--	1.5 µg /m <sup>3</sup>
	3-Month Avg.	0.15 µg /m <sup>3</sup>	--

Notes: ppm = parts per million, ug/m3 = Micrograms per Cubic Meter

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD, 2013

In 1997, new national standards for fine particulate matter diameter 2.5 microns or less (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) were adopted for 24-hour and annual averaging periods. The current PM<sub>10</sub> standards were to be retained, but the method and form for determining compliance with the standards were revised.

The State of California regularly reviews scientific literature regarding the health effects and exposure to PM and other pollutants. On May 3, 2002, CARB staff recommended lowering the level of the annual standard for PM<sub>10</sub> and establishing a new annual standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The new standards became effective on July 5, 2003, with another revision on November 29, 2005.

In addition to the criteria pollutants discussed above, Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are another group of pollutants of concern. TACs are injurious in small quantities and are regulated despite the absence of criteria documents. The identification, regulation and monitoring of TACs is relatively recent compared to that for criteria pollutants. Unlike criteria pollutants, TACs are regulated on the basis of risk rather than specification of safe levels of contamination.

Existing air quality concerns within San Joaquin County and the entire SJVAB are related to increases of regional criteria air pollutants (e.g., ozone and particulate matter), exposure to toxic air contaminants, odors, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate change. The primary source of ozone (smog) pollution is motor vehicles which account for 70 percent of the ozone in the region. Particulate matter is caused by dust, primarily dust generated from construction and grading activities, and smoke which is emitted from fireplaces, wood-burning stoves, and agricultural burning.

**Attainment Status**

In accordance with the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), the CARB is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified with respect to applicable standards. An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations did not violate the applicable standard in that area. A “nonattainment” designation indicates that a pollutant

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

concentration violated the applicable standard at least once, excluding those occasions when a violation was caused by an exceptional event, as defined in the criteria.

Depending on the frequency and severity of pollutants exceeding applicable standards, the nonattainment designation can be further classified as serious nonattainment, severe nonattainment, or extreme nonattainment, with extreme nonattainment being the most severe of the classifications. An “unclassified” designation signifies that the data do not support either an attainment or nonattainment status. The CCAA divides districts into moderate, serious, and severe air pollution categories, with increasingly stringent control requirements mandated for each category.

The U.S. EPA designates areas for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) as “does not meet the primary standards,” “cannot be classified,” or “better than national standards.” For sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), areas are designated as “does not meet the primary standards,” “does not meet the secondary standards,” “cannot be classified,” or “better than national standards.” However, the CARB terminology of attainment, nonattainment, and unclassified is more frequently used.

San Joaquin County has a state designation of Nonattainment for Ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and is either Unclassified or Attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of Nonattainment for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The County is designated either attainment or unclassified for the remaining national standards. Table 3.3-2 presents the state and nation attainment status for San Joaquin County.

**TABLE 3.3-2: STATE AND NATIONAL ATTAINMENT STATUS**

<i>CRITERIA POLLUTANTS</i>	<i>STATE DESIGNATIONS</i>	<i>NATIONAL DESIGNATIONS</i>
Ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
PM <sub>10</sub>	Nonattainment	Attainment
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	
Lead	Attainment	
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (2013).

#### San Joaquin Valley Air Basin Monitoring

The SJVAB consists of eight counties, from San Joaquin County in the north to Kern County in the south. SJVAPCD and CARB maintain numerous air quality monitoring sites throughout each County in the Air Basin to measure ozone, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. It is important to note that the federal ozone 1-hour standard was revoked by the EPA and is no longer applicable for federal standards. Data obtained from the monitoring sites throughout the SJVAB between 2010 and 2012 is summarized in **Tables 3.3-3** through **3.3-5**.

**TABLE 3.3-3 SJVAB AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA SUMMARY - OZONE**

Year	Days > Standard				1-Hour Observations			8-Hour Averages				Year Coverage	
	State		National		Max.	D.V. <sup>1</sup>	D.V. <sup>2</sup>	State		National			
	1-Hr	8-Hr	1-Hr	'08 8-Hr				Max.	D.V. <sup>1</sup>	Max.	D.V. <sup>1</sup>	Max.	'08 D.V. <sup>2</sup>
2012	72	134	3	105	0.135	0.14	0.130	0.116	0.116	0.116	0.098	0	100
2011	71	131	3	109	0.134	0.13	0.130	0.105	0.114	0.105	0.099	78	100
2010	59	115	7	93	0.140	0.14	0.140	0.115	0.122	0.114	0.104	70	100

NOTES: ALL CONCENTRATIONS EXPRESSED IN PARTS PER MILLION. THE NATIONAL 1-HOUR OZONE STANDARD WAS REVOKED IN JUNE 2005 AND IS NO LONGER IN EFFECT. STATISTICS RELATED TO THE REVOKED STANDARD ARE SHOWN IN ITALICS. D.V. <sup>1</sup> = STATE DESIGNATION VALUE . D.V. <sup>2</sup>= NATIONAL DESIGN VALUE.

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (AEROMETRIC DATA ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OR IADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES

**TABLE 3.3-4 SJVAB AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA SUMMARY - PM 2.5**

Year	Est. Days > Nat'l '06 Std.	Annual Average		Nat'l Ann. Std. D.V. <sup>1</sup>	State Annual D.V. <sup>2</sup>	Nat'l '06 Std. 98th Percentile	Nat'l '06 24-Hr Std. D.V. <sup>1</sup>	High 24-Hour Average		Year Coverage	
		Nat'l	State					Nat'l	State	Min.	Max.
2012	29.4	16.0	17.9	16.0	18	93.4	71	93.4	93.4	29	100
2011	39.3	20.4	18.1	18.2	21	69.5	62	80.3	82.8	34	100
2010	28.7	17.9	17.2	21.2	21	56.2	65	107.8	112.0	10	100

NOTES: ALL CONCENTRATIONS EXPRESSED IN PARTS PER MILLION. STATE AND NATIONAL STATISTICS MAY DIFFER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: STATE STATISTICS ARE BASED ON CALIFORNIA APPROVED SAMPLERS, WHEREAS NATIONAL STATISTICS ARE BASED ON SAMPLERS USING FEDERAL REFERENCE OR EQUIVALENT METHODS. STATE AND NATIONAL STATISTICS MAY THEREFORE BE BASED ON DIFFERENT SAMPLERS. STATE CRITERIA FOR ENSURING THAT DATA ARE SUFFICIENTLY COMPLETE FOR CALCULATING VALID ANNUAL AVERAGES ARE MORE STRINGENT THAN THE NATIONAL CRITERIA. D.V. <sup>1</sup> = STATE DESIGNATION VALUE . D.V. <sup>2</sup>= NATIONAL DESIGN VALUE

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (AEROMETRIC DATA ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OR IADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES

**TABLE 3.3-5: SJVAB AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA SUMMARY - PM 10**

Year	Est. Days > Std.		Annual Average		3-Year Average		High 24-Hr Average		Year Coverage
	Nat'l	State	Nat'l	State	Nat'l	State	Nat'l	State	
2012	0.0	89.4	45.1	41.4	38	44	138.6	125.8	100
2011	0.0	116.4	44.8	44.2	41	47	151.8	154.0	100
2010	1.0	67.4	43.5	35.0	46	56	235.6	238.0	100

NOTES: THE NATIONAL ANNUAL AVERAGE PM10 STANDARD WAS REVOKED IN DECEMBER 2006 AND IS NO LONGER IN EFFECT. AN EXCEEDANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY A VIOLATION. STATISTICS MAY INCLUDE DATA THAT ARE RELATED TO AN EXCEPTIONAL EVENT. STATE AND NATIONAL STATISTICS MAY DIFFER FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: STATE STATISTICS ARE BASED ON CALIFORNIA APPROVED SAMPLERS, WHEREAS NATIONAL STATISTICS ARE BASED ON SAMPLERS USING FEDERAL REFERENCE OR EQUIVALENT METHODS. STATE AND NATIONAL STATISTICS MAY THEREFORE BE BASED ON DIFFERENT SAMPLERS. NATIONAL STATISTICS ARE BASED ON STANDARD CONDITIONS. STATE CRITERIA FOR ENSURING THAT DATA ARE SUFFICIENTLY COMPLETE FOR CALCULATING VALID ANNUAL AVERAGES ARE MORE STRINGENT THAN THE NATIONAL CRITERIA.

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (AEROMETRIC DATA ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OR IADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

#### San Joaquin County Air Quality Monitoring

SJVAPCD and CARB maintain two air quality monitoring sites in San Joaquin County that collect data for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5. These include the Stockton - Hazelton Street and Tracy – Airport monitoring sites. The federal ozone 1-hour standard was revoked by the EPA in 2005, but subsequent litigation reinstated portions of implementation requirements under the revoked standard. As a result, the SJVAPCD adopted the 2013 Plan for the Revoked 1-Hour Ozone Standard in September 2013 to address the reinstated requirements for this standard. The data and analysis contained in this Draft EIR does not conflict with the 2013 Plan. Data obtained from the monitoring sites between 2010 and 2012 is shown in **Tables 3.3-6** and **3.3-7**.

**TABLE 3.3-6: AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA (STOCKTON – HAZELTON STREET)**

POLLUTANT	CAL.	FED.	YEAR	MAX CONCENTRATION	DAYS EXCEEDED STATE/FED STANDARD
	PRIMARY STANDARD				
Ozone (O3) (1-hour)	0.09 ppm for 1 hour	NA	2012	0.097	1 / (N/A)
			2011	0.089	0 / (N/A)
			2010	0.120	2 / (N/A)
Ozone (O3) (8-hour)	0.07 ppm for 8 hour	0.075 ppm for 8 hour	2012	0.083	8 / 2
			2011	0.068	0 / 0
			2010	0.095	3 / 2
Particulate Matter (PM10)	50 ug/m3 for 24 hours	150 ug/m3 for 24 hours	2012	70.0	17.9 / 0
			2011	70.1	24.4 / 0
			2010	55.4	6.1 / 0
Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)	No 24 hour State Standard	35 ug/m3 for 24 hours	2012	60.4	(N/A) / 6.0
			2011	60.0	(N/A) / 11.0
			2010	41.0	(N/A) / 5.3

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (AEROMETRIC DATA ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OR IADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES

**TABLE 3.3-7: AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA (TRACY – AIRPORT)**

POLLUTANT	CAL.	FED.	YEAR	MAX CONCENTRATION	DAYS EXCEEDED STATE/FED STANDARD
	PRIMARY STANDARD				
Ozone (O3) (1-hour)	0.09 ppm for 1 hour	NA	2012	0.109	8 / (N/A)
			2011	0.107	3 / (N/A)
			2010	0.113	1 / (N/A)
Ozone (O3) (8-hour)	0.07 ppm for 8 hour	0.075 ppm for 8 hour	2012	0.098	36 / 16
			2011	0.088	21 / 8
			2010	0.092	8 / 3
Particulate Matter (PM10)	50 ug/m3 for 24 hours	150 ug/m3 for 24 hours	2012	73.4	* / *
			2011	110.8	* / *
			2010	28.5	* / *
Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)	No 24 hour State Standard	35 ug/m3 for 24 hours	2012	26.8	* / *
			2011	35.1	* / *
			2010	42.3	* / *

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (AEROMETRIC DATA ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OR IADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES

---

## 3.3.2 REGULATORY SETTING

### FEDERAL

---

#### **Clean Air Act**

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) was first signed into law in 1970. In 1977, and again in 1990, the law was substantially amended. The FCAA is the foundation for a national air pollution control effort, and it is composed of the following basic elements: NAAQS for criteria air pollutants, hazardous air pollutant standards, state attainment plans, motor vehicle emissions standards, stationary source emissions standards and permits, acid rain control measures, stratospheric ozone protection, and enforcement provisions.

The EPA is responsible for administering the FCAA. The FCAA requires the EPA to set NAAQS for several problem air pollutants based on human health and welfare criteria. Two types of NAAQS were established: primary standards, which protect public health, and secondary standards, which protect the public welfare from non-health-related adverse effects such as visibility reduction.

The law recognizes the importance for each state to locally carry out the requirements of the FCAA, as special consideration of local industries, geography, housing patterns, etc. are needed to have full comprehension of the local pollution control problems. As a result, the EPA requires each state to develop a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that explains how each state will implement the FCAA within their jurisdiction. A SIP is a collection of rules and regulations that a particular state will implement to control air quality within their jurisdiction. CARB is the state agency that is responsible for preparing the California SIP.

#### **Transportation Control Measures**

One particular aspect of the SIP development process is the consideration of potential control measures as a part of making progress towards clean air goals. While most SIP control measures are aimed at reducing emissions from stationary sources, some are typically also created to address mobile or transportation sources. These are known as transportation control measures (TCMs). TCM strategies are designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled and trips, or vehicle idling and associated air pollution. These goals are achieved by developing attractive and convenient alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use. Examples of TCMs include ridesharing programs, transportation infrastructure improvements such as adding bicycle and carpool lanes, and expansion of public transit.

### STATE

---

#### **CARB Mobile-Source Regulation**

The State of California is responsible for controlling emissions from the operation of motor vehicles in the state. Rather than mandating the use of specific technology or the reliance on a specific fuel, the CARB's motor vehicle standards specify the allowable grams of pollution per mile driven. In other words, the regulations focus on the reductions needed rather than on the manner

in which they are achieved. Towards this end, the CARB has adopted regulations which required auto manufacturers to phase in less polluting vehicles.

### **California Clean Air Act**

The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) was first signed into law in 1988. The CCAA provides a comprehensive framework for air quality planning and regulation, and spells out, in statute, the state's air quality goals, planning and regulatory strategies, and performance. CARB is the agency responsible for administering the CCAA. CARB established ambient air quality standards pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code (CH&SC) [§39606(b)], which are similar to the federal standards. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District is one of 35 air quality management districts that have prepared air quality management plans to accomplish a five percent annual reduction in emissions documenting progress toward the state ambient air quality standards.

### **Air Quality Standards**

NAAQS are determined by the EPA. The standards include both primary and secondary ambient air quality standards. Primary standards are established with a safety margin. Secondary standards are more stringent than primary standards and are intended to protect public health and welfare. States have the ability to set standards that are more stringent than the federal standards. As such, California established more stringent ambient air quality standards.

Federal and state ambient air quality standards have been established for ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, suspended particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>) and lead. In addition, California has created standards for pollutants that are not covered by federal standards. The state and federal primary standards for major pollutants are shown in Table 3.3-1.

### **Tanner Air Toxics Act**

California regulates TACs primarily through the Tanner Air Toxics Act (AB 1807) and the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987 (AB 2588). The Tanner Act sets forth a formal procedure for ARB to designate substances as TACs. This includes research, public participation, and scientific peer review before ARB can designate a substance as a TAC. To date, ARB has identified more than 21 TACs and has adopted EPA's list of HAPs as TACs. Most recently, diesel PM was added to the ARB list of TACs. Once a TAC is identified, ARB then adopts an Airborne Toxics Control Measure (ATCM) for sources that emit that particular TAC. If there is a safe threshold for a substance at which there is no toxic effect, the control measure must reduce exposure below that threshold. If there is no safe threshold, the measure must incorporate BACT to minimize emissions.

The AB 2588 requires that existing facilities that emit toxic substances above a specified level prepare a toxic-emission inventory, prepare a risk assessment if emissions are significant, notify the public of significant risk levels, and prepare and implement risk reduction measures. ARB has adopted diesel exhaust control measures and more stringent emission standards for various on-road mobile sources of emissions, including transit buses and off-road diesel equipment (e.g., tractors, generators). In February 2000, ARB adopted a new public-transit bus-fleet rule and emission standards for new urban buses. These rules and standards provide for (1) more stringent

emission standards for some new urban bus engines, beginning with 2002 model year engines; (2) zero-emission bus demonstration and purchase requirements applicable to transit agencies; and (3) reporting requirements under which transit agencies must demonstrate compliance with the urban transit bus fleet rule. Upcoming milestones include the low-sulfur diesel-fuel requirement, and tighter emission standards for heavy-duty diesel trucks (2007) and off-road diesel equipment (2011) nationwide.

## LOCAL

### **San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District**

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) is the local agency with primary responsibility for compliance with both the federal and state standards and for ensuring that air quality conditions are maintained. They do this through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The eight counties that comprise the SJVAPCD are divided into three regions. These include:

- Northern Region: Merced, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus Counties
- Central Region: Madera, Fresno, and Kings Counties
- Southern Region: Tulare and Valley portion of Kern Counties

Activities of the SJVAPCD include the preparation of plans for the attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution, inspection of stationary sources of air pollution and response to citizen complaints, monitoring of ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implementation of programs and regulations required by the FCAA and CCAA.

The SJVAPCD has prepared the *2007 Ozone Plan* to achieve Federal and State standards for improved air quality in the SJVAB regarding ozone. The *2007 Ozone Plan* provides a comprehensive list of regulatory and incentive-based measures to reduce emissions of ozone and particulate matter precursors throughout the SJVAB. The *2007 Ozone Plan* calls for major advancements in pollution control technologies for mobile and stationary sources of air pollution. The *2007 Ozone Plan* calls for a 75-percent reduction in ozone-forming oxides of nitrogen emissions.

The SJVAPCD has also prepared the *2007 PM10 Maintenance Plan and Request for Redesignation* (2007 PM10 Plan). On April 24, 2006, the SJVAPCD submitted a Request for Determination of PM10 Attainment for the Basin to CARB. CARB concurred with the request and submitted the request to the EPA on May 8, 2006. On October 30, 2006, the EPA issued a Final Rule determining that the Basin had attained the NAAQS for PM10. However, the EPA noted that the Final Rule did not constitute a redesignation to attainment until all of the FCAA requirements under Section 107(d)(3) were met.

The SJVAPCD has prepared the *2008 PM2.5 Plan* to achieve Federal and State standards for improved air quality in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The *2008 PM2.5 Plan* provides a comprehensive list of regulatory and incentive based measures to reduce PM2.5.

In addition to the *2007 Ozone Plan*, the *2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan*, and the *2007 PM<sub>10</sub> Plan*, the SJVAPCD prepared the *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (GAMAQI). The GAMAQI is an advisory document that provides Lead Agencies, consultants, and project proponents with analysis guidance and uniform procedures for addressing air quality impacts in environmental documents. Local jurisdictions are not required to utilize the methodology outlined therein. This document describes the criteria that SJVAPCD uses when reviewing and commenting on the adequacy of environmental documents. It recommends thresholds for determining whether or not projects would have significant adverse environmental impacts, identifies methodologies for predicting project emissions and impacts, and identifies measures that can be used to avoid or reduce air quality impacts. An update of the GAMAQI was approved on January 10, 2002, and is used as a guidance document for this analysis. The SJVAPCD is currently in the process of updating the GAMAQI and has a February 2015 version available for consideration of approval by the SJVAPCD Board. At the time that this document was written, it was estimated that the Board would consider approval of the GAMQI in March 2015.

It is noted here that absent an approval of the 2015 GAMQI, we are required to use the 2002 GAMAQI as the guidance document for this analysis with certain caveats as directed by the SJVAPCD. For instance, the SJVAPCD has begun a transition to the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) for preparing air impact assessments within the San Joaquin Valley air basin. CalEEMod is the newest computer emissions estimating model developed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). The model calculates criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, retail, and industrial projects. CalEEMod also calculates the benefits of implementing mitigation measures, including GHG mitigation measures. This analysis utilizes the CalEEMod model as directed by the SJVAPCD.

### SJVAPCD RULES AND REGULATIONS

The SJVAPCD has adopted numerous rules and regulations to implement its air quality plans. Following, are significant rules that will apply to the proposed Project.

#### **Regulation VIII – Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Prohibitions**

Regulation VIII is comprised of District Rules 8011 through 8081 which are designed to reduce PM<sub>10</sub> emissions (predominantly dust/dirt) generated by human activity, including construction and demolition activities, road construction, bulk materials storage, paved and unpaved roads, carryout and track out, landfill operations, etc.

#### **Rule 4002**

Rule 4002 applies in the event an existing building will be renovated, partially demolished or removed (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants); this rule applies to all sources of Hazardous Air Pollutants.

**Rule 4102 (Nuisance)**

Rule 4102 dictates that if a source operation emits or may emit air contaminants or other materials such that the emissions create a public nuisance, the owner/operator may be subject to APCD enforcement action.

**Rule 4103 (Open Burning)**

Rule 4103 prohibits the burning of agricultural material when the land is converting from agriculture to non-agricultural (i.e. urban) purposes.

**Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings)**

Rule 4601 limits emissions of volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings by specifying storage, cleanup and labeling requirements.

**Rule 4641 – Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations**

If asphalt paving will be used, then paving operations of the proposed Project will be subject to Rule 4641. This rule applies to the manufacture and use of cutback asphalt, slow cure asphalt and emulsified asphalt for paving and maintenance operations.

**Rule 8021 – Construction, Demolition, Excavation, and Other Earthmoving Activities**

District Rule 8021 requires owners or operators of construction projects to submit a Dust Control Plan to the District if at any time the project involves non-residential developments of five or more acres of disturbed surface area or moving, depositing, or relocating of more than 2,500 cubic yards per day of bulk materials on at least three days of the project. The proposed Project will meet these criteria and will be required to submit a Dust Control Plan to the District in order to comply with this rule.

**Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review)**

Rule 9510 indirectly limits the vehicular emissions contribution of new development to regional air pollution. Through an application and review process, the developer may incorporate emission-reduction features in the project or may pay the fee prescribed in the rule. Fees collected by the APCD are indexed to the cost of providing offsetting mitigation and are used for that purpose. The provisions of the rule are described in more detail in the analysis of environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

**City of Manteca General Plan*****Air Quality Goals***

Goal AQ-1. Improve air quality by:

- Achieving and maintaining ambient air quality standards established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the California Air Resources Board, and the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District;

## 3.3 AIR QUALITY

---

- Minimizing public exposure to toxic or hazardous air pollutants; and
- Minimizing public exposure to pollutants that create a public nuisance, such as unpleasant odors.

Goal AQ-2. Integrate air quality planning with land use and transportation planning processes in order to reduce vehicle miles traveled in the City and by commuters.

Goal AQ-3. Increase opportunities for alternatives to internal combustion automobiles including, but not limited to, public transportation, bicycles, walking and alternative fuel vehicles including hybrid gas-electric, electric and compressed natural gas.

Goal AQ-4. Reduce air emissions through energy conservation.

Goal AQ-5. Reduce greenhouse gases from activities within the City by amounts needed to demonstrate consistency with State of California greenhouse gas reduction targets.

### ***Policies: Air Quality- Regional Coordination***

AQ-P-1: Cooperate with other agencies to develop a consistent and coordinated approach to reduction of air pollution and management of hazardous air pollutants.

### ***Implementation: Air Quality- Regional Coordination***

AQ-I-1. Work with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (APCD) to implement the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

- Cooperate with the APCD to develop consistent and accurate procedures for evaluating project-specific and cumulative air quality impacts.
- Cooperate with the APCD and the California Air Resources Board in their efforts to develop a local airshed model.
- Cooperate with the APCD in their efforts to develop a cost/benefit analysis of possible control strategies (mitigation measures to minimize short and long-term stationary and area source emissions as part of the development review process, and monitoring measures to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented.

AQ-I-2. In accordance with CEQA, submit development proposals to the APCD for review and comment prior to decision.

AQ-I-3. Cooperate with the San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department in identifying hazardous material users and in developing a hazardous materials management plan.

### ***Policies: Air Quality- Land Use***

AQ-P-2: Develop a land use plan that will help to reduce the need for trips and will facilitate the common use of public transportation, walking, bicycles, and alternative fuel vehicles.

AQ-P-3: Segregate and provide buffers between land uses that typically generate hazardous or obnoxious fumes and residential or other sensitive land uses.

***Implementation: Air Quality- Land Use***

AQ-I-4. Encourage mixed-use development that is conveniently accessible by pedestrians and public transit.

AQ-I-5. Locate employment, school, and daily shopping destinations near residential areas.

AQ-I-6. Locate higher intensity development such as multi-family housing, institutional uses, services, employment centers and retail along existing and proposed transit corridors.

AQ-I-7. Locate public facilities in areas easily served by current and planned public transportation.

AQ-I-8. Prior to entitlement of a project that may be an air pollution point source, such as a manufacturing and extracting facility, the developer shall provide documentation that the use is located and appropriately separated from residential areas and sensitive receptors (e.g., homes, schools, and hospitals).

***Policies: Air Quality- Transportation***

AQ-P-4: Develop and maintain street systems that provide for efficient traffic flow and thereby minimize air pollution from automobile emissions.

AQ-P-5: Develop and maintain circulation systems that provide alternatives to the automobile for transportation, including bicycles routes, pedestrian paths, bus transit, and carpooling.

AQ-P-6: Coordinate public transportation networks, including trains, local bus service, regional bus service and rideshare facilities to provide efficient public transit service.

***Implementation: Air Quality- Transportation***

AQ-I-9. Maintain acceptable traffic levels of service (LOS) as specified in the Circulation Element.

AQ-I-10. In new subdivisions, require the internal street system to include the installation of dedicated pedestrian/bicycle pathways connecting to adjacent residential and commercial areas as well as schools, parks and recreational areas.

AQ-I-11. Provide adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities for present and future transportation needs throughout the City.

***Policies: Air Quality- Dust and Other Airborne Particulate Materials***

AQ-P-7: New construction will be managed to minimize fugitive dust and construction vehicle emissions.

AQ-P-8: Woodburning devices shall meet current standards for controlling particulate air pollution.

AQ-P-9: Burning of any combustible material within the City will be controlled to minimize particulate air pollution.

***Implementation: Air Quality- Dust and Other Airborne Particulate Materials***

AQ-I-12. Construction activity plans shall include and/or provide for a dust management plan to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard.

- Project development applicants shall be responsible for ensuring that all adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction.

AQ-I-13. All residences built in a new subdivision or housing development shall be equipped with conventional heating devices with sufficient capacity to heat all areas of the building without reliance on woodburning heating devices.

AQ-I-14. All woodburning-heating devices installed shall meet EPA standards applicable at the time of project approval.

***Policies: Air Quality- Reduce Emissions From Energy Generating Facilities***

AQ-P-10: Encourage energy efficient building designs.

***Implementation: Air Quality- Reduce Emissions From Energy Generating Facilities***

AQ-I-15. Design review criteria shall include the following considerations, at a minimum:

- The developer of a sensitive air pollution receptor shall submit documentation that the project design includes appropriate buffering (e.g., setbacks, landscaping) to separate the use from highways, arterial streets, hazardous material locations and other sources of air pollution or odor.
- Promote the use of new and replacement fuel storage tanks at refueling stations that are clean fuel compatible, if technically and economically feasible.
- The use of energy efficient lighting (including controls) and process systems beyond Title 24 requirements shall be encouraged where practicable (e.g., water heating, furnaces, boiler units, etc.)
- The use of energy efficient automated controls for air conditioning beyond Title 24 requirements shall be encouraged where practicable.
- Promote solar access through building siting to maximize natural heating and cooling, and landscaping to aid passive cooling and to protect from winds.

***Policies: Air Quality – Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

AQ-P-11: Prepare and maintain a Climate Action Plan and community greenhouse gas emission inventory for sectors with the potential for control or influence by the City that demonstrates consistency with State of California targets.

AQ-P-12: Development projects shall incorporate the applicable strategies of the City of Manteca Climate Action Plan as needed to demonstrate consistency with CAP reduction targets and AB 32.

**Implementation: Air Quality – Greenhouse Gases**

AQ-I-16. Track and monitor aspects of development related to CAP strategies on an ongoing basis to measure progress in achieving CAP reduction targets.

AQ-I-17. Track implementation of municipal and community projects and programs related to energy efficiency, transit service improvements, transportation facilities such as bicycle paths and lanes, pedestrian infrastructure, and other projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions throughout the community.

AQ-I-18. Update CAP emission inventories, targets, and strategies to reflect new State of California greenhouse gas reduction targets when adopted for later years and to reflect the benefits of any new State and federal regulatory actions that reduce greenhouse gas emissions to demonstrate continued consistency with State targets.

### 3.3.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on the environment associated with air quality if it will:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- Cause a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations;
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

##### **Impact 3.3-1: Project operation has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (significant and unavoidable)**

The SJVAPCD is tasked with implementing programs and regulations required by the Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act. In that capacity, the SJVAPCD has prepared plans to attain Federal and State ambient air quality standards. To achieve attainment with the standards, the SJVAPCD has established thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions in their *SJVAPCD Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (2015). Projects with emissions below the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants would be determined to “Not conflict or obstruct implementation of the District’s air quality plan”.

The proposed Project would be a direct and indirect source of air pollution, in that it would generate and attract vehicle trips in the region (mobile source emissions) and it would increase

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

area source emissions and energy consumption. The mobile source emissions would be entirely from vehicles, while the area source emissions would be primarily from the use of natural gas fuel combustion, landscape fuel combustion, consumer products, and architectural coatings.

California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod)<sup>TM</sup> (v.2013.2.2) was used to estimate emissions for Buildout of the proposed Project, which collectively includes Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, and Future Phases. Table 3.3-8 shows the emissions, which include mobile, area source, and energy emissions of criteria pollutants that would result from operations of the proposed Project (all phases collectively).

**TABLE 3.3-8: OPERATIONAL BUILDOUT GENERATED EMISSIONS**

	ROG		NOx		PM <sub>10</sub>		PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Threshold	≤ 10 tons/year		≤ 10 tons/year		≤ 15 tons/year		≤ 15 tons/year	
Category	UM	M	UM	M	UM	M	UM	M
Area	5.628	5.272	4.8e-004	4.8e-004	1.8e-004	1.8e-004	1.8e-004	1.8e-004
Energy	0.133	0.117	1.2170	1.0665	0.0925	0.0811	0.0925	0.0811
Mobile	23.28	22.24	58.22	49.46	19.60	15.79	5.75	4.64
Total	<b>29.04</b>	<b>27.63</b>	<b>59.43</b>	<b>50.53</b>	<b>19.69</b>	<b>15.87</b>	<b>5.85</b>	<b>4.72</b>
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

NOTES: UM = UNMITIGATED, M = MITIGATED; THE AIR DISTRICT IS ATTAINMENT FOR CO, AND SO<sub>2</sub>. CO SCREENING IS PERFORMED UNDER IMPACT 3.3-3.

SOURCES: CALEEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

The SJVAPCD has established their thresholds of significance by which the project emissions are compared against to determine the level of significance. The SJVAPCD has established operations related emissions thresholds of significance as follows: 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NOx), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), 15 tons per year particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM<sub>10</sub>), and 15 tons per year particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in size (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). If the proposed Project's emissions will exceed the SJVAPCD's threshold of significance for operational-generated emissions, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on air quality and all feasible mitigation are required to be implemented to reduce emissions to the extent feasible. As shown in Table 3.3-8 above, annual emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM<sub>10</sub>, exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

The California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod)<sup>TM</sup> (v.2013.2.2) mitigation assumptions described above were incorporated into the model; however, the proposed Project would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for operations even with these measures. The proposed Project is subject to the SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Rule), which could result in substantial mitigation of emissions. The reductions are accomplished by the incorporation of mitigation measures into projects and/or by the payment of an Indirect Source Rule fee for any required reductions that have not been accomplished through project mitigation commitments. The current fees are \$9,350 per ton of NOx and \$9,011 per ton per of PM, although these are subject to adjustments by the SJVAPCD. The actual calculations will be accomplished by the SJVAPCD and project proponents as individual projects (i.e. portions of the subsequent phases) are brought forward for approval under Rule 9510. However, even with the application of the ISR and the mitigation measures described above, emissions levels would remain above the defined thresholds

of significance for the project as a whole (i.e. all phases). As such, operation of the proposed Project (all phases collectively) would have a **significant and unavoidable** impact relative to operational air emissions.

**Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreements** As noted above, design elements and compliance with District rules and regulations may not be sufficient to reduce project related impacts on air quality to a less than significant level. In such situations, the *SJVAPCD Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (February 2015) indicates that the project proponents may enter into a Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement (VERA) with the SJVAPCD. A VERA is a method by which the project proponent provides pound-for-pound mitigation of air emissions increases through a process that develops, funds, and implements emission reduction projects, with the District serving a role of administrator of the emissions reduction projects and verifier of the successful mitigation effort. To implement a VERA, the project proponent and the District enter into a contractual agreement in which the project proponent agrees to mitigate project specific emissions by providing funds for the District's Emission Reduction Incentive Program (ERIP). The funds are disbursed by ERIP in the form of grants for projects that achieve emission reductions. Thus, project specific impacts on air quality are offset. Types of emission reduction projects that have been funded in the past include electrification of stationary internal combustion engines (such as agricultural irrigation pumps), replacing old heavy-duty trucks with new, cleaner, more efficient heavy-duty trucks, and replacement of old farm tractors.

In implementing a VERA, the SJVAPCD verifies the actual emission reductions that have been achieved as a result of completed grant contracts, monitors the emission reduction projects, and ensures the enforceability of achieved reductions. The initial agreement is generally based on the projected maximum emissions increases as calculated by a SJVAPCD approved air quality impact assessment, and contains the corresponding maximum fiscal obligation. However, because the goal is to mitigate actual emissions, the SJVAPCD has designed flexibility into the VERA such that the final mitigation is based on actual emissions related to the project as determined by actual equipment used, hours of operation, etc. After the project is mitigated, the SJVAPCD certifies to the lead agency that the mitigation is completed, providing the lead agency with an enforceable mitigation measure demonstrating that project specific emissions have been mitigated.

A Mitigation Measure is included in this EIR that requires the project proponent to consider the potential use of a VERA as a method to achieve emissions reductions in excess of District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) requirements. The mitigation measure also requires consideration of the benefits of improved air quality with the costs of implementation in the decision making process. Because a VERA is a voluntary contractual agreement that is negotiated, it cannot be certain that both parties will agree to acceptable terms. The inclusion of this mitigation does not guarantee that the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. As such, the impact would be **significant and unavoidable** impact relative to operational air emissions.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-1:** *Prior to final approval for each individual phase of development, or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall submit an Air Impact*

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

---

*Assessment (AIA) application to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District for District Rule 9510 Indirect Source Review (ISR) to obtain AIA approval from the District for the phase or portion of an individual phase of development that is to be constructed. Prior to the issuance of a building permit of each individual phase or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall incorporate mitigation measures into the proposed Project and demonstrate compliance with District Rule 9510 including payment of all fees.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-2:** *Prior to the approval of improvement plans for each individual phase of development, or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall incorporate the following features into project plans:*

- *Bus turnouts and transit improvements where requested by the San Joaquin RTD.*
- *Continuous public sidewalks adjacent to all proposed public streets.*
- *Pavement and striping for bike lanes/paths.*
- *Street lighting.*
- *Pedestrian signalization, signage and safety designs at signalized intersections.*
- *Shade trees to shade sidewalks in street-side landscaping areas.*
- *Require low-VOC cleaning supplies to be used by businesses and cleaning services within the Project site.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-3:** *Prior to the approval of improvement plans for each individual phase of development, or portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall prepare and implement a transportation demand management (TDM) plan that includes, but is not limited to, the following measures subject to the review and approval of the City of Manteca:*

- *Provide secure bicycle parking in conjunction with each individual phase or project component.*
- *Provide designated vanpool parking spaces within the parking lots.*
- *Provide on-site amenities that encourage alternative transportation modes such as locker, shower, and secure bike storage facilities.*
- *Coordinate SJCOG's Commute Connection Program*

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-4:** *Prior to the approval of a Building Permit for each individual phase portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall provide the City of Manteca with confirmation that they have met with the SJVAPCD to explore the potential of entering into a Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA) as a method to achieve emissions reductions in excess of District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review) requirements and other mitigation measures required for the proposed Project. The City shall confirm that the project proponent has made a good-faith effort to reduce emissions through a VERA taking into consideration whether emissions reductions through a VERA can be accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, and taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.*

**Impact 3.3-2: Project construction has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (significant and unavoidable)**

**Construction Activities/Schedule:** Construction activities will consist of multiple phases over several years. These construction activities can be described as site improvements (grading, underground infrastructure, and topside improvements) and vertical construction (building construction and architectural coatings). For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the entire project is built out from 2015 through 2017. This construction schedule is considered a worst-case scenario. Actual construction emissions will likely be spread out over an extended period of time.

**Site Improvements:** The construction of site improvements will include the development of Phase 1 initially, and then subsequent phases to be determined in the future. The exact construction schedule of the entire Project is largely dependent on funding of future phases. For purposes of this analysis it is assumed that site improvements are installed in one phase. This approach will present a more conservative and worst-case scenario.

The site improvement phase of construction will begin with site preparation. This step will include the use of dozers, backhoes, and loaders to strip (clear and grub) all organic materials and the upper half-inch to inch of soil from the Project site. This task will generally take a month or less to complete and will include vehicle trips from construction workers. Given that the Project site lacks significant vegetation, this step will likely be less than the assumed month.

After the site is striped of organic materials grading will begin. This activity will involve the use of excavators, graders, dozers, scrapers, loaders, and backhoes to move soil around the Project site to create specific engineered grade elevations and soil compaction levels. Grading the Project site would take approximately four months and will include vehicle trips from construction workers. *(Note: It would be possible to grade the site under a more compacted schedule with extra equipment operating or under a longer timeframe with less equipment.)*

The next step involves the installation of underground infrastructure. This step will involve the use of excavators to dig trenches, place pipe and conduit, bury pipe and conduit, and compact trench soil. The undergrounding of infrastructure would also include the installation of box culverts to underground the French Camp Canal. Underground infrastructure installation would take approximately three months and will include vehicle trips from construction workers. *(Note: It would be possible to install the underground infrastructure under a more compacted schedule with extra equipment operating or under a longer timeframe with less equipment.)*

The last task is to install the topside improvements, which includes pouring concrete curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and access aprons and then paving of all streets and parking lots. This task will involve the use of pavers, paving equipment, and rollers and will take approximately three months and will include vehicle trips from construction workers. *(Note: It would be possible to install the topside improvements under a more compacted schedule with extra equipment operating or under a longer timeframe with less equipment.)*

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

**Building Construction/Architectural Coatings:** Building construction involves the vertical construction of structures and landscaping around the structures. This task will involve the use of forklifts, generator sets, welders and small tractors/loaders/backhoes. The exact construction schedule of the entire Project is largely dependent on funding of future phases. For purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the entire Project is constructed in approximately eight years. The actual building construction phase may be much shorter or much longer. Architectural coatings involve the interior and exterior painting associated with the structures. This task will generally begin four or five months after construction begins on the structure and will generally be completed with the completion of the building.

**Construction Emissions:** The proposed Project is larger in scope and size than the SJVAPCD's Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL), therefore, a quantification of the emissions of ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 that will be emitted by project construction has been performed. The California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod)<sup>TM</sup> (v. 2013.2.2) was used to estimate construction emissions for the proposed Project. In addition to the operational model assumptions presented under Impact 3.3-1 above, below is a list of model assumptions used in the construction screens of CalEEMod. Table 3.3-9 presents the construction phase schedule, which shows the duration of each construction phase. Table 3.3-10 shows the off-road construction equipment used during construction for each phase. Following these tables is a list of default factors that were used in the model.

#### MODEL ASSUMPTIONS (CONSTRUCTION)

**TABLE 3.3-9: CONSTRUCTION PHASE**

Phase Number	Phase Name	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days
1	Site Preparation	1/1/2016	1/28/2016	1/28/2016	20
2	Grading	1/28/2016	3/30/2016	3/30/2016	45
3	Building Construction	3/31/2016	8/14/2019	8/14/2019	880
4	Paving	8/15/2019	12/4/2019	12/4/2019	80
5	Architectural Coating	12/5/2019	3/25/2020	3/25/2020	80

SOURCES: CAL EEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

**TABLE 3.3-10: OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT**

Equipment Type	Unit Amount	Hours/Day	Horsepower	Load Factor
Site Preparation				
Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	255	0.40
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Grading				
Excavators	2	8.00	162	0.38
Graders	1	8.00	174	0.41
Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	255	0.40
Scrapers	2	8.00	361	0.48
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.00	97	0.37
Building Construction				
Cranes	1	7.00	226	0.29
Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Paving				
Pavers	2	8.00	125	0.42
Paving Equipment	2	8.00	130	0.36
Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Architectural Coatings				
Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48

SOURCES: CAL EEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

Table 3.3-11 shows the construction emissions for the construction years 2015 through 2017.

**TABLE 3.3-11: CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (UNMITIGATED)**

	ROG	NOx	PM10 Total	PM2.5 Total
Thresholds	≤ 10 tons/year	≤ 10 tons/year	≤ 15 tons/year	≤ 15 tons/year
2016	0.9330	7.2432	1.5809	0.6751
2017	0.8640	5.9963	0.9432	0.4379
2018	0.7671	5.3457	0.9060	0.4015
2019	2.5263	3.6170	0.5893	0.2659
2020	6.4946	0.0602	0.0271	9.8000e-003
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.5850</b>	<b>22.2624</b>	<b>4.0465</b>	<b>1.7902</b>
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	No	No

NOTES: THE AIR DISTRICT IS ATTAINMENT FOR CO, AND SO<sub>2</sub>.

SOURCES: CALFEEMOD (V.2013.2.2)

The SJVAPCD has established construction related emissions thresholds of significance as follows: 10 tons per year of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), 10 tons per year of reactive organic gases (ROG), or 15 tons per year particulate matter of 10 microns or less in size (PM<sub>10</sub>). If the proposed Project’s emissions will exceed the SJVAPCD’s threshold of significance for construction-generated emissions, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on air quality and all feasible mitigation are required to be implemented to reduce emissions. As shown in Table 3.3-11 above, annual emissions of ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> will exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance. However, regardless of emission quantities, the SJVAPCD requires construction related mitigation in accordance with their rules and regulations. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will ensure that the proposed Project would reduce construction related emissions to the extent possible; however, even with the implementation of mitigation measures the proposed Project would have a **significant and unavoidable** impact related to construction emissions.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-5:** Prior to the commencement of construction activities for each individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall prepare and submit a Dust Control Plan that meets all of the applicable requirements of APCD Rule 8021, Section 6.3, for the review and approval of the APCD Air Pollution Control Officer.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-6:** During all construction activities, the project proponent shall implement dust control measures, as required by APCD Rules 8011-8081, to limit Visible Dust Emissions to 20% opacity or less. Dust control measures shall include application of water or chemical dust suppressants to unpaved roads and graded areas, covering or stabilization of transported bulk materials, prevention of carryout or trackout of soil materials to public roads, limiting the area subject to soil disturbance, construction of wind barriers, access restrictions to inactive sites as required by the applicable rules.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-7:** During all construction activities, the project proponent shall implement the following dust control practices identified in Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of the GAMAQI (San Joaquin Valley APCD, 2002):

### 3.3 AIR QUALITY

---

- a. All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.
- b. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- c. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall control fugitive dust emissions by application of water or by presoaking.
- d. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.
- e. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.
- f. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- g. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; and
- h. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-8:** Architectural coatings applied to all structures on the Project site shall meet or exceed volatile organic compound (VOC) standards set in APCD Rule 4601. The ODS shall submit to the APCD a list of architectural coatings to be used and shall indicate how the coatings meet or exceed VOC standards. If the APCD determines that any architectural coatings do not meet VOC standards, the ODS shall replace the identified coatings with those that meet standards.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-9:** To reduce impacts from construction related exhaust emissions, the project proponent shall utilize off-road construction fleets that can achieve fleet average emissions equal to or cleaner than the Tier II emission standards, as set forth in §2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations. This can be achieved through any combination of uncontrolled engines and engines complying with Tier II and above engine standards.

**Mitigation Measure 3.3-10:** Asphalt paving shall be applied in accordance with APCD Rule 4641. This rule applies to the manufacture and use of cutback asphalt, slow cure asphalt and emulsified asphalt for paving and maintenance operations.

**Impact 3.3-3: The proposed project has the potential to have carbon monoxide hotspot impacts (less than significant)**

Project traffic would increase concentrations of carbon monoxide along streets providing access to the project site. Carbon monoxide is a local pollutant (i.e., high concentrations are normally only found very near sources). The major source of carbon monoxide, a colorless, odorless, poisonous gas, is automobile traffic. Elevated concentrations (i.e. hotspots), therefore, are usually only found near areas of high traffic volume and congestion.

The SJVAPCD recommends utilizing a screening approach for analyzing CO concentrations to determine if dispersion modeling is warranted. The methodology provides lead agencies with a conservative indication of whether project-generated vehicle trips will result in the generation of CO emissions that contribute to an exceedance of the thresholds of significance. The recommended screening criteria are divided into two tiers, as described below.

First Tier: The proposed project will result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality for local CO if:

- Traffic generated by the proposed project will not result in deterioration of intersection level of service (LOS) to LOS E or F; and
- The project will not contribute additional traffic to an intersection that already operates at LOS of E or F.

For the proposed project, the first tier is not met because the operations at the Airport Way/Atherton Drive intersection would operate at Peak Hour LOS F (19 second delay) under the existing plus project conditions. Additionally, Airport Way/Atherton Drive, Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps, Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps, Airport Way/Daniels Street, Airport Way/Wawona Street, and Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue each operate at an unacceptable Peak Hour LOS E or F under the Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The screening approach requires that if the first tier of screening criteria is not met then the second tier of screening criteria shall be examined.

Second Tier: If all of the following criteria are met, the proposed project will result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality for local CO.

- The project will not result in an affected intersection experiencing more than 31,600 vehicles per hour;
- The project will not contribute traffic to a tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, urban street canyon, or below-grade roadway; or other locations where horizontal or vertical mixing of air will be substantially limited; and
- The mix of vehicle types at the intersection is not anticipated to be substantially different from the County average (as identified by the EMFAC or CalEEMod models).

The proposed project screens out under the second tier because it meets all three criteria. First, the six intersections that will operate at LOS E or F under Cumulative Plus Project conditions (listed above), will only experience a Peak Hour traffic of between 1,608 to 4,300 vehicles per hour during the peak hour. The maximum of 4,300 vehicles per hour is significantly below the 31,600 vehicles

per hour threshold. Secondly, these intersections do not include a tunnel, parking garage, bridge underpass, urban street canyon, or below-grade roadway; or other locations where horizontal or vertical mixing of air will be substantially limited. Lastly, the mix of vehicle types at these intersections is not anticipated to be substantially different from the County average (Fehr and Peers, 2014). As such, the proposed project screens out satisfactorily under tier 2.

### **Conclusion**

The traffic study for the proposed project examined Level of Service (LOS) for both road segments and intersections affected by the proposed project. There are six intersections that would operate at an LOS E or F during the Peak Hour for Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The screening approach for analyzing CO concentrations was used to analyze CO impacts for the proposed project. The proposed project screens out satisfactorily under tier 2 based on a peak hour vehicle per hour that is low, combined with the fact that the project does not include any tunnels, parking garages, bridge underpasses, urban street canyons, or below-grade roadways, or other locations where horizontal or vertical mixing of air will be substantially limited. The project is within an attainment area for carbon monoxide (ambient air quality standards are currently attained) and in an area with low background concentrations, changes in carbon monoxide levels resulting from the proposed project would not result in violations of the ambient air quality standards, and would represent a **less than significant** impact.

### **Impact 3.3-4: The proposed project has the potential for public exposure to toxic air contaminants (less than significant)**

A toxic air contaminant (TAC) is defined as an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or that may pose a hazard to human health. TACs are usually present in minute quantities in the ambient air. However, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at very low concentrations. In general, for those TACs that may cause cancer, there is no concentration that does not present some risk. This contrasts with the criteria pollutants for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which the state and federal governments have set ambient air quality standards.

Controlling air toxic emissions became a national priority with the passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990, whereby Congress mandated that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulate 188 air toxics, also known as hazardous air pollutants. The EPA has assessed this expansive list in their latest rule on the Control of Hazardous Air Pollutants from Mobile Sources (Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 37, page 8430, February 26, 2007) and identified a group of 93 compounds emitted from mobile sources. In addition, EPA identified seven compounds with significant contributions from mobile sources that are among the national and regional-scale cancer risk drivers from their 1999 National Air Toxics Assessment. These are acrolein, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, diesel particulate matter plus diesel exhaust organic gases (diesel PM), formaldehyde, naphthalene, and polycyclic organic matter.

The 2007 EPA rule requires controls that will dramatically decrease Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) emissions through cleaner fuels and cleaner engines. According to an FHWA analysis using

EPA’s MOBILE6.2 model, even if vehicle activity (VMT) increases by 145 percent, a combined reduction of 72 percent in the total annual emission rate for the priority MSAT is projected from 1999 to 2050. California maintains stricter standards for clean fuels and emissions compared to the national standards, therefore it is expected that MSAT trends in California will decrease consistent with or more than the U.S. EPA’s national projections.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) published the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (2007) to provide information to local planners and decision-makers about land use compatibility issues associated with emissions from industrial, commercial and mobile sources of air pollution. The CARB Handbook indicates that mobile sources continue to be the largest overall contributors to the State’s air pollution problems, representing the greatest air pollution health risk to most Californians. The most serious pollutants on a statewide basis include diesel exhaust particulate matter (diesel PM), benzene, and 1,3-butadiene, all of which are emitted by motor vehicles. These mobile source air toxics are largely associated with freeways and high traffic roads. Non-mobile source air toxics are largely associated with industrial and commercial uses. Table 3.3-12 provides the California Air Resources Board minimum separation recommendations on siting sensitive land uses.

**TABLE 3.3-12: CARB MINIMUM SEPARATION RECOMMENDATIONS ON SITING SENSITIVE LAND USES**

<i>Source Category</i>	<i>Advisory Recommendations</i>
Freeways and High-Traffic Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles/day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day.</li> </ul>
Distribution Centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week).</li> <li>• Take into account the configuration of existing distribution centers and avoid locating residences and other new sensitive land uses near entry and exit points.</li> </ul>
Rail Yards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance rail yard.</li> <li>• Within one mile of a rail yard, consider possible siting limitations and mitigation approaches.</li> </ul>
Ports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting of new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of ports in the most heavily impacted zones. Consult local air districts or the CARB on the status of pending analyses of health risks.</li> </ul>
Refineries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses immediately downwind of petroleum refineries. Consult with local air districts and other local agencies to determine an appropriate separation.</li> </ul>
Chrome Platers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a chrome plater.</li> </ul>
Dry Cleaners Using Perchloro-ethylene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation. For operations with two or more machines, provide 500 feet. For operations with 3 or more machines, consult with the local air district.</li> <li>• Do not site new sensitive land uses in the same building with perc dry cleaning operations.</li> </ul>
Gasoline Dispensing Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50 foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.</li> </ul>

SOURCES: AIR QUALITY AND LAND USE HANDBOOK: A COMMUNITY HEALTH PERSPECTIVE” (CARB 2005)

There are no traditional sensitive receptors such as residences, hospitals, or schools that are proposed as part of this project. The park amenities are well beyond the 500-foot minimum

separation distance. Additionally, the proposed project does not include any of the source categories identified in the CARB minimum separation standards. Implementation of the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.


#### **Impact 3.3-5: The proposed project has the potential for exposure to odors (significant and unavoidable)**

While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress among the public and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and the SJVAPCD. The general nuisance rule (Health and Safety Code §41700) is the basis for the threshold.

Examples of facilities that are known producers of odors include: Wastewater Treatment Facilities, Chemical Manufacturing, Sanitary Landfill, Fiberglass Manufacturing, Transfer Station, Painting/Coating Operations (e.g. auto body shops), Composting Facility, Food Processing Facility, Petroleum Refinery, Feed Lot/Dairy, Asphalt Batch Plant, and Rendering Plant.

The proposed Project does not propose uses that would create odors; however, the Manteca Water Quality Control Facility is located immediately north of the project site. While this facility falls into the category of a known producer of odors, there have been few past odor complaints associated with the Manteca Water Quality Control Facility (per. comm. Laurie Ramirez May 6, 2014). This may be in part due to the fact that there is over 1,000 feet of agricultural land separating the facility and the closest residence. The existing Big League Dreams recreational facility is located approximately 900 feet to the southeast of the facility and no odor complaints have been received.

The proposed Project would place people in closer proximity to the Manteca Water Quality Control Facility than currently occurs. By the very nature of the operations at the Manteca Water Quality Control Facility, there will be odors generated at the facility. The generation of these odors could be considered a nuisance at times by patrons of the proposed Project. The Manteca Water Quality Control Facility currently operates with state of the art wastewater treatment technology, which minimizes the odors generated at the facility. Nevertheless, all odors cannot be eliminated and any development near the Manteca Water Quality Control Facility is going to result in exposure of people to odors. This cannot be mitigated and is not avoidable so long as development occurs adjacent to the facility. The level of significance of this impact, however, is largely based on the perception of the individual that is exposed. For instance, for one individual any odor may be considered intolerable, while to another individual the same odor may be tolerable. Because it is anticipated that some people will find any odor intolerable, implementation of the proposed Project adjacent to the odor producing Manteca Water Quality Control Facility would be a **significant and unavoidable** impact.



**Air Districts**


- Amador
- Bay Area
- Calaveras
- Sacramento Metro
- San Joaquin Valley Unified
- Tuolumne
- Yolo-Solano

Air Basins

County Boundaries

**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

Figure 3.3-1: Air Basins and Districts



1:750,000

Data sources: California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board.  
Shaded relief from the California Spatial Information Library. Map date: June 11, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section describes the regulatory setting, regional biological resources, and impacts that are likely to result from project implementation. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to an urban use. This section is based in part on the following technical studies: *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City of Manteca as amended through 2013), *Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report* (City of Manteca 2003), and *Preliminary Wetland Delineation, French Camp Outlet Canal Improvements and Manteca Family Entertainment Zone Project* (De Novo 2014). Comments received during the NOP comment period regarding biological resources include: SJCOG, Inc.

### 3.4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### GEOMORPHIC PROVINCES/BIOREGION

---

The City of Manteca is located in the western portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province of California. The Great Valley Province is a broad structural trough bounded by the tilted block of the Sierra Nevada on the east and the complexly folded and faulted Coast Ranges on the west. The San Joaquin River is located just south and west of the City. This major river drains the Great Valley Province into the San Joaquin Delta to the north, ultimately discharging into the San Francisco Bay to the northwest.

The City of Manteca is located within the Bay Area/Delta Bioregion which extends from the Pacific Ocean to the Sacramento Valley and San Joaquin Valley bioregions to the northeast and southeast, and a short stretch of the eastern boundary joins the Sierra Bioregion at Amador and Calaveras counties (Figure 3.4-1). The bioregion is bounded by the Klamath/North Coast on the north and the Central Coast Bioregion to the south. The Bay Area/Delta Bioregion is one of the most populous areas of the state, encompassing the San Francisco Bay Area and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. The water that flows through the Delta supplies two-thirds of California's drinking water, irrigating farmland, and sustaining fish and wildlife and their habitat. The bioregion fans out from San Francisco Bay in a jagged semi-circle that takes in all or part of 12 counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, and parts of Sacramento, and Yolo. The habitats and vegetation of the Bay Area/Delta Bioregion are as varied as the geography.

#### LOCAL SETTING

---

##### **Location**

The project site is located in the City of Manteca, San Joaquin County, California. The project site is located on the Lathrop, California, USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle, Township 2 South, Range 6 East. The UTM coordinates for the center point of the project site are 652688.47536 W, 4183417.94368 N (zone 10N, NAD 83, meters). The Lat/Long coordinates are 37.7853 N, -121.2660 W (WGS 84, decimal degrees).

The Project site is located to the north and west of the Stadium Shopping Center, to the west of Milo Candini Drive, to the east of McKinley Avenue, to the south of the City of Manteca

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF), and to the north of State Route 120. The property is comprised of approximately 210.7 acres, of which 28.5 acres is already developed (Big League Dreams Sports Park). The site includes 182.2 acres of undeveloped land under agricultural development to be developed with various public serving regional and local recreation, parks and sporting facilities including visitor serving commercial uses and public infrastructure to be developed in phases.

### Topography

The project site has been leveled for agricultural uses. Topographic features within the project site include level agricultural fields, farm roads, an irrigation ditch, and wetland areas. Elevation ranges from approximately 20 feet to 25 feet above mean sea level (MSL).

### Climate

The City of Manteca is located in the northern portion of the San Joaquin Valley, which has a Mediterranean climate that is subject to cool, wet winters (often blanketed with fog) and hot, dry summers. The average annual precipitation is approximately 13.81 inches. Precipitation occurs as rain most of which falls between the months of November through April, peaking in January at 2.85 inches. The average temperatures range from December lows of 37.5 F to July highs of 94.3 F.

### Vegetation

Vegetation on the project site can be broken up into upland and wetland communities in the undeveloped portion of the Project site, as well as urban landscaping in the existing developed Big League Dreams Sports Park. Common plant species observed within the upland communities include: wild oat (*Avena barbata*), rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), softchess (*Bromus hordeaceus*) alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), rough pigweed (*Amaranthus retroflexus*), sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), tarragon (*Artemisia dracunculoides*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), telegraphweed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*), sow thistle (*Sonchus asper*), telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), barley (*Hordeum* sp.), milkthistle (*Silybum marianum*), mustard (*Brassica niger*), and heliotrope (*Heliotropium curassavicum*).

Common plant species in the wetland communities include: tapertip rush (*Juncus acuminatus*), tule (*Schoenoplectus acutus*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), hyssop loosestrife (*Lythrum hyssopifolia*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), black willow (*Salix goodingia*), stinging nettles (*Urtica dioica*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), willow herb (*Epilobium brachycarpum*), horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*), Canadian waterweed (*Elodea canadensis*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), spiny sowthistle (*Sonchus asper*), horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium*), and yellow sweetclover (*Melilotus officinalis*).

### Wildlife

Agricultural and ruderal vegetation found on the project site provides habitat for both common and rare wildlife populations. For example, some commonly observed wildlife species in the region

include: California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), California vole (*Microtus californicus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), American killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*), gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), garter snake (*Thamnophis species*), and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), as well as many native insect species. There are also several bat species in the region. Bats often feed on insects as they fly over agricultural and natural areas, and all bat species are state species of special concern.

Locally common and abundant wildlife species are important components of the ecosystem. Due to habitat loss, many of these species must continually adapt to using agricultural, ruderal, and ornamental vegetation for cover, foraging, dispersal, and nesting.

### Plant Communities

Agricultural and natural plant communities provide habitat for a variety of biological resources in the region. Sensitive habitats include those that are of special concern to resource agencies or those that are protected under a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, CEQA, the Fish and Game Code, or the Clean Water Act. Additionally, sensitive habitats are usually protected under specific policies from local agencies. Below is a list brief description of the communities found on the project site. Figure 3.4-2 illustrates the plant communities (land cover types) in the vicinity of the Project site.

**Agricultural:** Agricultural areas occur throughout the region. The agricultural areas are generally flat and well drained, and as a result are well suited for many crops. Alfalfa fields, hay, row crops, orchards, annual grasslands, cattle pasture, and dairies dominate the agricultural areas. Agricultural fields commonly have irrigation canals, ditches, and stock ponds that serve as a water source or drainage for the fields and habitat for a variety of plants and animals.

**Riparian Communities:** Riparian natural communities support woody vegetation found along rivers, creeks and streams. Riparian habitat can range from a dense thicket of shrubs to a closed canopy of large mature trees covered by vines. Riparian systems are considered one of the most important natural resources. While small in total area when compared to the state's size, they provide a special value for wildlife habitat.

Over 135 California bird species either completely depend upon riparian habitats or use them preferentially at some stage of their life history. Riparian habitat provides food, nesting habitat, cover, and migration corridors. Another 90 species of mammals, reptiles, invertebrates and amphibians depend on riparian habitat. Riparian habitat also provides riverbank protection, erosion control and improved water quality, as well as numerous recreational and aesthetic values.

**Grassland Communities:** Grassland communities occur in a wide range of soil types in disturbed and undisturbed environments. Additionally, grasslands can occur where other natural communities have occurred historically, but have been mechanically removed. Vernal pool and vernal swale grasslands are more restricted based on specific soil, drainage, geology, and climate requirements.

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Wetland Communities:** A wetland is an area that is inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas.

Wetlands are defined by regulatory agencies as having special vegetation, soil, and hydrology characteristics. Hydrology, or water inundation, is a catalyst for the formation of wetlands. Frequent inundation and low oxygen causes chemical changes to the soil properties resulting in what is known as hydric soils. The prevalent vegetation in wetland communities consists of hydrophytic plants, which are adapted to areas that are frequently inundated with water. Hydrophytic plant species have the ability to grow, effectively compete, reproduce, and persist in low oxygen soil conditions.

### Soils

The USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey indicates the presence of five soil series occurring within the project site. Table 3.4-1 identifies the soils found on the project site. The NRCS Soils Map is provided in Figure 3.2-2 in Section 3.2 Agricultural Resources.

**TABLE 3.4-1: USDA SOIL SERIES INFORMATION**

SOIL SERIES	DESCRIPTION	SOURCE MATERIAL	PEDON/DEPTH	DRAINAGE
Bisgani	loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	40 to 60 inches	Poorly drained
Delhi	Loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Wind-modified alluvium	40 to 60 inches	Well drained
Timor	Loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	50 to 60 inches	Well drained
Tinnin	Loamy coarse sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	53 to 75 inches	Well drained
Veritas	Fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from mixed rock sources	54 to 70 inches	Moderately well drained

SOURCE: USDA/NRCS, WEB SOIL SURVEY, 2014.

**Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 - 2% slopes:** The Bisgani series consists of very deep, poorly drained soils that formed in mixed alluvium dominantly from granitic rock sources. Bisgani soils are on bars, flood plains, low alluvial fans, basins floors and valley basins. This series typically has a Mollic epipedon with an Aquic moisture regime. Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 - 2% slopes is included on the NRCS National Hydric Soils List with a hydric component percent of 85.

The color range for the A horizon (0 to 22 inches) in the Bisgani series is 10YR 4/1, 4/2, 5/1, 5/2, 8/1; 2.5Y 4/2 or 5/2. The moist colors of this horizon have a lower value and range from 10YR 2/1, 3/1, 3/2, 3/3; or 2.5Y 3/2. Texture is sandy loam, loamy sand or loamy coarse sand. The Ap horizon in some pedons has an overwash of clay loam. Some pedons are slightly effervescent.

The color range for C horizon (22 to 43 inches) has color of 10YR 6/1, 6/2, 6/3, 7/1, 7/2, 7/3, 8/1. 2.5Y 6/2, 7/1, 7/2; or N 7/0. Moist color is 10YR 3/2, 4/2, 4/3, 5/3, 5/4; 2.5Y 4/2, 5/2, 5/4 or 6/2; 5Y

4/1, 4/2. Texture is sandy loam, loamy sand, loamy coarse sand, coarse sand or sand. Some pedons have 2 to 5 percent fine gravel.

**Delhi loamy sand, 0 - 2% slopes:** The Delhi series consists of somewhat excessively drained soils on dunes. These soils are very deep. They formed in wind-modified alluvium derived from granitic rock sources. Slope ranges from 0 to 5 percent. Soils of the Delhi series are mixed, thermic, Typic Xeropsamments. Typical pedon of Delhi loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes. The content of clay is 0 to 5 percent. Reaction is slightly acid to mildly alkaline. Delhi loamy sand, 0 - 2% slopes is not included on the NRCS National Hydric Soils List.

The A horizon has color of 10YR 4/3, 5/2, 5/3, 5/4, or 6/2. When moist, it has color of 10YR 4/2 or 4/3. It is fine sand or loamy sand.

The C horizon has color of 10YR 5/2, 6/1, 6/2, 6/3, 6/4, 7/1, 7/2, 7/3, or 7/4. When moist, it has color of 10YR 5/1, 5/2, 5/3, 5/4, 6/1, 6/2, 6/3, or 6/4. It is fine sand, loamy sand, or sand.

**Timor loamy sandy, 0 - 2% slopes:** The Timor series consists of moderately well drained soils on low fan terraces or alluvial fans. These soils are deep to a hardpan. They formed in alluvium derived from granitic rock sources. Slope ranges from 0 to 2 percent. Soils of the Timor series are sandy, mixed, thermic Entic Haploxerolls. Typical pedon of Timor loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Depth to the duripan is 40 to 60 inches. The depth to distinct and prominent mottles is 30 to 48 inches. Timor loamy sand, 0 - 2% slopes is included on the NRCS National Hydric Soils List with a hydric component percent of 3.

The A horizon has color of 10YR 5/2, 5/3, 4/2, or 4/3. When moist, it has color of 10YR 2/2, 3/2, or 3/3. It is neutral or mildly alkaline.

The Bk horizon has color of 10YR 4/4, 5/3, 5/4, 6/2, 6/3, or 6/4. When moist, it has color of 10YR 5/4, 5/3, 4/4, 4/3, 4/2, or 3/3. It is mildly alkaline or moderately alkaline.

The 2Bkqm horizon has color of 10YR 7/3, 7/2, 7/1, 6/2, or 6/1. When moist, it has color of 10YR 5/2 or 2.5Y 5/2.

**Tinnin loamy coarse sand, 0 - 2% slopes:** The Tinnin series consists of very deep, well drained soils formed in predominantly granitic alluvium or eolian sands. Tinnin soils are on low alluvial terraces of fans and narrow ridges and mounds and have slopes of 0 to 9 percent. This series is typically a Mollic epipedon. Tinnin loamy coarse sand, 0 - 2% slopes is not included on the NRCS National Hydric Soils List.

The color range for A horizon (0-28 inches) is 10YR 5/2, 5/3, 4/2, or 4/3 and 10YR 2/2, 3/2 or 3/3 moist. It is loamy coarse sand, loamy sand, fine sand or sand. It is slightly acid to mildly alkaline. This horizon has 1 to 3 percent organic matter.

The color range for the C horizon (28-75 inches) is 10YR 4/4, 5/3, 5/4, 6/2, 6/3, 6/4, 7/2, 7/3 or 7/4, and moist color of 10YR 5/4, 5/3, 4/4, 4/3, 4/2, 3/3 or 3/4. It commonly is loamy coarse sand or loamy sand, but includes sand in the lower part of some pedons. The upper C horizon is slightly acid to mildly alkaline, and the lower C horizon is neutral to moderately alkaline.

**Veritas fine sandy loam, 0 - 2% slopes:** The Veritas series consists of deep to duripan, moderately well drained, soils that formed in alluvium derived from mixed rock sources. Veritas soils are on low fan terraces with slopes of 0 to 2 percent. This series typically has a Mollic epipedon. Veritas fine sandy loam, 0 - 2% slopes is included on the NRCS National Hydric Soils List with a hydric component percent of 2.

The color range for the A horizon (0-15 inches) is 10YR 5/1, 5/2 or 4/2 and moist color of 10YR 3/2 or 3/1. It is neutral to moderately alkaline. Organic matter ranges from 1 to 2 percent.

The color range for the B horizon (15-70 inches) is 10YR 5/4, 5/3, 5/1, 6/3, 6/4, 6/2 or 2.5Y 6/2 and moist color of 10YR 4/3, 4/2, 4/1 or 2.5Y 4/2. It is mildly or moderately alkaline.

### **Hydrogeomorphic Features**

The project site contains an irrigation ditch that is part of an extensive network of irrigation ditches that are owned and operated by the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID). SSJID was formed in the early 1900s, at which time they built several dams for reservoirs and hundreds of miles of irrigation ditches to supply irrigation water to farms in the region. The French Camp Outlet Canal functions as an irrigation water drainage ditch for farms receiving SSJID irrigation water “upstream.” The irrigation ditch drains upland agricultural irrigation water from these farms during irrigation season. The SSJID provides regulatory maintenance and weed abatement to their entire system of irrigation ditches.

The French Camp Outlet Canal enters the Project site from the southeastern corner of the Project site and travels northwesterly for approximately 400 feet before turning northerly for approximately 675 feet. The French Camp Outlet Canal then turns westerly for approximately 525 feet. The French Camp Outlet Canal then turns northwesterly for approximately 1,000 feet, before turning northerly as it exits the Project site approximately 825 feet to the north.

The Project site also contains two wetlands. Wetland 1 and 2 are on the eastern side of the Project site between the property line and the French Camp Outlet Canal near the Stadium Shopping Center.

The remainder of the Project site is level agricultural property with agricultural roads and ancillary structures. There are no hydrological features on the remainder of the Project site. The agricultural fields are actively maintained in crops during the growing season.

### **Water Source**

Surface flows within the French Camp Outlet Canal are derived primarily from drainage of upstream agricultural irrigation water. SSJID provides this water from their reservoirs to their customers through their extensive network of irrigation ditches. The irrigation water comes from SSJID reservoirs behind the Tulloch, New Melones, Beardsley, Goodwin, and Donnell's dams. Upstream farms (uplands) receive the water for irrigation, and excess water drains back into the SSJID irrigation ditches until it ultimately reaches the French Camp Outlet Canal. The French Camp Outlet Canal functions as an irrigation ditch that drains agricultural irrigation water from these farms (uplands) during irrigation season.

Irrigation season runs from approximately March 15 to October 15, depending on the weather. The canal network ultimately connects into the San Joaquin River approximately 12 miles north of the project site.

**Drainage Pattern**

The region generally drains from east to west. The natural drainage pattern in the area is largely changed from its natural conditions due to agricultural activities. With the exception of the two wetlands and the French Camp Outlet Canal, there are no natural drainage patterns within the project site.

The flows in the French Camp Outlet Canal travel northerly through the property and are fully contained within the banks of the ditch. These ditches are not known to overflow or otherwise cause flooding on adjacent properties, other than the two wetland areas within the Project site.

Wetland 1 is a low terrace that receives water from the ditch through a low point along the bank. The water is received during high flows, which occur during the summer irrigation season. Wetland 2 is an active floodplain that receives water along a portion of the ditch with no bank.

**Downstream Connectivity**

The ditch has connectivity to the San Joaquin River, a “Traditional Navigable Water” (TNW); however, it should be noted that connectivity is controlled with man-made structures that prevent tidal influence and movement of fish upstream into the ditch. There is no anadromous fish movement from the San Joaquin River into the French Camp Outlet Canal. Downstream connectivity is summarized in Table 3.4-2 (below).

**TABLE 3.4-2: DISTANCE TO DOWNSTREAM RESOURCES**

DOWNSTREAM RESOURCE (NAME)	TYPE	LENGTH (FEET)	LENGTH (MILES)
Ditch	Tributary	40,027.85	7.58
Unnamed Stream	Tributary	5,889.55	1.12
French Camp Slough (Artificial Path)	Tributary	17,213.03	3.26
San Joaquin River	TNW	N/A	N/A

*SOURCE: USGS NATIONAL HYDROGRAPHY DATA SET, FEBRUARY 11, 2011*

**SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES**

The following discussion is based on a background search of special-status species that are documented in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), the California Native Plant Society’s (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) endangered and threatened species lists. The background search was regional in scope and focused on the documented occurrences within 10 miles of the Project site. Table 3.4-3 provides a list of special-status plants and Table 3.4-4 provides a list of special-status animals. Figure 3.4-3 and 3.4-4 present the documented occurrences within a one-mile and ten-mile radius of the Project site.

TABLE 3.4-3: SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT SPECIES WHICH MAY OCCUR IN PROJECT AREA

SPECIES	STATUS (FED./CA/CNPS/SJMCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT	BLOOMING PERIOD
Suisun Marsh aster <i>Aster lentus</i>	--/--/1B.2/Yes	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Suisun Marsh, Suisun Bay; Contra Costa, Napa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Solano Counties	Brackish and freshwater marshes and swamps; below 3 m	May-November
Big tarplant <i>Blepharizonia plumosa</i>	--/--/1B.1/No	San Francisco Bay area with occurrences in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Solano Counties	Valley and foothill grassland; 30-505 m	July- Oct
Slough thistle <i>Cirsium crassicaule</i>	--/--/1B.1/Yes	San Joaquin Valley: Kings, Kern, and San Joaquin Counties	Freshwater sloughs and marshes; 3-100 m	May-August
Recurved larkspur <i>Delphinium recurvatum</i>	--/--/1B.2/Yes	Central Valley from Colusa to Kern Counties	Alkaline soils in saltbush scrub, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland; 3-750 m	March-May
Round-leaved filaree <i>Erodium macrophyllum</i>	--/--/2.1/No	Scattered occurrences in the Great Valley, southern north Coast Ranges, San Francisco Bay area, south Coast Ranges, Channel Islands, Transverse Ranges, and Peninsular Ranges	Cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland on clay soils; 15-1,200 m	March-May
Delta button-celery <i>Eryngium racemosum</i>	--/E/1B.1/Yes	San Joaquin River delta floodplains and adjacent Sierra Nevada foothills; Calaveras, Merced, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus Counties	Riparian scrub, seasonally inundated depressions along floodplains on clay soils; below 75 m	June-August
Rose-mallow <i>Hibiscus lasiocarpus</i> var. <i>occidentalis</i>	--/--/1B.2/Yes	Scattered locations in central California in the central and southern Sacramento Valley, deltaic Central Valley from Butte to San Joaquin Counties	Freshwater marshes along rivers and sloughs; below 120 m	June-September
Wright's trichocoronis <i>Trichocoronis wrightii</i> var. <i>wrightii</i>	--/--/2.1/Yes	Scattered locations in the Central Valley; southern coast of Texas	Floodplains, moist places, on alkaline soils; below 450 m	May-September
Caper-fruited tropidocarpum <i>Tropidocarpum capparidium</i>	--/--/1B.1/Yes	Historically known from the northwest San Joaquin Valley and adjacent Coast Range foothills; currently known from Fresno, Monterey, and San Luis Obispo Counties	Alkaline hills in valley and foothill grassland; below 455 m	March-April

Notes: CNPS = California Native Plant Society

SJMSCP = San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan

**Federal**

E = endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act.

T = threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act.

**State**

E = endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

T = threatened under the California Endangered Species Act.

R = rare under the California Endangered Species Act

**California Native Plant Society**

1B = rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.

2 = rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere.

3 = a review list – plants about which more information is needed.

4 = plants of limited distribution – a watch list

.1 = seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened-high degree and immediacy of threat).

.2 = fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened).

.3 = not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened).

TABLE 3.4-4: SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE AND FISH SPECIES WHICH MAY OCCUR IN PROJECT AREA

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/SJ MCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
<b>INVERTEBRATES</b>			
Molestan blister beetle <i>Lytta molesta</i>	--/--/Yes	Distribution of this species is poorly known.	Annual grasslands, foothill woodlands or saltbush scrub.
Sacramento anthicid beetle <i>Anthicus sacramento</i>	--/--/No	Found in several locations along the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, from Shasta to San Joaquin counties, and at one site along the Feather River.	Sand dune area, sand slipfaces among bamboo and willow, but may not depend on these plants.
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle <i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	T/--/Yes	Stream side habitats below 3,000 feet throughout the Central Valley	Riparian and oak savanna habitats with elderberry shrubs; elderberries are the host plant.
Vernal pool fairy shrimp <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	T/--/Yes	Central Valley, central and south Coast Ranges from Tehama County to Santa Barbara County. Isolated populations also in Riverside County	Common in vernal pools; also found in sandstone rock outcrop pools.
<b>AMPHIBIANS</b>			
California tiger salamander <i>Ambystoma californiense tigrinum c.</i>	T/SSC/Yes	Central Valley, including Sierra Nevada foothills, up to approximately 1,000 feet, and coastal region from Butte County south to northeastern San Luis Obispo County.	Small ponds, lakes, or vernal pools in grass-lands and oak woodlands for larvae; rodent burrows, rock crevices, or fallen logs for cover for adults and for summer dormancy.
<b>BIRDS</b>			
Aleutian goose <i>Branta canadensis leucopareia</i>	D/--/Yes	The entire population winters in Butte Sink, then moves to Los Banos, Modesto, the Delta, and East Bay reservoirs; stages near Crescent City during spring before migrating to breeding grounds.	Roosts in large marshes, flooded fields, stock ponds, and reservoirs; forages in pastures, meadows, and harvested grainfields; corn is especially preferred
White-tailed kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>	--/FP/Yes	Lowland areas west of Sierra Nevada from the head of the Sacramento Valley south, including coastal valleys and foothills to western San Diego County at the Mexico border	Low foothills or valley areas with valley or live oaks, riparian areas, and marshes near open grasslands for foraging
Swainson's hawk <i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	--/T/Yes	Lower Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Klamath Basin, and Butte Valley. Highest nesting densities occur near Davis and Woodland, Yolo County	Nests in oaks or cottonwoods in or near riparian habitats. Forages in grasslands, irrigated pastures, and grain fields
Merlin <i>Falco columbarius</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Does not nest in California. Rare but widespread winter visitor to the Central Valley and coastal areas	Forages along coastline in open grasslands, savannas, and woodlands. Often forages near lakes and other wetlands
Western yellow-billed cuckoo <i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	--/E/Yes	Nests along the upper Sacramento, lower Feather, south fork of the Kern, Amargosa, Santa Ana, and Colorado Rivers	Wide, dense riparian forests with a thick understory of willows for nesting; sites with a dominant cottonwood overstory are preferred for foraging; may avoid valley oak riparian habitats where scrub jays are abundant

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
Western burrowing owl <i>Athene cunicularia hypugea</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Lowlands throughout California, including the Central Valley, northeastern plateau, southeastern deserts, and coastal areas. Rare along south coast	Level, open, dry, heavily grazed or low stature grassland or desert vegetation with available burrows
Tricolored blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Permanent resident in the Central Valley from Butte County to Kern County. Breeds at scattered coastal locations from Marin County south to San Diego County; and at scattered locations in Lake, Sonoma, and Solano Counties. Rare nester in Siskiyou, Modoc, and Lassen Counties	Nests in dense colonies in emergent marsh vegetation, such as tules and cattails, or upland sites with blackberries, nettles, thistles, and grainfields. Habitat must be large enough to support 50 pairs. Probably requires water at or near the nesting colony
<b>MAMMALS</b>			
San Joaquin pocket mouse <i>Perognathus inornatus</i>	--/--/Yes	Occurs throughout the San Joaquin Valley and in the Salinas Valley	Favors grasslands and scrub habitats with fine textured soils
Riparian (San Joaquin Valley) woodrat <i>Neotoma fuscipes riparia</i>	E/SSC, FP/Yes	Historical distribution along the San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne Rivers, and Caswell State Park in San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Merced Counties; presently limited to San Joaquin County at Caswell State Park and a possible second population near Vernalis	Riparian habitats with dense shrub cover, willow thickets, and an oak overstory
Riparian brush rabbit <i>Sylvilagus bachmani riparius</i>	E/E/Yes	Limited to San Joaquin County at Caswell State Park near the confluence of the Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers and Paradise Cut area on Union Pacific right-of-way lands	Native valley riparian habitats with large clumps of dense shrubs, low-growing vines, and some tall shrubs and trees
American badger <i>Taxidea taxus</i>	--/SSC/Yes	In California, badgers occur throughout the state except in humid coastal forests of northwestern California in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties	Badgers occur in a wide variety of open, arid habitats but are most commonly associated with grasslands, savannas, mountain meadows, and open areas of desert scrub; the principal habitat requirements for the species appear to be sufficient food (burrowing rodents), friable soils, and relatively open, uncultivated ground
San Joaquin kit fox <i>Vulpes macrotis mutica</i>	E/T/Yes	Principally occurs in the San Joaquin Valley and adjacent open foothills to the west; recent records from 17 counties extending from Kern County north to Contra Costa County	Saltbush scrub, grassland, oak, savanna, and freshwater scrub
<b>Fish</b>			
Delta smelt <i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	T/T/Yes	Primarily in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary but has been found as far upstream as the mouth of the American River on the Sacramento River and Mossdale on the San Joaquin River; range extends downstream to San Pablo Bay.	Occurs in estuary habitat in the Delta where fresh and brackish water mix in the salinity range of 2-7 parts per thousand.
Central Valley steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	T/--/No	Sacramento River and tributary Central Valley rivers.	Occurs in well-oxygenated, cool, riverine habitat with water temperatures from 7.8°C to 18°C. Habitat types are riffles, runs, and pools.

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
Central Valley fall- /late fall-run Chinook salmon <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	--/SSC/No	Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and tributary Central Valley rivers.	Have the same general habitat requirements as winter and spring-run Chinook salmon.
Longfin smelt <i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Occurs in estuaries along the California coast. Adults concentrated in Suisun, San Pablo, and North San Francisco Bays.	Prior to spawning, these fish aggregate in deepwater habitats available in the northern Delta, including, primarily, the channel habitats of Suisun Bay and the Sacramento River. Spawning occurs in fresh water on the San Joaquin River below Medford Island and on the Sacramento River below Rio Vista.
Sacramento splittail <i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Sacramento splittail are found only in California's Central Valley. Currently largely confined to: (1) the Delta, (2) Suisun Bay, (3) Suisun Marsh, (4) Napa River, (5) Petaluma River, and (6) other parts of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary.	Adults require flooded vegetation for spawning and rearing, and are often found in areas subject to flooding. Spawning occurs on submerged vegetation in temporarily flooded upland and riparian habitat. Spawning occurs in the lower reaches of rivers, bypasses used for flood management, dead-end sloughs and in larger sloughs such as Montezuma Slough.
River lamprey <i>Lampetra ayresii</i>	--/SSC/No	Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Napa Rivers; tributaries of San Francisco Bay (Moyle 2002; Moyle et al. 1995)	Adults live in the ocean and migrate into fresh water to spawn
Hardhead <i>Mylopharodon conocephalus</i>	--/SSC/No	Tributary streams in the San Joaquin drainage; large tributary streams in the Sacramento River and the main stem	Reside in low to mid-elevation streams and prefer clear, deep pools and runs with slow velocities. Also occur in reservoirs.

Status explanations:

**Federal**

E = endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act.

T = threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act.

PE = proposed for endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act.

PT = proposed for threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act.

C = candidate species for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act.

D = delisted from federal listing status.

**State**

E = endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

T = threatened under the California Endangered Species Act.

FP = fully protected under the California Fish and Game Code.

SSC = species of special concern in California.

### 3.4.2 REGULATORY SETTING

There are a number of regulatory agencies whose responsibility includes the oversight of the natural resources of the state and nation including the CDFW, USFWS, USACE, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. These agencies often respond to declines in the quantity of a particular habitat or plant or animal species by developing protective measures for those species or habitat type. The following is an overview of the federal, state and local regulations that are applicable to the proposed project.

#### FEDERAL

---

##### **Federal Endangered Species Act**

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), passed in 1973, defines an endangered species as any species or subspecies that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. A threatened species is defined as any species or subspecies that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Once a species is listed it is fully protected from a “take” unless a take permit is issued by the USFWS. A take is defined as the harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting wildlife species or any attempt to engage in such conduct, including modification of its habitat (16 USC 1532, 50 CFR 17.3). Proposed endangered or threatened species are those species for which a proposed regulation, but not a final rule, has been published in the Federal Register.

##### **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

To kill, possess, or trade a migratory bird, bird part, nest, or egg is a violation of the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (FMBTA: 16 U.S.C., §703, Supp. I, 1989), unless it is in accordance with the regulations that have been set forth by the Secretary of the Interior.

##### **Federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act**

The Federal Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act provide regulations to protect bald and golden eagles as well as their nests and eggs from willful damage or injury.

##### **Clean Water Act – Section 404**

Section 404 of the CWA regulates all discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. Discharges of fill material includes the placement of fill that is necessary for the construction of any structure, or impoundment requiring rock, sand, dirt, or other material for its construction; site-development fills for recreational, industrial, commercial, residential, and other uses; causeways or road fills; and fill for intake and outfall pipes and subaqueous utility lines [33 C.F.R. §328.2(f)].

Waters of the U.S. include lakes, rivers, streams, intermittent drainages, mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, and wet meadows. Wetlands are defined as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support and under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions” [33 C.F.R. §328.3(b)]. Waters of the U.S. exhibit a defined bed and bank and ordinary high water mark (OHWM). The OHWM is defined by the USACE as “that line on shore established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical character of the soil, destruction of terrestrial vegetation, the presence of litter and debris, or other appropriate means that consider the characteristics of the surrounding areas” [33 C.F.R. §328.3(e)].

The USACE is the agency responsible for administering the permit process for activities that affect waters of the U.S. Executive Order 11990 is a federal implementation policy, which is intended to result in no net loss of wetlands.

### **Clean Water Act – Section 401**

Section 401 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. 1341) requires an applicant who is seeking a 404 permit to first obtain a water quality certification from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). To obtain the water quality certification, the CVRWQCB must indicate that the proposed fill would be consistent with the standards set forth by the state.

### **Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899**

The Rivers and Harbors Act prohibits the obstruction or alteration of any navigable water of the United States. The Act requires authorization from the USACE for any excavation or deposition of materials into these waters or for any work that could affect the course, location, condition, or capacity of rivers or harbors.

## STATE

---

### **Fish and Game Code §2050-2097 - California Endangered Species Act**

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) protects certain plant and animal species when they are of special ecological, educational, historical, recreational, aesthetic, economic, and scientific value to the people of the State. CESA established that it is State policy to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance endangered species and their habitats.

CESA was expanded upon the original Native Plant Protection Act and enhanced legal protection for plants. To be consistent with Federal regulations, CESA created the categories of "threatened" and "endangered" species. It converted all "rare" animals into the Act as threatened species, but did not do so for rare plants. Thus, there are three listing categories for plants in California: rare, threatened, and endangered. Under State law, plant and animal species may be formally designated by official listing by the California Fish and Game Commission.

### **Fish and Game Code §1900-1913 California Native Plant Protection Act**

In 1977 the State Legislature passed the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) in recognition of rare and endangered plants of the state. The intent of the law was to preserve, protect, and enhance endangered plants. The NPPA gave the California Fish and Game Commission the power to designate native plants as endangered or rare, and to require permits for collecting, transporting, or selling such plants. The NPPA includes provisions that prohibit the taking of plants designated as "rare" from the wild, and a salvage mandate for landowners, which requires notification of the CDFW 10 days in advance of approving a building site.

### **Fish and Game Code §3503, 3503.5, 3800 - Predatory Birds**

Under the California Fish and Game Code, all predatory birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes in California, generally called "raptors," are protected. The law indicates that it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird unless it is in accordance with the code. Any activity that would cause a nest to be abandoned or cause a reduction or loss in a reproductive effort is considered a take. This generally includes construction activities.

### **Fish and Game Code §1601-1603 – Streambed Alteration**

Under the California Fish and Game Code, CDFW has jurisdiction over any proposed activities that would divert or obstruct the natural flow or change the bed, channel, or bank of any lake or stream. Private landowners or project proponents must obtain a "Streambed Alteration Agreement" from CDFW prior to any alteration of a lake bed, stream channel, or their banks. Through this agreement, the CDFW may impose conditions to limit and fully mitigate impacts on fish and wildlife resources. These agreements are usually initiated through the local CDFW warden and will specify timing and construction conditions, including any mitigation necessary to protect fish and wildlife from impacts of the work.

### **Public Resources Code § 21000 - California Environmental Quality Act**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) identifies that a species that is not listed on the federal or state endangered species list may be considered rare or endangered if the species meets certain criteria. (CEQA Guidelines § 15380) Species that are not listed under FESA or CESA, but are otherwise eligible for listing (i.e. candidate, or proposed) may be protected by the local government until the opportunity to list the species arises for the responsible agency.

Species that may be considered for review are included on a list of "Species of Special Concern," developed by the CDFW. Additionally, the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintains a list of plant species native to California that have low populations, limited distribution, or are otherwise threatened with extinction. This information is published in the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California. List 1A contains plants that are believed to be extinct. List 1B contains plants that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere. List 2 contains plants that are rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more numerous elsewhere.

### **California Wetlands Conservation Policy**

In August 1993, the Governor announced the "California Wetlands Conservation Policy." The goals of the policy are to establish a framework and strategy that will:

- Ensure no overall net loss and to achieve a long-term net gain in the quantity, quality, and permanence of wetland acreage and values in California in a manner that fosters creativity, stewardship, and respect for private property.
- Reduce procedural complexity in the administration of State and federal wetland conservation programs.
- Encourage partnerships to make landowner incentive programs and cooperative planning efforts the primary focus of wetland conservation and restoration.

The Governor also signed Executive Order W-59-93, which incorporates the goals and objectives contained in the new policy and directs the Resources Agency to establish an Interagency Task Force to direct and coordinate administration and implementation of the policy.

### **Natural Community Conservation Planning Act**

The Natural Community Conservation Planning Act provides long-term protection of species and habitats through regional, multi-species planning before the special measures of the CESA become necessary.

### **Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act**

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act authorizes the SWRCB to regulate state water quality and protect beneficial uses.

### **Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basins**

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan), adopted by the Central Valley RWQCB in 1998, identifies the beneficial uses of water bodies and provides water quality objectives and standards for waters of the Sacramento River and SJR basins, including the Delta.

State and federal laws mandate the protection of designated "beneficial uses" of water bodies. State law defines beneficial uses as "domestic; municipal; agricultural and industrial supply; power generation; recreation; aesthetic enjoyment; navigation; and preservation and enhancement of fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources or preserves" (Water Code Section 13050[f]). Additional protected beneficial uses of the SJR include groundwater recharge and fresh water replenishment. Major issues and the general conditions of existing beneficial uses in the SJR are as follows:

- **Water Supply:** The SJR is not currently a source of municipal water supply for the City of Manteca and is not identified as a source for the proposed proposed Project project, although some farms in the area use the river as a source of water for irrigation. The City currently uses groundwater only and surface water from the South San Joaquin Irrigation

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

District (SSJID) South County Surface Water Supply Project (SCSWSP), which does not rely on the SJR.

- **Agricultural Supply:** Extensive use is made of SJR and Delta waters for agricultural purposes. Annual water diversions from the Delta by the State Water Project (SWP) and the Central Valley Project (CVP) for agriculture are estimated to reach 4.3 million acre-feet (MAF) per year by 2030. In addition, about 2,000 privately owned agricultural water supply diversions are scattered throughout the Delta, generally consisting of riverside pumping stations.
- **Recreation:** Water-dependent recreation uses of the SJR and the Delta include swimming, wading, waterskiing, sport fishing, and a variety of other activities that involve contact with the water. Noncontact (water-enhanced) recreation uses include picnicking, camping, pleasure boating, hunting, bird watching, education, and aesthetic enjoyment.
- **Groundwater Recharge:** Water from the SJR and the Delta recharges the San Joaquin Valley groundwater basin. Recharge serves to maintain salt balance in the soil column, prevent saltwater intrusion into freshwater aquifers, and provide for water supplies. Groundwater is replenished through deep percolation of streamflow, precipitation, and applied irrigation water. Groundwater quality is generally adequate throughout the San Joaquin Valley and the Delta, although at shallow depths within the Delta the water is often saline and contains high levels of total dissolved solids (TDS) and dissolved minerals. Enforceable TDS standards do not exist for drinking water. The need for treatment generally depends on consumer acceptance.
- **Fish and Wildlife:** The SJR and the waterways of the Delta provide important habitat for a diverse variety of aquatic life and terrestrial wildlife. This includes temporary habitat and migration routes for anadromous and other migratory species, as well as permanent habitat for resident species. Fish dependent on the Delta as a migration corridor, nursery, or permanent residence include Chinook salmon, steelhead, delta smelt, Sacramento splittail, striped bass, American shad, sturgeon, catfish, largemouth bass, and numerous other estuary and freshwater species. The amount and quality of water flowing through the Delta greatly influences the overall productivity of the area on an annual basis. A large assemblage of wildlife uses the Delta either seasonally or year round, including waterfowl; migratory and resident songbirds; mice, rabbits, and other small mammals; water dependent mammals, such as beaver and muskrat; and predators such as skunk, raccoon, northern harrier, and coyote.

### LOCAL

---

#### **San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan**

A Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is a federal planning document that is prepared pursuant to Section 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). An approved HCP within a defined plan area allows for the incidental take of species and habitat that are otherwise protected under FESA during development activities.

A Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) is a state planning document administered by CDFW. An approved NCCP within a defined plan area allows for the incidental take of species and habitat that are otherwise protected under CESA during growth and development activities.

***Background:*** The key purpose of the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), is to provide a strategy for balancing the need to conserve Open Space and the need to Convert Open Space to non-Open Space uses while protecting the region's agricultural economy; preserving landowner property rights; providing for the long-term management of plant, fish and wildlife species, especially those that are currently listed, or may be listed in the future, under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or the California Endangered Species Act (CESA); providing and maintaining multiple-use Open Spaces which contribute to the quality of life of the residents of San Joaquin County; and accommodating a growing population while minimizing costs to Project Proponents and society at large.

San Joaquin County's past and future (2001-2051) growth has affected and will continue to affect 97 special status plant, fish and wildlife species in 52 vegetative communities scattered throughout San Joaquin County's 1,400+ square miles and 900,000+ acres, which include 43% of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta's Primary Zone. The SJMSCP, in accordance with ESA Section 10(a)(1)(B) and CESA Section 2081(b) Incidental Take Permits, provides compensation for the Conversion of Open Space to non-Open Space uses which affect the plant, fish and wildlife species covered by the Plan, hereinafter referred to as "SJMSCP Covered Species". In addition, the SJMSCP provides some compensation to offset the impacts of Open Space land Conversions on non-wildlife related resources such as recreation, agriculture, scenic values and other beneficial Open Space uses.

The SJMSCP compensates for Conversions of Open Space for the following activities: urban development, mining, expansion of existing urban boundaries, non-agricultural activities occurring outside of urban boundaries, levee maintenance undertaken by the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency, transportation projects, school expansions, non-federal flood control projects, new parks and trails, maintenance of existing facilities for non-federal irrigation district projects, utility installation, maintenance activities, managing Preserves, and similar public agency projects. These activities will be undertaken by both public and private individuals and agencies throughout San Joaquin County and within the County's incorporated cities of Escalon, Manteca, Lodi, Manteca, Ripon, Stockton and Tracy. Public agencies including Caltrans (for transportation projects), and the San Joaquin Council of Governments (for transportation projects) also will undertake activities which will be covered by the SJMSCP. In addition, 5,340 acres is allocated for anticipated projects (e.g., annexations, general plan amendments)

The 97 SJMSCP Covered Species include 25 state and/or federally listed species. The SJMSCP Covered Species include 27 plants (6 listed), 4 fish (2 listed), 4 amphibians (1 listed), 4 reptiles (1 listed), 33 birds (7 listed), 15 mammals (3 listed) and 10 invertebrates (5 listed).

***Implementation:*** The SJMSCP is administered by a Joint Powers Authority consisting of members of the San Joaquin County Council of Governments (SJCOG), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Development project applicants are given

the option of participating in the SJMSCP as a way to streamline compliance with required local, State and federal laws regarding biological resources, and typically avoid having to approach each agency independently. According to the SJMSCP, adoption and implementation by local planning jurisdictions provides full compensation and mitigation for impacts to plants, fish and wildlife. Adoption and implementation of the SJMSCP also secures compliance pursuant to the state and federal laws such as CEQA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Planning and Zoning Law, the State Subdivision Map Act, the Porter-Cologne Act and the Cortese-Knox Act in regard to species covered under the SJMSCP.

Applicants pay mitigation fees on a per-acre basis, as established by the Joint Powers Authority according to the measures needed to mitigate impacts to the various habitat and biological resources. Different types of land require different levels of mitigation; i.e., one category requires that one acre of a similar land type be preserved for each acre developed, while another type requires that two acres be preserved for each acre developed. The entire County is mapped according to these categories so that land owners, project proponents and project reviewers are easily aware of the applicable SJMSCP fees for the proposed development.

The appropriate fees are collected by the City and remitted to SJCOG for administration. SJCOG uses the funds to preserve open space land of comparable types throughout the County, often coordinating with other private or public land trusts to purchase conservation easements or buy land outright for preservation. Development occurring on land that has been classified under the SJMSCP as “no-pay” would not be required to pay a fee. This category usually refers to already urbanized land and infill development areas. Although the fees are automatically adjusted on an annual basis, based on the construction cost index, they often cannot keep pace with the rapidly rising land prices in the Central Valley. Therefore, SJCOG is currently in the process of updating the mitigation fee schedule to more accurately match the market value of the various land types.

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

#### ***Biological Resources Policies***

RC-P-31. Minimize impact of new development on native vegetation and wildlife.

RC-P-32. Condition new development in the vicinity of the San Joaquin River and Walthall Slough to protect riparian habitat, wetlands, and other native vegetation and wildlife communities and habitats.

RC-P-33. Discourage the premature removal of orchard trees in advance of development, and discourage the removal of other existing healthy mature trees, both native and introduced.

RC-P-34. Protect special status species and other species that are sensitive to human activities.

RC-P-35. Allow contiguous habitat areas.

RC-P-36. Consider the development of new drainage channels planted with native vegetation, which would provide habitat as well as drainage.

***Biological Resources Implementation Measures***

RC-I-32. Continue to support and comply with the requirements of the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) when reviewing proposed public and private land use changes.

RC-I-33. Project proponents who opt not to participate in the SJMSCP shall:

- Satisfy applicable U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA), California Endangered Species Act (CESA), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and other applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulation provisions through consultations with the Permitting Agencies and local planning agencies.
- Provide site-specific research and ground surveys for proposed development projects. This research must include a detailed inventory of all biological resources onsite, and appropriate mitigation measures for avoiding or reducing impact to these biological resources. This requirement may be waived if determined by the City that the proposed project area is already sufficiently surveyed.

RC-I-34. Until such time that a Clean Water Act regional general permit or its equivalent is issued for coverage under the SJMSCP, acquisition of a Section 404 permit by project proponents will continue to occur as required by existing regulations. Project proponents shall comply with all requirements for protecting federally protected wetlands.

RC-I-35. Continue to enforce the City's heritage tree ordinance which defines and identifies mature trees to be protected, and establishes regulations for their protection and removal.

RC-I-36. Limit the access of pedestrians and bicyclists to wetland areas so that access is compatible with long-term protection of these natural resources.

RC-I-37. The City shall implement multiple use of resource areas, where feasible, that includes passive recreational and educational opportunities with the protection of wildlife and vegetation habitat areas.

**City of Manteca Municipal Code**

Manteca Municipal Code calls for the avoidance of heritage trees. Heritage trees are defined under section 17.100.060 (Universal Definitions) of the code as any natural woody plant rooted in the ground and having a diameter of 30 inches or more when measured two feet above the ground. Section 17.48.060 calls for the protection of all existing trees having a diameter of six inches or more when measured 4½ feet above the ground. The City planning department must be notified of planned construction or grade changes within the proximity of existing mature trees. Existing trees must be protected from construction equipment, machinery, grade changes, and excavation for utilities, paving, and footers. Replacement of existing trees is subject to approval from the planning director and must be with a minimum 24-inch box tree of compatible species for the development site and be consistent with Section 17.48.060. Orchard areas of one acre or more are exempt from section 17.48.060; however, as outlined above, policy RC-P-33 of the City's General Plan discourages the premature removal of orchard trees in advance of development.

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

Section 12.08.070 of the municipal code prohibits cutting, pruning, removing, injuring, or interference with any tree, shrub, or plant upon or in any street tree area or other public place in the City without prior approval from the superintendent. The City is authorized to grant such permission at their discretion and where necessary. Except for utility companies, as provided in Section 12.08.080, no such permission shall be valid for a longer period than 30 days after its issuance.

### 3.4.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on biological resources if it will:

- 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
- 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
- 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;
- 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;
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance;
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

---

##### **Impact 3.4-1: The proposed project has the potential to have a direct or indirect effect on special-status invertebrate species (less than significant)**

There are four special-status invertebrates that are documented within a 10-mile radius of the Project site including: Molestan blister beetle (*Lytta molesta*), Sacramento anthicid beetle (*Anthicus sacramento*), valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*), and vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*). Of the four documented species, there are two federal listed species (threatened), no state listed species, and one federal species of concern. The federal listed and federal species of concern are covered species under the SJMCP. Field surveys

and habitat evaluations for the entire project site were performed on March 28, March 29, and April 14, 2011 and on March 28, 2014.

Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB) is a federal threatened insect, proposed for delisting. Elderberry (*Sambucus* sp.), which is a primary host species for valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB), is not present within the project site. Elderberry shrubs are a common component of riparian areas throughout the Central Valley region and are often found as isolated residual plants within and around Central Valley farmland. The Project site was surveyed by searching for the presence of elderberry shrubs and VELB. The Project site does not contain VELB, or its habitat. VELB is not anticipated to be directly affected by any individual phase or component of the proposed Project because this species is presumed to be absent from the Project site. Nevertheless, VELB is a covered species under the SJMSCP.

The wetlands along the French Camp Outlet Canal are considered unsuitable habitat for vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*) or any other vernal pool crustaceans. The vegetative community within the wetlands indicates that these features receive supplemental irrigation throughout the year, which would render these features unsuitable as habitat for the vernal pool crustaceans. Vernal pool fairy shrimp is not anticipated to be directly affected by any individual phase or component of the proposed Project. Vernal pool fairy shrimp is a covered species under the SJMSCP.

Essential habitat for Molestan blister beetle and Sacramento anthicid beetle is not present on the project site.

No special-status invertebrates were observed within the project site or offsite improvement corridors during field surveys and none are expected to be affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project, including each individual phase and the offsite improvements would have a **less than significant** impact on special-status invertebrate species. While there are no special status invertebrate species that are anticipated to be affected by any individual phase or component of the proposed Project, participation in the SJMSCP will provide the coverage for the incidental take of a species if it were to occur. The following mitigation measure will ensure coverage under the SJMSCP.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-1:** *Prior to commencement of any grading activities for each individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase of development, the project proponent shall seek coverage under the SJMSCP to mitigate for habitat impacts to covered special status species. (Note: Coverage is not needed for an individual phase, or portion of an individual phase, until grading or other disturbance activities are planned to commence.) Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. These fees are used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected as a result of the proposed project. There are a wide variety of incidental take avoidance and*

*minimization measures contained in the SJMSCP that were developed in consultation with the USFWS, CDFW, and local agencies. The applicability of incidental takes avoidance and minimization measures are determined by SJCOG on a project basis. The process of obtaining coverage for a project includes incidental take authorization (permits) under the Endangered Species Act Section 10(a) and California Fish and Game Code Section 2081. The Section 10(a) permit also serves as a special-purpose permit for the incidental take of those species that are also protected under the MBTA. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on covered special-status species. The SJMSCP includes the implementation of an ongoing Monitoring Plan to ensure success in mitigating the habitat impacts that are covered. The SJMSCP Monitoring Plan includes an Annual Report process, Biological Monitoring Plan, SJMSCP Compliance Monitoring Program, and the SJMSCP Adaptive Management Plan SJCOG.*

### **Impact 3.4-2: The proposed project has the potential to have direct or indirect effects on special-status reptile and amphibian species (less than significant)**

There is one special-status amphibian that is documented within a 10-mile radius of the Project site including: California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*). There is no essential habitat for this species within any phase of project.

While not documented within the 10-mile search radius, the riparian habitat adjacent to the French Camp Outlet Canal represents potentially-suitable habitat for giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*), which is a federal and state listed threatened species. Essential giant garter snake habitat components consist of 1) adequate water during early spring through mid-fall to provide prey base and cover, 2) emergent wetland vegetation for escape cover and foraging habitat, 3) uplands for basking and retreat sites, and 4) higher elevation upland for cover and flood refugia. The USFWS considers areas within 200 feet of aquatic habitat to represent potential upland habitat. Additionally, the USFWS identifies various levels of impact to giant garter snake habitat, from temporary to permanent, and applies mitigation requirements accordingly. The nearest previously documented giant garter snake occurrence is located greater than 10 miles to the northeast of the site, and while this special status species is not anticipated to be affected by the proposed Project, participation in the SJMSCP will provide the coverage for the incidental take of a species if it were to occur.

While not documented within the 10-mile search radius, the French Camp Outlet Canal represents potentially-suitable habitat for western pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*), which is known to occur in aquatic habitats, such as streams, ponds, freshwater marshes, and lakes. They require still or slow-moving water with instream emergent woody debris, rocks, or other similar features for basking sites. Western pond turtle nests are typically located on unshaded upland slopes in dry substrates with clay or silt soils. The French Camp Outlet Canal provides suitable aquatic habitat for western pond turtles. The banks along the French Camp Outlet Canal could provide suitable nesting sites, but regular disturbance from vegetation removal activities, such as burning, mowing, and herbicide spraying, makes it very unlikely that pond turtles would nest in the banks. The agricultural portion of the Project site is unlikely to be utilized by western pond turtle. The nearest previously documented western pond turtle occurrence is located greater than 10 miles from the

Project site, and while this special status species is not anticipated to be affected by the proposed Project, participation in the SJMSCP will provide the coverage for the incidental take of a species if it were to occur.

The French Camp Outlet Canal provides potential aquatic habitat for several species, including those discussed above. A potential impact to the aquatic habitat and adjacent upland area would first occur in Phase 1 with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal and development of the hotel resort facility with all of its amenities. French Camp Outlet Canal also traverses through a portion of Phase 3, Phase 4, and Future Phases. Undergrounding the Canal and development of the land immediately adjacent to the Canal in these additional phases would present a potential impact to this habitat; however, no special-status reptiles or amphibians were observed within the project site or offsite improvement corridors during field surveys and none are expected to be affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact on special status reptile or amphibian species. While there are no special status reptiles or amphibians species that are anticipated to be affected by the proposed Project, participation in the SJMSCP will provide the coverage for the incidental take of a species if it were to occur. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, previously listed, will ensure coverage under the SJMSCP.

### **Impact 3.4-3: The proposed project has the potential to have direct or indirect effects on special-status bird species (less than significant with mitigation)**

Special-status birds that are documented within a ten-mile radius of the Project site include: Aleutian goose (*Branta canadensis leucopareia*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), Merlin (*Falco columbarius*), western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*), western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypogea*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) and Tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*).

Plant communities within the project site may provide suitable habitat for a variety of potentially occurring special-status birds, including those listed above. Potential nesting habitat is present for colonial nesting water birds, special-status and common raptors, and special-status songbirds. There is also the potential for other special-status birds that do not nest in this region and represent migrants or winter visitants.

**Colonial Nesting Water Birds:** Colonial nesting water bird rookery sites of double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), great egret (*Ardea alba*), snowy egret (*Egretta thula*), and black-crowned night heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), among others are considered sensitive. These species are not formally listed and protected pursuant to either the State or federal Endangered Species Acts but are of stated interest to CDFW and are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

The wetland habitat along the French Camp Outlet Canal represents potentially suitable nesting habitat for these species, although rookeries of these species have not been previously reported in this area nor were they observed during any of the field surveys. In general, the nesting season for

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

these colonial nesters is from March through July, but may vary depending on weather conditions or disturbances. The agricultural area throughout the Project site provides foraging habitat for these colonial nesters. Although these species were not observed during any of the field surveys, they are common in the region and may use the Project site for foraging from time to time.

The undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal would remove these wetland areas, which is potential nesting habitat for these colonial nesters. The proposed Project would eliminate the agricultural areas on the project site, which serve as foraging habitat for colonial nesters in the region. Construction activities on the project site would create temporary sources of noise and light that could affect colonial nesters if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. The ongoing activities associated with the operational phase (i.e. human and/or domesticated animal presence, light, noise, etc.) could disrupt colonial nesters if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. A potential impact to the aquatic habitat and adjacent upland area would first occur in Phase 1 with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal and development of the hotel resort facility with all of its amenities. French Camp Outlet Canal also traverses through a portion of Phase 3, Phase 4, and Future Phases. Undergrounding the Canal and development of the land immediately adjacent to the Canal in these additional phases would present a potential impact to this habitat.

These colonial nesters are covered by the SJMSCP, which serves as a special-purpose permit for the incidental take of species that are protected under the MBTA. Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. These fees are used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected as a result of the proposed project. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on these colonial nesters. Incidental take, avoidance, and minimization measures are designed to fully mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the individuals and their activities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation in the SJMSCP. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would require a preconstruction survey of the Project site and immediate vicinity prior to construction. If nesting birds are found, an appropriate buffer would be developed around active nests as deemed appropriate in coordination with the CDFW to ensure that the nesting birds are not disrupted during the breeding season. Implementation of the proposed Project, with the Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 and 3.4-2, would ensure that potential impacts to special status colonial nesters are reduced to a *less than significant* level.

**Nesting Raptors (Birds of Prey):** All raptors (owls, hawks, eagles, falcons), including common species, and their nests, are protected from take pursuant to the Fish and Game Code of California Section 3503.5, and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, among other federal and State regulations.

The PGE powerlines and trees located on the project site represent potentially suitable nesting habitat for a variety of special-status raptors, including white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*),

Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*). The agricultural land represents potentially suitable nesting habitat for the ground-nesting northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and it also serves as foraging habitat for a wide variety of raptors. The CNDDDB currently contains nesting records for Swainson's hawk and burrowing owl within one mile of the Project site.

In general, raptor nesting occurs from late February and early March through late July and early August, depending on various environmental conditions. In addition to the species described above, common raptors such as red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) and great horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*), among others, may nest in or adjacent to the Project site.

The proposed Project would eliminate the agricultural areas on the project site, which serve as potential nesting habitat for ground-nesting northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and foraging habitat for a variety of raptors in the region. Construction activities on the project site would create temporary sources of noise and light that could affect nesting raptors if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. The ongoing activities associated with the operational phase (i.e. human and/or domesticated animal presence, light, noise, etc.) could disrupt nesting raptors if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. A potential impact to the habitat would first occur in Phase 1 with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal and development of the hotel resort facility with all of its amenities. Development of all additional phases would present a potential impact to this habitat later in the building horizon.

These raptors are covered by the SJMSCP. Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. These fees are used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected as a result of the proposed project. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on these raptors. Incidental take, avoidance, and minimization measures are designed to fully mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the individuals and their activities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation in the SJMSCP. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would require a preconstruction survey of the Project site and immediate vicinity prior to construction. If nesting birds are found, an appropriate buffer would be developed around active nests as deemed appropriate in coordination with the CDFW to ensure that the nesting birds are not disrupted during the breeding season. Implementation of the proposed Project, with the Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 and 3.4-2, would ensure that potential impacts to special status nesting raptors are reduced to a **less than significant** level.

**Nesting Songbirds:** Potentially suitable nesting habitat is present on the project site for two regionally occurring special-status songbirds: loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) and tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*). Loggerhead shrikes nest in small trees and shrubs within oak woodland/savannah and grassland communities. Tricolored blackbirds nest in large colonies in patches of cattails, tule, or other dense vegetation near water.

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

The wetland habitat adjacent to the French Camp Outlet Canal in the southern portion of the Project site represents potentially suitable nesting habitat for these species, although rookeries of these species have not been previously reported in this area nor were they observed during any of the field surveys. In general, the nesting season for these nesting songbirds is from March through July, but may vary depending on weather conditions or disturbances. The agricultural area throughout the Project site provides foraging habitat for these nesting songbirds. Although these species were not observed during any of the field surveys, they are common in the region and may use the Project site for foraging from time to time.

The undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal would remove these wetland areas, which is potential nesting habitat for nesting songbirds. The proposed Project would eliminate the agricultural areas on the project site, which serve as potential foraging habitat for these species. Construction activities on the project site would create temporary sources of noise and light that could affect nesting songbirds if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. The ongoing activities associated with the operational phase (i.e. human and/or domesticated animal presence, light, noise, etc.) could disrupt nesting songbirds if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. A potential impact to the aquatic habitat and adjacent upland area would first occur in Phase 1 with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal and development of the hotel resort facility with all of its amenities. French Camp Outlet Canal also traverses through a portion of Phase 3, Phase 4, and Future Phases. Undergrounding the Canal and development of the land immediately adjacent to the Canal in these additional phases would present a potential impact to this habitat.

These nesting songbirds are covered by the SJMSCP. Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. These fees are used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected as a result of the proposed project. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on these nesting songbirds. Incidental take, avoidance, and minimization measures are designed to fully mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the individuals and their activities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation in the SJMSCP. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would require a preconstruction survey of the Project site and immediate vicinity prior to construction. If nesting birds are found, an appropriate buffer would be developed around active nests as deemed appropriate in coordination with the CDFW to ensure that the nesting birds are not disrupted during the breeding season. Implementation of the proposed Project, with the Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 and 3.4-2, would ensure that potential impacts to special status nesting songbirds are reduced to a ***less than significant*** level.

**Other Non-Nesting Birds:** Other special-status birds that may occur on the project site but are not known to nest in this region, or suitable nesting habitat is not present on the project site include: ferruginous hawk (*Buteo rega*), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), merlin (*Falco columbarius*) and prairie falcon (*Falco mexicanus*). Foraging habitat for these species is present in the agricultural fields within the project site.

The proposed Project would eliminate the agricultural areas on the project site, which serve as potential foraging habitat for these other non-nesting birds. Construction activities on the project site would create temporary sources of noise and light that could affect these birds if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. The ongoing activities associated with the operational phase (i.e. human and/or domesticated animal presence, light, noise, etc.) could disrupt these birds if they located adjacent to the Project site in the future. A potential impact to the aquatic habitat and adjacent upland area would first occur in Phase 1 with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal and development of the hotel resort facility with all of its amenities. French Camp Outlet Canal also traverses through a portion of Phase 3, Phase 4, and Future Phases. Undergrounding the Canal and development of the land immediately adjacent to the Canal in these additional phases would present a potential impact to this habitat.

These birds are covered by the SJMSCP. Coverage involves compensation for habitat impacts on covered species through payment of development fees for conversion of open space lands that may provide habitat for covered special status species. These fees are used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected as a result of the proposed project. Coverage under the SJMSCP would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on these birds. Incidental take, avoidance, and minimization measures are designed to fully mitigate direct and indirect impacts to the individual birds and their activities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation in the SJMSCP. Implementation of the proposed Project, with the Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, would ensure that potential impacts to special status non-nesting birds are reduced to a **less than significant** level.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-2:** *If construction activities occur during the avian breeding season (March 1 – August 31) then the project proponent shall conduct pre-construction surveys to prevent impacts to nesting birds. No more than 15 days prior to the start of construction a bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify any active nests within the project site or Offsite Infrastructure Corridor. If construction stops for a period of 15 days or more during the avian breeding season than an additional bird survey shall be conducted. The biologist will conduct a survey on the project site or Offsite Infrastructure Corridor, including the French Camp Outlet Canal and adjacent wetlands, for all special-status birds protected by the federal and state ESA, MBTA and CFGC, including but not limited to those that are documented within a ten-mile radius of the Project site and are known to nest in the region. The biologist shall map all nests that are within, and visible from, the Project site or Offsite Infrastructure Corridor. If nests are identified, the biologist shall develop buffer zones around active nests as deemed appropriate in coordination with the CDFW. Construction activity shall be prohibited within the buffer zones until the young have fledged or the nest fails. Nests shall be monitored at least twice per week and a report submitted to the City and CDFW monthly.*

### **Impact 3.4-4: The proposed project has the potential to result in direct or indirect effects on special-status mammal species (less than significant)**

Special-status mammals that are documented within a 10-mile radius of the Project site include: San Joaquin pocket mouse (*Perognathus inornatus*), Riparian (San Joaquin Valley) woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes riparia*), Riparian brush rabbit (*Sylvilagus bachmani riparius*), American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), and San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*).

**Special-status bats:** The Project site provides potential habitat for several special-status bats, including: Greater western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevillii*), small-footed myotis/bat (*Myotis ciliolabrum*), long-eared myotis/bat (*Myotis evotis*), fringed myotis/bat (*Myotis thysanodes*), long-legged myotis/bat (*Myotis volans*), and Yuma myotis/bat (*Myotis yumanensis*). These species are not federal or state listed; however, they are considered CDFW species of special concern and/or are tracked by the CNDDB.

Development of the Project site would eliminate foraging habitat for special status bats by removing the open agricultural areas. A potential impact to the habitat would first occur in Phase 1 with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal and development of the hotel resort facility with all of its amenities. Development of all additional phases would present a potential impact to this habitat later in the building horizon.

These special status bat species are covered by the SJMSCP. Coverage is intended to reduce impacts to special status bat species through the payment of a fee that is used to preserve and/or create habitat in preserves to be managed in perpetuity. In addition, coverage includes incidental take avoidance and minimization measures for species that could be affected. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation in the SJMSCP.

These special status bat species were not observed during the field surveys and have not been documented on the project site; therefore they are not expected to be directly affected. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 would provide compensation for the loss of the potential foraging habitat. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact on special status bat species.

**Riparian (San Joaquin Valley) woodrat and riparian brush rabbit:** The riparian/wetland habitat along the French Camp Outlet Canal provides limited, if any, potential habitat for riparian (San Joaquin Valley) woodrat and riparian brush rabbit. The riparian/wetland habitat was surveyed on March 28, March 29, and April 14, 2011 and on March 28, 2014 and included surveys of the entire property to determine if any areas represented potentially suitable habitat for either species. The habitat in French Camp Outlet Canals is limited in vegetative composition (almost barren) due to the regular maintenance activities associated with the French Camp Outlet Canal. These species were not observed during the field surveys and have not been documented on the project site. Based on field surveys these species are not present. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact on this special-status species.

Participation in the SJMSCP will provide coverage for the impact on habitat for these species, although this habitat is deemed unoccupied by these species. SJCOG, Inc. as administrator of the SJMSCP will impose appropriate avoidance and minimization measures as part of the incidental take permit. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, previously listed, will ensure coverage under the SJMSCP.

**American badger, San Joaquin kit fox, or San Joaquin pocket mouse:** The Project site is frequently disturbed from active agricultural activities. As a result, the Project site does not contain high quality habitat for the American badger, San Joaquin kit fox, or San Joaquin pocket mouse. All but one of the documented occurrences of the San Joaquin kit fox occur on the southwest side of Tracy near the foothills. One documented occurrence is located near Mountain House. There is only one documented occurrence of American badger southeast of Tracy. The closest documented occurrence of San Joaquin pocket mouse is approximately five miles west of the Project site. It is highly unlikely that the Project site is used by American badger, San Joaquin kit fox, or San Joaquin pocket mouse and these species have not been observed during recent or previous field surveys. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact on these species. Nevertheless, these species are covered species under the SJMCP and participation in the SJMSCP will provide the coverage for the incidental take of a species if it were to occur. SJCOG, Inc. as administrator of the SJMSCP will impose appropriate avoidance and minimization measures as part of the incidental take permit. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, previously listed, will ensure coverage under the SJMSCP.

### **Impact 3.4-5: The proposed project has the potential for direct or indirect effects on candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant species (less than significant)**

The records search identified nine documented special-status plant species within a 10 mile radius of the Project site. These nine special status plants include: Suisun Marsh aster (*Aster lentus*), Big tarplant (*Blepharizonia plumose*), Slough thistle (*Cirsium crassicaule*), Recurved larkspur (*Delphinium recurvatum*), Round-leaved filaree (*Erodium macrophyllum*), Delta button-celery (*Eryngium racemosum*), Rose-mallow (*Hibiscus lasiocarpus* var. *occidentalis*), Wright's trichocoronis (*Trichocoronis wrightii* var. *wrightii*), and Caper-fruited tropidocarpum (*Tropidocarpum capparideum*).

Of the nine documented species, there are no federal listed species, one state listed species (endangered), six CNPS 1B listed species, and one CNPS 2 listed species. The state listed species and CNPS 1B listed species are covered species under the SJMCP. The CNPS 2 listed species is not covered under the SJMCP.

Field surveys and habitat evaluations were performed on March 28, March 29, and April 14, 2011 and on March 28, 2014. The collection of field surveys included surveys that coincided with the optimum blooming period for special status plants known to occur within the region.

No special-status plants were observed within the project site or offsite improvement corridors during field surveys. The surveys were conducted within the blooming period for all species.

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Implementation of the individual phases, and the proposed Project as a whole, will have a **less than significant** impact on special status plants.

### Impact 3.4-6: Effects on Protected Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters (less than significant with mitigation)

A Preliminary Wetland Delineation, French Camp Outlet Canal Improvements and Manteca Family Entertainment Zone Project (De Novo 2014) was prepared for the Project site. The wetland delineation serves as the basis for the following analysis. The final determination of the wetland size and jurisdiction is subject to the regulatory agencies.

Table 3.4-5 provides a summary of USACE delineated features present onsite. A USACE jurisdictional map is provided in Figure 3.4-5. In addition, the following information is provided in the attached appendices: SSJID Cross Sections, Site Photographs, Wetland data forms, and OHWM forms. The USACE, with oversight by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), will make the final U.S. jurisdictional determination.

**TABLE 3.4-5: SUMMARY OF USACE DELINEATED FEATURES**

FEATURE	TYPE	AREA (ACRE)
French Camp Outlet Canal	Channelized soft-bottom irrigation ditch created in uplands for the purpose of draining surface water from agricultural uplands during spring/summer, and for storm drainage during rain events.	2.98
Wetland 1	Seasonal wetland	1.19
Wetland 2	Perennial wetland	1.25
<i>Total Delineated Features</i>		<i>5.42</i>

NOTE: THE FINAL JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL BY THE USACE DURING THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

SOURCE: DE NOVO PLANNING GROUP, INC., 2011 AND 2014.

Table 3.4-6 provides a summary of CDFW delineated features present onsite. CDFW Jurisdiction was measured to the top of bank or to the outer extent of associated riparian vegetation (including adjacent wetlands). The CDFW will make the final California jurisdictional determination.

**TABLE 3.4-6: SUMMARY OF CDFW DELINEATED FEATURES**

FEATURE	TYPE	AREA (ACRE)
French Camp Outlet Canal	Channelized soft-bottom irrigation ditch created in uplands for the purpose of providing surface water for agricultural use during spring/summer, and for storm drainage during rain events.	3.61
Wetland 1	Seasonal wetland- low terrace	1.19
Wetland 2	Perennial wetland - active floodplain	1.25
<i>Total Delineated Features</i>		<i>6.05</i>

NOTE: THE FINAL JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION IS SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL BY THE CDFW DURING THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

SOURCE: DE NOVO PLANNING GROUP, INC., 2011 AND 2014.

The Project site contains delineated wetlands and other waters, consisting of wetlands, and an irrigation ditch. The development of Phase 1 will include the fill of Wetland 1 (1.19 acres) and Wetland 2 (1.25 acres) totaling 2.44 acres of wetland habitat. It is possible that Phase 1 is developed in sub-phases, where the wetland fills are the last component of the phase. It is also possible that the wetland fills in Phase 1 are not developed until a later phase of the project. Regardless, the proposed wetland fill located in Phase 1 of the project would require authorization from several agencies, including the USACE, CDFW, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The French Camp Outlet Canal (FCOC) is also a delineated feature that transects Phase 1, 3, 4, and Future Phases. Development of the FEZ will require the relocation of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8. It is proposed that each of these facilities ultimately be converted from an open water canal to an underground conveyance system, and that these facilities will be routed north through the east utility corridor (just west of Big League Dreams) to the northern property boundary, then west to the current FCOC canal next to the railroad. The ultimate undergrounding of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 may be completed in phases. It is anticipated that the first phase would include undergrounding the portions of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 that occur within the Planning Area 16 (Phase 1) in association with the hotel resort facility (i.e. from the southern project boundary to a point just north of Daniels Road). The balance of the FCOC is anticipated to be relocated to the new north-south alignment from Daniels to the northern property boundary then west to the existing FCOC as shown Figure 2-12; however, this section may be temporarily left as an open water canal until such time that the Planning Areas north of Daniels are developed. It is also possible that portions of the realigned FCOC (i.e. the east-west segment located along the northern project boundary) could be left open water in perpetuity as a buffer between the project and the WQCF. The FCOC carries a peak flow of approximately 150 cubic feet per second (cfs). To accommodate this flow, the undergrounding of the channel will require dual 60-inch pipes or another infrastructure concept that would allow an equivalent flow capacity.

The development of the land uses and undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal within the project site will require fill and/or discharge into 2.44 acres of wetlands and 2.98 acres of irrigation ditch as measured by the OHWM (3.61 acres as measured by top of bank). The preliminary wetland delineation concluded that the fill activities of the wetlands (2.44 acres) fall under the jurisdiction of several agencies, including the USACE, CDFW, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 and 3.4-4 would ensure that the regulatory agencies are consulted, permits are obtained, compensatory mitigation is purchased, and the impact to jurisdictional wetlands/water is reduced to a **less than significant** level.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-3:** *Prior to any construction activities that would disturb protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas on the project site, the appropriate state and federal authorizations (Streambed Alteration Agreement, Section 404 permit, Section 401 water quality certification) shall be obtained. All requirements of these authorizations shall be adhered to throughout the construction phase.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-4:** *The project proponent shall compensate for any authorized disturbance to protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas to ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Compensation ratios shall be based on site-specific information and determined through coordination with state, federal, and local agencies as part of the permitting process for the project. Unless determined otherwise by the regulatory/permitting agency, the compensation shall be at a minimum ratio of 1 acre restored, created, and/or preserved for every 1 acre of protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas disturbed. Compensation may comprise onsite*

*restoration/creation, off-site restoration, preservation, or mitigation credits (or a combination of these elements).*

### **Impact 3.4-7: Adverse Effects on Riparian Habitat or Sensitive Natural Community (less than significant with mitigation)**

The CNDDB record search revealed documented occurrences of four sensitive habitats within 10 miles of the Project site including: Elderberry Savanna, Great Valley Cottonwood Riparian Forest, Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest, and Great Valley Valley Oak Riparian. None of these sensitive natural communities occur within the portion of the Project site. The strip of riparian and wetland habitat along the French Camp Outlet Canal will be removed with the undergrounding of the French Camp Outlet Canal. The riparian and wetland habitat contains elements of the above referenced sensitive natural communities, but is not identified as such in any local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and is not high quality habitat that is commonly associated with these sensitive natural community designations. Mitigation Measure 3.4-4 requires the project applicant to compensate for any authorized disturbance to protected wetlands and/or jurisdictional areas to ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Unless determined otherwise by the regulatory/permitting agency, the compensation must be at a minimum ratio of 1 acre restored, created, and/or preserved for every 1 acre of wetland disturbed. Compensation may comprise onsite restoration/creation, off-site restoration, preservation, or mitigation credits (or a combination of these elements). Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that the potential impact to riparian and wetland habitat associated with the undergrounding of French Camp Outlet Canal is reduced to a ***less than significant*** level. There are no other sensitive natural communities within the project site.

### **Impact 3.4-8: Interference with the Movement of Native Fish or Wildlife Species or with Established Wildlife Corridors, or Impede the Use of Native Wildlife Nursery Sites (less than significant with mitigation)**

The CNDDB record search did not reveal any documented wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites on or adjacent to the project site. The French Camp Outlet Canal is not considered spawning habitat for Chinook salmon or Central Valley steelhead. The closest major natural movement corridor for native fish that are documented in the region is the San Joaquin River, located approximately two miles to the west and south of the Project site. The land uses within the project site would not have any direct disturbance to the San Joaquin River or its tributaries, and therefore, would not have any direct disturbance to the movement corridor or habitat.

The ongoing operational phase of the proposed Project requires discharge of stormwater into the French Camp Outlet Canal, which ultimately discharges into the Delta. The discharge of stormwater could result in indirect impacts to special status fish and wildlife if stormwater was not appropriately treated through BMPs prior to its discharge to the Delta. The Manteca Municipal Code Title 13 (Public Services) Chapter 13.28 (Stormwater Management and Discharges) establish minimum storm water management requirements and controls. The objectives are to 1) minimize increases in storm water runoff from any development in order to reduce flooding, siltation and

stream bank erosion and maintain the integrity of drainage channels; 2) minimize increases in nonpoint source pollution caused by storm water runoff from development that would otherwise degrade local water quality; 3) minimize the total annual volume of surface water runoff that flows from any specific site during and following development to not exceed the pre-development hydrologic regime to the MEP; and 4) reduce storm water runoff rates and volumes, soil erosion and non-point source pollution wherever possible, through storm water management controls and to ensure that these management controls are properly maintained and pose no threat to public safety.

Storm water drainage is managed through the implementation of best management practices to the extent they are technologically achievable to prevent and reduce pollutants. The City requires reasonable protection from accidental discharge of prohibited materials or other wastes into the municipal storm drain system or watercourses. There are also various non-structural and structural stormwater BMPs that can be implemented to reduce pollution. Non-structural BMPs are typically aimed at prevention of pollution through public education and outreach. Non-structural BMPs include: school educational programs, newsletters, website information, commercial, billboards/advertisements, river cleanups, and storm drain stenciling. Structural BMPs are aimed at the physical collection, filtering, and detaining of stormwater. Structural BMPs include items such as drop inlet filters, vault filters, hydrodynamic separators, surface detention basins, and underground detention facilities. The following mitigation measures would ensure that BMPs are implemented to reduce the amount of pollution in stormwater discharged from the Project site into the storm drainage system, which ultimately flows to the Delta. The management of water quality through BMPs is intended to ensure that water quality does not degrade to levels that would interfere or impede fish or wildlife. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that this potential impact is reduced to a ***less than significant*** level.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

***Mitigation Measure 3.4-5:*** *The project proponent shall implement the following nonstructural BMPs that focus on preventing pollutants from entering stormwater:*

- *Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping*
  - *A spill response and prevention plan shall be developed as a component of (1) SWPPPs prepared for construction activities, (2) SWPPPs for facilities subject to the NPDES Stormwater Permit, and (3) spill prevention control and countermeasure plans for qualifying facilities.*
  - *Streets and parking lots shall be swept at an interval acceptable to minimize pollution.*
- *Operation and Maintenance (O&M) of Treatment Controls*
  - *An Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan shall be developed for the storm drainage facilities to ensure long-term performance. The O&M plan shall incorporate the manufacturers' recommended maintenance procedures and include (1) provisions for debris removal, (2) guidance for addressing public health or safety issues, and (3) methods and criteria for assessing the efficacy of the storm*

*drainage system. An annual report shall be submitted to the City certifying that maintenance of the facilities was conducted according to the O&M plan.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-6:** *The project proponent shall implement the following structural BMPs that focus on preventing pollutants from entering stormwater, or alternative BMPs approved by the City of Manteca:*

- *Extended Detention Facilities: Extended detention refers to the facilities proposed for the Project site that would detain and temporarily store stormwater runoff to reduce the peak rates of discharge to the storm drainage system. Detention of stormwater allows particles and other pollutants to settle and thereby potentially reduce concentrations and mass loading of contaminants in the discharge.*
- *Grassed Swales: A swale is a vegetated, open channel management practice designed to treat and attenuate stormwater runoff for a specified water quality volume. Stormwater runoff flowing through these channels is treated by being filtered through vegetation in the channel, through a subsoil matrix, and/or through infiltration into the underlying soils. Swales can be used throughout the proposed Project area where feasible in the landscape design to treat parking lot runoff.*
- *Proprietary Devices: There are a variety of commercially available stormwater treatment devices designed to remove contaminants from drainage once flows enter the conveyance systems. StormFilter™ units, or equivalent filtration-type systems, are recommended within the commercial and industrial areas as the main structural BMP for these areas. Bioswales are also recommended for streets and parking areas. Drop inlet filters should also be used to control drainage runoff water quality.*

### **Impact 3.4-9: Conflict with an Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (less than significant)**

The proposed Project is subject to the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP). The proposed Project does not conflict with the SJMSCP. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation in the SJMSCP.

### **Impact 3.4-10: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (less than significant with mitigation)**

The Resource Conservation Element of the General Plan establishes numerous policies and implementation measures related to biological resources as listed below:

#### Conservation Element Policies

RC-P-31. Minimize impact of new development on native vegetation and wildlife.

- **Consistent:** *This EIR includes an in depth analysis of impacts for sensitive plants and wildlife, as well as habitat. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are presented to minimize, avoid, or compensate to the extent practicable.*

RC-P-33. Discourage the premature removal of orchard trees in advance of development, and discourage the removal of other existing healthy mature trees, both native and introduced.

- **Consistent:** The Project site does not include the removal of orchard trees; however, the Project site contains trees in three locations. The first is within the Phase one development area along the French Camp Outlet Canal and adjacent to the wetlands. These areas are anticipated to be removed and must be replaced in accordance with the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060). There is a cluster of trees located on the Project site near McKinley Avenue and the UPRR tracks. It is not known from the available project plans whether or not these trees are anticipated to be avoided/protected through the design of the buildings/infrastructure. There is also a cluster of trees located amongst the former Manteca Police Department shooting range. It is not known from the available project plans whether or not these trees are anticipated to be avoided/protected through the design of the buildings/infrastructure. If they are planned to be removed they must be replaced in accordance with the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060). The City would review project improvement plans, grading plans, and building plans and apply the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060) as applicable once these project details are known.

RC-P-34. Protect special status species and other species that are sensitive to human activities.

- **Consistent:** *This EIR includes an in depth analysis of impacts for sensitive plants and wildlife, as well as habitat. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are presented to minimize, avoid, or compensate to the extent practicable.*

RC-P-35. Allow contiguous habitat areas.

- **Consistent:** *Habitat areas in the vicinity of the Project site include both agricultural and natural plant communities which provide habitat for a variety of biological resources in the region. Agricultural areas occur throughout the region and are generally flat and well drained, and as a result are well suited for many crops. Alfalfa fields, hay, row crops, orchards, dominate the agricultural areas in the vicinity. Wetland areas occur throughout the region also but in generally smaller more isolated instances. Wetlands are areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas. The wetlands in the vicinity of the Project site include the FCOC, and miscellaneous stock ponds and wetlands located on undeveloped lands. The proposed Project does not require contiguous habitat areas to change or convert to another use.*

RC-P-36. Consider the development of new drainage channels planted with native vegetation, which would provide habitat as well as drainage.

- **Consistent:** *This EIR includes an in depth analysis of impacts for numerous topics, and provides mitigation requirements to offset each corresponding impact that has been identified. This*

## 3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

*includes requirements to pay fees, build infrastructure, and provide amenities desirable to the community to make a positive benefit to the City of Manteca.*

### Municipal Code

The Manteca Municipal Code Section 17.48.060 calls for the avoidance of heritage trees as defined under section 17.100.060 (Universal Definitions). Heritage trees are any natural woody plant rooted in the ground and having a diameter of 30 inches or more when measured two feet above the ground. Section 17.48.060 calls for the protection of all existing trees having a diameter of six inches or more when measured 4½ feet above the ground. The City planning department must be notified of planned construction or grade changes within the proximity of existing mature trees. Existing trees must be protected from construction equipment, machinery, grade changes, and excavation for utilities, paving, and footers. Replacement of existing trees is subject to approval from the planning director and must be with a minimum 24-inch box tree of compatible species for the development site and be consistent with Section 17.48.060. The Municipal Code does not specifically identify a replacement ratio; however, a replacement ratio of three trees planted for every tree removed is generally accepted in the region.

Section 12.08.070 of the municipal code prohibits cutting, pruning, removing, injuring, or interference with any tree, shrub, or plant upon or in any street tree area or other public place in the City without prior approval from the superintendent. The City is authorized to grant such permission at their discretion and where necessary. Except for utility companies, as provided in Section 12.08.080, no such permission shall be valid for a longer period than 30 days after its issuance.

The Project site contains trees in three locations. The first is within the Phase one development area along the French Camp Outlet Canal and adjacent to the wetlands. These areas are anticipated to be removed and must be replaced in accordance with the *Manteca Municipal Code* (17.48.060). There is a cluster of trees located on the Project site near McKinley Avenue and the UPRR tracks. It is not known from the available project plans whether or not these trees can be avoided/protected. There is also a cluster of trees located amongst the former Manteca Police Department shooting range. It is not known from the available project plans whether or not these trees can be avoided/protected.


The following mitigation measures would require compliance with the Manteca Municipal Code for removal and replacement of trees. With the implementation of the following mitigation measures, the proposed Project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

***Mitigation Measure 3.4-7:*** *Prior to the approval of grading plans for phase one, the project proponent shall provide a landscape plan that includes tree planting specifications established by the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060) for the replacement of the eight trees to be removed during Phase 1. Replacement shall be at a ratio of 1:1 and in accordance with the Tree Replacement Schedule as outlined in the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060). Replacement trees shall be planted on-site at a location that is agreeable to the City.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.4-8:** *Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each individual phase (after phase 1), or a portion of each individual phase (after Phase 1), a tree survey shall be conducted by a qualified arborist to enumerate and evaluate all trees on the proposed project site that meet the standards in the applicable Manteca Municipal Code. Trees that are subject to protection but are proposed to be removed as a result of project implementation shall be replaced at a ratio of 1:1 and in accordance with the Tree Replacement Schedule as outlined in the Manteca Municipal Code (17.48.060). Replacement trees shall be planted on-site at a location in the general vicinity that is agreeable to the City.*


*This page left intentionally blank.*



- Bay Area/Delta
- Central Coast
- Sacramento Valley
- San Joaquin Valley
- Sierra
- County Boundaries

**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**


Figure 3.4-1: Bioregions Map



1:750,000

Data sources: California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Bioregions (INACC Regions), publication date 2004. Shaded relief from the California Spatial Information Library. Map date: December 14, 2014.


*This page left intentionally blank.*



Wildlife-Habitat Relationship Type	
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:yellow;"></span>	Annual Grassland
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:darkgreen;"></span>	Deciduous Orchard
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightblue;"></span>	Lacustrine
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:purple;"></span>	Pasture
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:pink;"></span>	Urban


**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

Figure 3.4-2: Land Cover Types



Data sources: USDA Forest Service-Pacific Southwest Region-Remote Sensing Lab, August 2009; Evgfile294\_00\_07\_100k\_v2; San Joaquin County GIS, ArcGIS Online Imagery; Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*




1-mile Radius

PROJECT AREA

**Map Label: Species: Number of Occurrences**

- 1: burrowing owl: 1
- 2: California tiger salamander: 1
- 3: Delta button-celery: 1
- 4: Swainson's hawk: 2
- 5: tricolored blackbird: 2
- 6: yellow-headed blackbird: 1
- Area of Multiple Species Occurrence

**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**  
 Figure 3.4-3: California Natural Diversity Database  
 1-mile Radius Search



Data sources: CDFW California Natural Diversity Database, June 3, 2014;  
 ArcGIS Online USA Topo Maps Map Service. Map date: June 19, 2014.


*This page left intentionally blank.*

**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**  
**Figure 3.4-4: California Natural Diversity Database**  
**10-mile Radius**


- Map Label: Common Name: Occurrence Count
- 1: American badger: 1
  - 2: big tairplant: 1
  - 3: burrowing owl: 37
  - 4: cackling (=Aleutian Canada) goose: 1
  - 5: California tiger salamander: 2
  - 6: cape-fruited tropicocarum: 1
  - 7: Delta button-celery: 3
  - 8: Elderberry Savanna: 1
  - 9: Great Valley Cottonwood Riparian Forest: 2
  - 10: Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest: 1
  - 11: Great Valley Valley Oak Riparian Forest: 2
  - 12: hardhead: 1
  - 13: longfin smelt: 1
  - 14: merfin: 1
  - 15: moesian blister beetle: 2
  - 16: recurved larkspur: 1
  - 17: riparian (=San Joaquin Valley) woodrat: 3
  - 18: riparian brush rabbit: 14
  - 19: round-leaved filaree: 1
  - 20: Sacramento anthicid beetle: 4
  - 21: slough thistle: 2
  - 22: song sparrow ("Modesto" population): 2
  - 23: steelhead - Central Valley DPS: 3
  - 24: Swainson's hawk: 154
  - 25: tricolored blackbird: 7
  - 26: valley elderberry longhorn beetle: 2
  - 27: vernal pool fairy shrimp: 1
  - 28: western yellow-billed cuckoo: 1
  - 29: white-tailed kite: 1
  - 30: Wright's trichocoris: 1
  - 31: yellow-headed blackbird: 1
- Area of Multiple Species Occurrence



Base layer: ©2012 California Natural Diversity Database, June 1, 2014.  
 ArcGIS Online 10.5.1 Style Map, Server Map Date: June 20, 2014.



*This page left intentionally blank.*



USGS 7.5' Quadrangle Index


HOLT	STOCKTON WEST	STOCKTON EAST
UNION ISLAND	LATHROP	MANTECA
TRACY	VERNALIS	RIPON

Wetlands	Area (Sq Ft)	Area (Ac)
A	51,950.20	1.19
B	54,290.50	1.25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>106,240.70</b>	<b>2.44</b>

Other Waters	Area (Sq Ft)	Area (Ac)	Length (Ft)	Avg Width (Ft)
W1	1,231.27	0.03	89	22
W2	34,387.50	0.79	898	38
W3	19,807.60	0.45	530	40
W4	56,563.00	1.30	1,874	28
W5	17,978.60	0.41	739	25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>129,967.97</b>	<b>2.98</b>		

Figure 2-7: USACE Jurisdictional Map

Lathrop Quadrangle  
T2S, R6E, sec1  
UTM 10N: 4183835.9N, 652920.29E  
GCS NAD83: 37.79N, 121.26W



**Legend**

- ▭ Project Boundary (210.7 ac)
- ▭ Wetlands (2.44 ac, 106,240.70 sq ft)
- ▭ Other Waters (2.98 ac, 129,967.97 sq ft)
- OHWM Data Points
- Wetland Data Points
- Soil Sample Data Points
- Project Reference Point

Data sources: Orthophotographic and survey data provided by Point Co., Fair Oaks, California, 2011. Wetlands mapped using Trimble GeoExplorer SH 3808 GPS. Data recorded in UTM Zone 10N, North American Datum 1983. Property boundaries from San Joaquin County GIS, www.sj-map.org. Map date: October 16, 2014. Revised November 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section provides a discussion of the prehistoric period background, ethnographic background, historic period background, known cultural resources in the region, the regulatory setting, an impact analysis, and mitigation measures. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to an urban use. The NOP was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in accordance with SB 18. The NAHC did not provide comments, and did not provide a list of Native American contacts. There were no comments received during the public review period(s) for the NOP related to cultural resources. Information in this section is derived primarily from the *Cultural Resource Assessment for the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone, City of Manteca, San Joaquin County, California (Peak & Associates, Inc. March 2014)*.

### 3.5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### PROJECT SETTING

---

The Project site is located along the west side of the City of Manteca off of Daniels Drive within close proximity to State Route (SR) 120. The site includes 210.7 acres of land, 28.5 acres of which are already developed and 182.2 acres would be developed with various public serving regional and local recreational activities, parks and sporting facilities including visitor serving commercial uses and public infrastructure to be developed in phases. The Project site is located in section 1, Township 2 North, Range 6 East, mapped on the Lathrop 7.5' United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangle.

#### CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL SETTING

---

##### **Prehistory**

The Central Valley region was among the first in the state to attract intensive fieldwork, and research has continued to the present day. This has resulted in a substantial accumulation of data.

In the early decades of the 1900s, E.J. Dawson explored numerous sites near Stockton and Lodi, later collaborating with W.E. Schenck (Schenck and Dawson 1929). By 1933, the focus of work was directed to the Cosumnes locality, where survey and excavation studies were conducted by the Sacramento Junior College (Lillard and Purves 1936). Excavation data, in particular from the stratified Windmill site (CA-Sac-107), suggested two temporally distinct cultural traditions. Later work at other mounds by Sacramento Junior College and the University of California, Berkeley, enabled the investigators to identify a third cultural tradition, intermediate between the previously postulated Early and Late Horizons. The three-horizon sequence, based on discrete changes in ornamental artifacts and mortuary practices, as well as on observed differences in soils within sites (Lillard, Heizer and Fenenga 1939), was later refined by Beardsley (1954). An expanded definition of artifacts diagnostic of each time period was developed, and its application extended to parts of the central California coast. Traits held in common allow the application of this system within certain limits of time and space to other areas of prehistoric central California.

## 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

The Windmill Culture (Early Horizon) is characterized by ventrally-extended burials (some dorsal extensions are known), with westerly orientation of heads; a high percentage of burials with grave goods; frequent presence of red ocher in graves; large projectile points, of which 60 percent are of materials other than obsidian; rectangular *Haliotis* beads; *Olivella* shell beads (types A1a and L); rare use of bone; some use of baked clay objects; and well-fashioned charmstones, usually perforated.

The Cosumnes Culture (Middle Horizon) displays considerable changes from the preceding cultural expression. The burial mode is predominately flexed, with variable cardinal orientation and some cremations present. There are a lower percentage of burials with grave goods, and ocher staining is common in graves. *Olivella* beads of types C1, F and G predominate, and there is abundant use of green *Haliotis* sp. rather than red *Haliotis* sp. Other characteristic artifacts include perforated and canid teeth; asymmetrical and "fishtail" charmstones, usually unperforated; cobble mortars and evidence of wooden mortars; extensive use of bone for tools and ornaments; large projectile points, with considerable use of rock other than obsidian; and use of baked clay.

Hotchkiss Culture (Late Horizon) -- The burial pattern retains the use of the flexed mode, and there is wide spread evidence of cremation, lesser use of red ocher, heavy sue of baked clay, *Olivella* beads of Types E and M, extensive use of *Haliotis* ornaments of many elaborate shapes and forms, shaped mortars and cylindrical pestles, bird-bone tubes with elaborate geometric designs, clam shell disc beads, small projectile points indicative of the introduction of the bow and arrow, flanged tubular pipes of steatite and schist, and use of magnesite (Moratto 1984:181-183). The characteristics noted are not all-inclusive, but cover the more important traits.

Schulz (1981), in an extensive examination of the central California evidence for the use of acorns, used the terms Early, Middle and Late Complexes, but the traits attributed to them remain generally the same. While it is not altogether clear, Schulz seemingly uses the term "Complex" to refer to the particular archeological entities (above called "Horizons") as defined in this region. Ragir's (1972) cultures are the same as Schulz's complexes.

Bennyhoff and Hughes (1984) have presented alternative dating schemes for the Central California Archeological Sequence. The primary emphasis is a more elaborate division of the horizons to reflect what is seen as cultural/temporal changes within the three horizons and a compression of the temporal span.

There have been other chronologies proposed, including Fredrickson (1973), and since it is correlated with Bennyhoff's (1977) work, it does merit discussion. The particular archeological cultural entities Fredrickson has defined, based upon the work of Bennyhoff, are patterns, phases and aspects. Bennyhoff's (1977) work in the Plains Miwok area is the best definition of the Cosumnes District, which likely conforms to Fredrickson's pattern. Fredrickson also proposed periods of time associated heavily with economic modes, which provides a temporal term for comparing contemporary cultural entities. It corresponds with Willey and Phillips' (1958) earlier "tradition", although it is tied more specifically to the archeological record in California.

## **Ethnography**

The project area lies within the northern portion of the ethnographic territory of the Yokuts people. The Yokuts were members of the Penutian language family which held all of the Central Valley, San Francisco Bay Area, and the Pacific Coast from Marin County to near Point Sur. The Yokuts differed from other ethnographic groups in California as they had true tribal divisions with group names (Kroeber 1925; Latta 1949). Each tribe spoke a particular dialect, common to its members, but similar enough to other Yokuts that they were mutually intelligible (Kroeber 1925).

The Yokuts held portions of the San Joaquin Valley from the Tehachapis in the south to Stockton in the north. On the north they were bordered by the Plains Miwok, and on the west by the Saclan or Bay Miwok and Costonoan peoples. Although neighbors were often from distinct language families, differences between the people appear to have been more influenced by environmental factors as opposed to linguistic affinities. Thus the Plains Miwok were more similar to the nearby Yokuts than to foothill members of their own language group. Similarities in cultural inventory co-varied with distance from other groups and proximity to culturally diverse people. The material culture of the southern San Joaquin Yokuts was therefore more closely related to that of their non-Yokuts neighbors than to that of Delta members of their own language group.

Trade was well developed, with mutually beneficial interchange of needed or desired goods. Obsidian, rare in the San Joaquin Valley, was obtained by trade with Paiute and Shoshoni groups on the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada, where numerous sources of this material are located, and to some extent from the Napa Valley to the north. Shell beads, obtained by the Yokuts from coastal people, and acorns, rare in the Great Basin, were among many items exported to the east by Yokuts traders (Davis 1961).

Economic subsistence was based on the acorn, with substantial dependency on gathering and processing of wild seeds and other vegetable foods. The rivers, streams, and sloughs that formed a maze within the valley provided abundant food resources such as fish, shellfish, and turtles. Game, wild fowl, and small mammals were trapped and hunted to provide protein augmentation of the diet. In general, the eastern portion of the San Joaquin Valley provided a lush environment of varied food resources, with the estimated large population centers reflecting this abundance (Cook 1955; Baumhoff 1963).

Settlements were oriented along the water ways, with their village sites normally placed adjacent to these features for their nearby water and food resources. House structures varied in size and shape (Latta 1949; Kroeber 1925), with most constructed from the readily available tules found in the extensive marshes of the low-lying valley areas. The housepit depressions for the structures ranged in diameter from 3 meters to 18 meters (Wallace 1978:470).

## **Historical Background**

The first extensive wheat-growing in the San Joaquin Valley took place on the sand plains in the region between Stockton and Manteca and on the west side of the valley between Tracy and Newman. The wheat growing was due to an initial experiment of John Wheeler Jones, who

## 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

planted 160 acres to wheat in 1855 which included the central town site of what is now Manteca. He plowed his fields with a walking plow. The famous Stockton gang-plow was reported to be invented near the present site of Manteca (Smith 1960: 221, 243).

When the railroad was completed through the San Joaquin Valley, a shipping point was set up in the region and named Cowell for Joshua Cowell, who had donated the right of way for the railroad. The station was re-named Manteca in 1904 or 1905 by the Southern Pacific for a local creamery that had taken its name from the Spanish word for “butter” or “lard” (Gudde 1969: 191).

In 1879, the land was part of the holdings of J.P. Wolfe, a farmer from Illinois who acquired the land in 1860 (Thompson and West 1879).

The Western Pacific Railroad line had been constructed along the northwest side of the project area by 1915. At that date, there were no buildings or features in the Project site (Lathrop USGS 1:31,680 1915).

### METHODOLOGY

---

#### **Records Search**

Records of previously recorded cultural resources and cultural resource investigations were examined by the Central California Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System on February 7, 2014 for the project area (CCIC File # 8850 L). No historic or prehistoric cultural resources have been recorded within the project area. Near the project area is located the Western Pacific rail route. The Project area has been partially surveyed by six earlier surveys, dating from 1981 to 1998, but these prior surveys are considered too old to be of consequence for the current review.

#### **Native American Consultation**

The Native American Heritage Commission completed a check of the Sacred Lands files, with no identified sites within the Project area. The NAHC provided a name of a contact that might have additional information about the project area; a letter was sent to her requesting information on sites of concerns. No reply has been received to date (Appendix 3 of the Cultural Study).

#### **Field Survey**

The Project site was subject to a complete survey on February 18 and 27, 2012 by Robert Gerry and Mike Lawson, covering the area with transects no wider than 20 meters. Most of the project area was in cultivation for corn.

The ground surface on within the project area was inspected for artifacts, midden or any other indication of site presence. The ground surface, though heavily disturbed by previous agricultural work, was easily visible with no vegetation on the surface in most areas. There were no significant impediments to surface visibility.

No prehistoric artifacts or evidence of prehistoric use of the survey area was found. No historic resources were recorded. The existing in-use railroad line lies outside the Project site.

There is a segment of a post-1915, pre-1952 irrigation canal within the Project area. It appears to be part of the Southern San Joaquin Irrigation District's system, researched and recorded in other locations in the region in 1993 by JRP (P-39-000103). The recorders of the nearby segments concluded that there was no way to find a specific date of construction for any segment of the ditch system since the district does not maintain records with that information. The ditches were not considered eligible resources under the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places, and similarly would in no way be eligible for the California Register. The ditch system is forever recorded through the plotting of its location on the Lathrop 1952, 1968, 1978 and 1996 USGS topographic maps.

## 3.5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

### FEDERAL

#### **National Historic Preservation Act**

The National Historic Preservation Act was enacted in 1966 as a means to protect cultural resources that are eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The law sets forth criterion that is used to evaluate the eligibility of cultural resources. The NRHP is composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, objects, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture that are significant to American History.

Virtually any physical evidence of past human activity can be considered a cultural resource. Although not all such resources are considered to be significant and eligible for listing, they often provide the only means of reconstructing the human history of a given site or region, particularly where there is no written history of that area or that period. Consequently, their significance is judged largely in terms of their historical or archaeological interpretive values. Along with research values, cultural resources can be significant, in part, for their aesthetic, educational, cultural and religious values.

#### **National Register of Historic Places**

The eligibility criteria for the NRHP are as follows (36 CFR 60.4):

*The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of state and local importance that possess aspects of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and*

- (A) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history and cultural heritage; or*
- (B) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- (C) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic*

*values or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or*

*(D) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

### STATE

---

#### **California Register of Historic Resources**

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) was established in 1992 and codified in the Public Resource Code §5020, 5024 and 21085. The law creates several categories of properties that may be eligible for the CRHR. Certain properties are included in the program automatically, including: properties listed in the NRHP; properties eligible for listing in the NRHP; and certain classes of State Historical Landmarks. Determining the CRHR eligibility of historic and prehistoric properties is guided by CCR §§15064.5(b) and Public Resources Code (PRC) §§21083.2 and 21084.1.

Cultural resources, under CRHR guidelines, are defined as buildings, sites, structures, or objects that may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance. A cultural resource may be eligible for listing on the CRHR if it:

- is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values; or
- has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

#### **California Environmental Quality Act**

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 provides guidance for determining the significance of impacts to archaeological and historical resources. Demolition or material alteration of a historical resource, including archaeological sites, is generally considered a significant impact. Determining the CRHR eligibility of historic and prehistoric properties is guided by CCR §§15064.5(b) and Public Resources Code (PRC) §§21083.2 and 21084.1.

CEQA also provides for the protection of Native American human remains (CCR §15064.5[d]). Native American human remains are also protected under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 USC 3001 et seq.), which requires federal agencies and certain recipients of federal funds to document Native American human remains and cultural items within their collections, notify Native American groups of their holdings, and provide an opportunity for repatriation of these materials. This act also requires plans for dealing with potential future collections of Native American human remains and associated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony that might be uncovered as a result of development projects overseen or funded by the federal government.

If a prehistoric or historic period cultural resource does not meet any of the four CRHR criteria, but does meet the definition of a “unique” site as outlined in PRC §21083.2, it may still be treated as a significant resource if it is: an archaeological artifact, object or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information,
- it has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type, or
- it is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event.

### **Assembly Bill 978**

In 2001, Assembly Bill (AB) 978 expanded the reach of Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 and established a state commission with statutory powers to assure that federal and state laws regarding the repatriation of Native American human remains and items of patrimony are fully complied with. In addition, AB 978 also included non-federally recognized tribes for repatriation.

## **LOCAL**

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

- RC-P-37: The City shall not knowingly approve any public or private project that may adversely affect an archaeological site without consulting the California Archaeological Inventory at Stanislaus State University, conducting a site evaluation as may be indicated, and attempting to mitigate any adverse impacts according to the recommendation of a qualified archaeologist. City implementation of this policy shall be guided by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).
- RC-P-38: The City shall require that the proponent of any development proposal in an area with potential archaeological resources, and specifically near the San Joaquin River and Walthall Slough, and on the east side of State Highway 99 at the Louise Avenue crossing, shall consult with the California Archaeological Inventory, Stanislaus State University to determine the potential for discovery of cultural resources, conduct a site evaluation as may be indicated, and mitigate any adverse impacts according to the recommendation of a qualified archaeologist. The survey and mitigation shall be developer funded.
- RC-P-39: The City shall set as a priority the protection and enhancement of Manteca's historically and architecturally significant buildings.
- RC-P-40: The City shall work with property owners seeking registration of historical structures as Historic Landmarks or listing on the Register of Historic Sites.
- RC-P-41: The City shall prepare and adopt a Historical Preservation Ordinance.

## 3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

- RC-P-42: The City and Redevelopment Agency shall support the efforts of property owners to preserve and renovate historic and architecturally significant structures. Where such buildings cannot be preserved intact, the City shall seek to preserve the building facades.

### 3.5.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project is considered to have a significant impact on cultural resources if it will:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5;
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource;
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

##### **Impact 3.5-1: Project implementation has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant historical resource, as Defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The Project site is located in an area known to have historical resources. The field surveys did not reveal a significant historical resource or site on the Project site. However, as with most projects in the region that involve ground-disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown historical resource. The implementation of the following mitigation measure for each individual phase of the project would ensure that this potential impact is **less than significant**.

##### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.5-1:** *If any cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic artifact, or other indications of archaeological resources are found during grading and construction activities for any individual phase, or portion of an individual phase, of the project, all work shall be halted immediately within a 200-foot radius of the discovery until an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology, as appropriate, has evaluated the find(s). Construction activities beyond the 200-foot radius can proceed unless it is determined by the City and the archaeologist that additional areas require evaluation.*

*Work cannot continue at the discovery site until the archaeologist conducts sufficient research and data collection to make a determination that the resource is either 1) not cultural in origin; or 2) not potentially significant or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR; or 3) not a significant Public Trust Resource.*

*If Native American resources are identified, a Native American monitor, following the Guidelines for Monitors/Consultants of Native American Cultural, Religious, and Burial Sites established by the Native American Heritage Commission, may also be required and, if required, shall be retained at the Applicant's expense.*

**Impact 3.5-2: Project implementation has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change to a significant archaeological resource, as Defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The Project site is located in an area known to have cultural resources. The field surveys did not reveal a significant archeological resource or site on the Project site. However, as with most projects in the region that involve ground-disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown cultural resource or human remains. The implementation of the following mitigation measure for each individual phase of the project would ensure that this potential impact is **less than significant**.

MITIGATION MEASURES

***Implement Mitigation Measure 3.5-1***

**Impact 3.5-3: Project implementation has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The field surveys did not reveal any surface evidence of paleontological resources on the Project site. The Project site is not expected to contain subsurface paleontological resources, although it is possible.

Damage to or destruction of a paleontological resource would be considered a potentially significant impact under local, state, or federal criteria. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure steps would be taken to reduce impacts to paleontological resources in the event that they are discovered during construction. The implementation of the following mitigation measure for each individual phase of the project would ensure that this potential impact is **less than significant**.

MITIGATION MEASURES

***Mitigation Measure 3.5-2:*** *If paleontological resources are discovered during the course of construction for any individual phase, or portion of an individual phase of the project, work shall be halted immediately within 165 feet of the discovery, the City of Manteca shall be notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. If the paleontological resource is considered significant, it should be excavated by a qualified paleontologist and given to a local agency, State University, or other applicable institution, where they could be curated and displayed for public education purposes.*

### **Impact 3.5-4: Project implementation has the potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Indications are that humans have occupied San Joaquin County for over 10,000 years and it is not always possible to predict where human remains may occur outside of formal burials. Therefore, excavation and construction activities, regardless of depth, may yield human remains that may not be interred in marked, formal burials.

Under CEQA, human remains are protected under the definition of archaeological materials as being “any evidence of human activity.” Additionally, Public Resources Code Section 5097 has specific stop-work and notification procedures to follow in the event that human remains are inadvertently discovered during project implementation.

While no human remains were found during field surveys, implementation of the following mitigation measure would ensure that all construction activities that inadvertently discover human remains implement state required consultation methods to determine the disposition and historical significance of any discovered human remains. The implementation of the following mitigation measure for each individual phase of the project would ensure that this potential impact is **less than significant**.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Mitigation Measure 3.5-3:** *If human remains are discovered during the course of construction for any individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase of the project, work shall be halted at the site and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the San Joaquin County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the remains are of Native American origin, either of the following steps will be taken:*

- *The coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission in order to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner will make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, which may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains.*
- *The project proponent shall retain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance when any of the following conditions occurs:*
  - *The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a descendent.*
  - *The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.*
  - *The City of Manteca or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.*

The purpose of this section is to disclose and analyze the potential impacts associated with the geology of the Project site and regional vicinity, and to analyze issues such as the potential exposure of people and property to geologic hazards, landform alteration, and erosion. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to an urban use. This section is based in part on the following: *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City of Manteca as amended through 2013), *Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report* (City of Manteca 2003), *Custom Soils Report for San Joaquin County, California* (NRCS 2014) and NRCS Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2014). No comments were received regarding geology and soils during the NOP review period(s).

### 3.6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### GEOLOGIC SETTING

---

##### **Regional Geology**

The Project site lies in the San Joaquin Valley in central California. The San Joaquin Valley is located in the southern portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province. The Great Valley, also known as the Central Valley, is a topographically flat, northwest-trending, structural trough (or basin) about 50 miles wide and 450 miles long. It is bordered by the Tehachapi Mountains on the south, the Klamath Mountains on the north, the Sierra Nevada on the east, and the Coast Ranges on the west.

The San Joaquin Valley (Valley) is filled with thick sedimentary rock sequences that were deposited as much as 130 million years ago. Large alluvial fans have developed on each side of the Valley. The larger and more gently sloping fans are on the east side of the Valley, and overlie metamorphic and igneous basement rocks. These basement rocks are exposed in the Sierra Nevada foothills and consist of meta-sedimentary, volcanic, and granitic rocks.

##### **Local Setting**

The Project site has relatively flat terrain that varies between elevation 20 and 25 feet above sea level. The UPRR tracks are located along the western boundary. SR 120 is located along the southern boundary. High voltage power lines (115 and 60 Kilovolts), within Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) power line easements, traverse portions of the Project site running northeast/southwest. The French Camp Canal bisects the Project site.

A Custom Soil Survey was completed for the Project site using the NRCS Web Soil Survey program. Table 3.6-1 identifies the soils found in the Project site. The NRCS Soils Map is provided in Figure 3.2-2 in Section 3.2 Agricultural Resources.

## 3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**TABLE 3.6-1: PROJECT SITE SOILS**

MAP UNIT SYMBOL MAP	NAME	PERCENT OF AOI
109	Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes	64.8%
142	Delhi loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	4.7%
153	Timor loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	9.8%
166	Tinnin loamy coarse sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	17.1%
169	Veritas fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	3.6%

SOURCE: NRCS CUSTOM SOIL SURVEY

**Bisgani loamy coarse sand, partially drained.** This very deep, poorly drained, nearly level soil formed in alluvium. Permeability is rapid in this soil. Runoff is very slow, and the hazard of water erosion is slight. The shrink-swell potential of this soil is low. The risk of corrosion is moderate for steel, and moderate for concrete.

**Delhi loamy sand.** This very deep, somewhat excessively drained, nearly level soil was formed in wind-modified alluvium. Permeability is rapid in this soil. Runoff is slow, and the hazard of water erosion is slight. The shrink-swell potential of this soil is low. The risk of corrosion is moderate for steel, and moderate for concrete.

**Timor loamy sand.** This deep, moderately well drained, nearly level soil was formed in alluvium derived from granitic rock sources. Permeability is rapid in this soil. Runoff is slow, and the hazard of water erosion is slight. The shrink-swell potential of this soil is low. The risk of corrosion is moderate for steel, and low for concrete.

**Tinnin loamy coarse sand:** The Tinnin series consists of very deep, well drained soils formed in predominantly granitic alluvium or eolian sands. Tinnin soils are on low alluvial terraces of fans and narrow ridges and mounds and have slopes of 0 to 9 percent. The shrink-swell potential of this soil is low. The risk of corrosion is moderate for steel, and low for concrete.

**Veritas fine sandy loam:** The Veritas series consists of deep to duripan, moderately well drained, soils that formed in alluvium derived from mixed rock sources. Veritas soils are on low fan terraces with slopes of 0 to 2 percent. The shrink-swell potential of this soil is low. The risk of corrosion is moderate for steel, and moderate for concrete.

## FAULTS AND SEISMICITY

### Faults

A fault is a fracture in the crust of the earth along which rocks on one side have moved relative to those on the other side. A fault trace is the line on the earth's surface defining the fault. Displacement of the earth's crust along faults releases energy in the form of earthquakes and in some cases in fault creep. Most faults are the result of repeated displacements over a long period of time.

Surface rupture occurs when movement on a fault deep within the earth breaks through to the surface. Surface ruptures have been known to extend up to 50 miles with displacements of an inch to 20 feet. Fault rupture almost always follows preexisting faults, which are zones of weakness. Rupture may occur suddenly during an earthquake or slowly in the form of fault creep. Sudden displacements are more damaging to structures because they are accompanied by shaking.

The State of California designates faults as active, potentially active, and inactive depending on how recent the movement that can be substantiated for a fault. Table 3.6-2 presents the California fault activity rating system.

**TABLE 3.6-2: FAULT ACTIVITY RATING**

<i>FAULT ACTIVITY RATING</i>	<i>GEOLOGIC PERIOD OF LAST RUPTURE</i>	<i>TIME INTERVAL (YEARS)</i>
Active (A)	Holocene	Within last 11,000 years
Potentially Active (PA)	Quaternary	11,000-1.6 Million Years
Inactive (I)	Pre-Quaternary	Greater than 1.6 Million

*SOURCE: CALIFORNIA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY*

The 2010 Fault Activity Map provided by the California Department of Conservation identified potential seismic sources within 100 kilometers (62 miles) of the Project site. Two of the closest known faults classified as active by the California Geological Survey are the Greenville fault, located approximately 23 miles to the west, and the Foothills Fault System, located approximately 33 miles to the east. The Vernalis Fault is located approximately 13 miles to the west. Other faults that could potentially affect the proposed Project include the Mount Diablo, Calaveras, Hayward, Ortigalita and San Andreas Faults. See Figure 3.6-1.

**Seismicity**

The amount of energy available to a fault is determined by considering the slip-rate of the fault, its area (fault length multiplied by down-dip width), maximum magnitude, and the rigidity of the displaced rocks. These factors are combined to calculate the moment (energy) release on a fault. The total seismic energy release for a fault source is sometimes partitioned between two different recurrence models, the characteristic and truncated Gutenberg-Richter (G-R) magnitude-frequency distributions. These models incorporate our knowledge of the range of magnitudes and relative frequency of different magnitudes for a particular fault. The partition of moment and the weights for multiple models are given in the following summary.

Earthquakes are generally expressed in terms of intensity and magnitude. Intensity is based on the observed effects of ground shaking on people, buildings, and natural features. By comparison, magnitude is based on the amplitude of the earthquake waves recorded on instruments, which have a common calibration. The Richter scale, a logarithmic scale ranging from 0.1 to 9.0, with 9.0 being the strongest, measures the magnitude of an earthquake relative to ground shaking. Table 3.6-3 provides a description and a comparison of intensity and magnitude.

## 3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**TABLE 3.6-3: MODIFIED MERCALLI INTENSITY SCALE FOR EARTHQUAKES**

<i>RICHTER MAGNITUDE</i>	<i>MODIFIED MERCALLI SCALE</i>	<i>EFFECTS OF INTENSITY</i>
0.1 – 0.9	I	Earthquake shaking not felt
1.0 – 2.9	II	Shaking felt by those at rest.
3.0 – 3.9	III	Felt by most people indoors, some can estimate duration of shaking.
4.0 – 4.5	IV	Felt by most people indoors. Hanging objects rattle, wooden walls and frames creak.
4.6 – 4.9	V	Felt by everyone indoors, many can estimate duration of shaking. Standing autos rock. Crockery clashes, dishes rattle and glasses clink. Doors open, close and swing.
5.0 – 5.5	VI	Felt by all who estimate duration of shaking. Sleepers awoken, liquids spill, objects are displaced, and weak materials crack.
5.6 – 6.4	VII	People frightened and walls unsteady. Pictures and books thrown, dishes and glass are broken. Weak chimneys break. Plaster, loose bricks and parapets fall.
6.5 – 6.9	VIII	Difficult to stand. Waves on ponds, cohesionless soils slump. Stucco and masonry walls fall. Chimneys, stacks, towers, and elevated tanks twist and fall.
7.0 – 7.4	IX	General fright as people are thrown down, hard to drive. Trees broken, damage to foundations and frames. Reservoirs damaged, underground pipes broken.
7.5 – 7.9	X	General panic. Ground cracks, masonry and frame buildings destroyed. Bridges destroyed, railroads bent slightly. Dams, dikes and embankments damaged.
8.0 – 8.4	XI	Large landslides, water thrown, general destruction of buildings. Pipelines destroyed, railroads bent.
8.5 +	XII	Total nearby damage, rock masses displaced. Lines of sight/level distorted. Objects thrown into air.

According to the California Geological Survey’s Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment Program, San Joaquin County is considered to be within an area that is predicted to have a 10 percent probability that a seismic event would produce horizontal ground shaking of 10 to 20 percent within a 50-year period. This level of ground shaking correlates to a Modified Mercalli intensity of V to VII, light to strong. As a result of these factors the California Geological Survey has defined the entire county as a seismic hazard zone. The Uniform Building Code places all of California in the zone of greatest earthquake severity because recent studies indicate high potential for severe ground shaking.

### **Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone**

The California legislature passed the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act in 1972 to address seismic hazards associated with faults and to establish criteria for developments for areas with identified seismic hazard zones. The California Geologic Survey (CGS) evaluates faults with available geologic and seismologic data and determines if a fault should be zoned as active, potentially active, or inactive. If CGS determines a fault to be active, then it is typically incorporated into a Special Studies Zone in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard

Act. Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones are usually one-quarter mile or less in width and require site-specific evaluation of fault location and require a structure setback if the fault is found traversing a project site. The Project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone.

## SEISMIC HAZARDS

---

### **Seismic Ground Shaking**

The potential for seismic ground shaking in California is expected. As a result of the foreseeable seismicity in California, the State requires special design considerations for all structural improvements in accordance with the seismic design provisions in the California Building Code. These seismic design provisions require enhanced structural integrity based on several risk parameters. Seismic ground shaking in the Project site is expected during the life of the proposed Project. All structures will be built in accordance with the seismic design standards in California.

### **Fault Rupture**

A fault rupture occurs when the surface of the earth breaks as a result of an earthquake, although this does not happen with all earthquakes. These ruptures generally occur in a weak area of an existing fault. Ruptures can be sudden (i.e. earthquake) or slow (i.e. fault creep). The Alquist-Priolo Fault Zoning Act requires active earthquake fault zones to be mapped and it provides special development considerations within these zones. The Project site does not have surface expression of active faults and fault rupture is not anticipated.

### **Liquefaction**

Liquefaction typically requires a significant sudden decrease of shearing resistance in cohesionless soils and a sudden increase in water pressure, which is typically associated with an earthquake of high magnitude. The potential for liquefaction is highest when groundwater levels are high, and loose, fine, sandy soils occur at depths of less than 50 feet. Soil data from the NRCS Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2013b) suggests that the potential for liquefaction is moderate to high given that the soils are high in sand and the water table is exceptionally high. The City of Manteca General Plan Draft EIR has indicated that "Given that there is a relatively high water table, liquefaction could be a significant impact within the Study Area." The General Plan Draft EIR indicates that with the implementation of goals, policies, and implementation measures from the 2023 General Plan Safety Element the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

### **Lateral Spreading**

Lateral spreading typically results when ground shaking moves soil toward an area where the soil integrity is weak or unsupported, and it typically occurs on the surface of a slope, although it does not occur strictly on steep slopes. Oftentimes, lateral spreading is directly associated with areas of liquefaction. Since the potential for liquefaction is moderate to high, the potential for lateral spreading is present. The General Plan Draft EIR indicates that with the implementation of goals,

policies, and implementation measures from the 2023 General Plan Safety Element the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

### **Landslides**

Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides is construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e. cut and fill). The Project site is essentially flat; therefore, the potential for a landslide in the Project site is non-existent.

## **NON-SEISMIC HAZARDS**

---

### **Expansive Soils**

Expansive soils can undergo significant volume change with changes in moisture content. They shrink and harden when dried and expand and soften when wet. If structures are underlain by expansive soils, it is important that foundation systems be capable of tolerating or resisting any potentially damaging soil movements. In addition, it is important to limit moisture changes in the surficial soils by using positive drainage away from buildings as well as limiting landscaping watering.

According to the *Custom Soils Report*, the soils in the Project site have a low shrink-swell potential. This potential is directly related to the linear extensibility of the soils on the Project site.

### **Erosion**

Erosion naturally occurs on the surface of the earth as surface materials (i.e. rock, soil, debris, etc.) is loosened, dissolved, or worn away, and transported from one place to another by gravity. Two common types of soil erosion include wind erosion and water erosion. The steepness of a slope is an important factor that affects soil erosion. Erosion potential in soils is influenced primarily by loose soil texture and steep slopes. Loose soils can be eroded by water or wind forces, whereas soils with high clay content are generally susceptible only to water erosion. The potential for erosion generally increases as a result of human activity, primarily through the development of facilities and impervious surfaces and the removal of vegetative cover.

The *Custom Soils Report* identified the erosion potential for the soils in the Project site. This report summarizes those soil attributes used by the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation Version 2 (RUSLE2) for the map units in the selected area. Soil property data for each map unit component includes the hydrologic soil group, erosion factors Kf for the surface horizon, erosion factor T, and the representative percentage of sand, silt, and clay in the surface horizon. According to the NRCS the erosion potential of soils found in the Project site is considered slight.

### **Collapsible Soils**

Collapsible soils undergo a rearrangement of their grains and a loss of cementation, resulting in substantial and rapid settlement under relatively low loads. Collapsible soils occur predominantly

at the base of mountain ranges, where Holocene-age alluvial fan and wash sediments have been deposited during rapid run-off events. Soils prone to collapse are commonly associated with manmade fill, wind-laid sands and silts, and alluvial fan and mudflow sediments deposited during flash floods. During an earthquake, even slight settlement of fill materials can lead to a differentially settled structure and significant repair costs. Differential settlement of structures typically occurs when heavily irrigated landscape areas are near a building foundation. Examples of common problems associated with collapsible soils include tilting floors, cracking or separation in structures, sagging floors, and nonfunctional windows and doors. Collapsible soils has not been identified in the Manteca General Plan as an issue in the Manteca area.

### **Subsidence**

Land subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of an area with little or no horizontal motion due to changes taking place underground. It is a natural process, although it can also occur (and is greatly accelerated) as a result of human activities. Common causes of land subsidence from human activity include: pumping water, oil, and gas from underground reservoirs; dissolution of limestone aquifers (sinkholes); collapse of underground mines; drainage of organic soils; and initial wetting of dry soils. Subsidence has not been identified in the Manteca General Plan as an issue in the Manteca area.

## **3.6.2 REGULATORY SETTING**

### **FEDERAL**

---

#### **Uniform Building Code (UBC)**

The purpose of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) is to provide minimum standards to preserve the public peace, health, and safety by regulating the design, construction, quality of materials, certain equipment, location, grading, use, occupancy, and maintenance of all buildings and structures. UBC standards address foundation design, shear wall strength, and other structurally related conditions.

### **STATE**

---

The State of California has established a variety of regulations and requirements related to seismic safety and structural integrity, including the California Building Code, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act.

#### **California Building Standards Code**

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, known as the California Building Standards Code (CBSC) or just "Title 24," contains the regulations that govern the construction of buildings in California. The CBSC includes 12 parts including: California Building Standards Administrative Code, California Building Code, California Residential Building Code, California Electrical Code, California Mechanical Code, California Plumbing Code, California Energy Code, California Historical Building Code, California Fire Code, California Existing Building Code, California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code), California Reference Standards Code. Through the CBSC, the state provides

a minimum standard for building design and construction. The CBSC contains specific requirements for seismic safety, excavation, foundations, retaining walls and site demolition. It also regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control.

### **California Building Code**

The California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 16 addresses structural design, Chapter 17 addresses structural tests and special inspections, and Chapter 18 addresses soils and foundations. Section 1610 provides structural design standards for foundation walls and retaining walls to ensure resistance to lateral soil loads. Section 1613 provides structural design standards for earthquake loads. Section 1704.7 requires special inspections for existing site soil conditions, fill placement and load-bearing requirements during the construction as specified in Table 1704.7 of this section. Sections 1704.8 through 1704.16 provide inspection and testing requirements for various foundation types, and construction material types. Section 1803.1.1.1 requires each city and county enact an ordinance which requires a preliminary soil report and that the report be based upon adequate test borings or excavations, of every subdivision, where a tentative and final map is required pursuant to Section 66426 of the Government Code. Section 1803.5.3 defines expansive soils and specifies that in areas likely to have expansive soil, the building official shall require soil tests to determine where such soils do exist. Section 1803.5.4 specifies that a subsurface soil investigation must be performed to determine whether the existing ground-water table is above or within 5 feet (1524 mm) below the elevation of the lowest floor level where such floor is located below the finished ground level adjacent to the foundation. Section 1803.5.8 provides specific standards where shallow foundations will bear on compacted fill material more than 12 inches (305 mm) in depth. Section 1803.5.11 and 1803.5.12 provide requirements for geotechnical investigations for structures assigned varying Seismic Design Categories in accordance with Section 1613. Section 1804 provides standards and requirements for excavation, grading, and fill. Section 1808, 1809, and 1810 provides standards and requirements for the construction of varying foundations.

### **Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act**

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 sets forth the policies and Criteria of the State Mining and Geology Board, which governs the exercise of governments' responsibilities to prohibit the location of developments and structures for human occupancy across the trace of active faults. The policies and criteria are limited to potential hazards resulting from surface faulting or fault creep within Earthquake Fault Zones, as delineated on maps officially issued by the State Geologist. Working definitions include:

- Fault – a fracture or zone of closely associated fractures along which rocks on one side have been displaced with respect to those on the other side;
- Fault Zone – a zone of related faults, which commonly are braided and sub parallel, but may be branching and divergent. A fault zone has a significant width (with respect to the scale at which the fault is being considered, portrayed, or investigated), ranging from a few feet to several miles;

- Sufficiently Active Fault – a fault that has evidence of Holocene surface displacement along one or more of its segments or branches (last 11,000 years); and
- Well-Defined Fault – a fault whose trace is clearly detectable by a trained geologist as a physical feature at or just below the ground surface. The geologist should be able to locate the fault in the field with sufficient precision and confidence to indicate that the required site-specific investigations would meet with some success.

“Sufficiently Active” and “Well Defined” are the two criteria used by the State to determine if a fault should be zoned under the Alquist-Priolo Act.

### **Seismic Hazards Mapping Act**

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, passed in 1990, addresses non-surface fault rupture earthquake hazards, including liquefaction and seismically-induced landslides. Under the Act, seismic hazard zones are to be mapped by the State Geologist to assist local governments in land use planning. The program and actions mandated by the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act closely resemble those of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (which addresses only surface fault-rupture hazards) and are outlined below:

The State Geologist is required to delineate the various “seismic hazard zones.”

- Cities and Counties, or other local permitting authority, must regulate certain development “projects” within the zones. They must withhold the development permits for a site within a zone until the geologic and soil conditions of the site are investigated and appropriate mitigation measures, if any, are incorporated into development plans.
- The State Mining and Geology Board provides additional regulations, policies, and criteria, to guide cities and counties in their implementation of the law. The Board also provides guidelines for preparation of the Seismic Hazard Zone Maps and for evaluating and mitigating seismic hazards.
- Sellers (and their agents) of real property within a mapped hazard zone must disclose that the property lies within such a zone at the time of sale.

### **Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has Seismic Design Criteria (SDC), which is an encyclopedia of new and currently practiced seismic design and analysis methodologies for the design of new bridges in California. The SDC adopts a performance-based approach specifying minimum levels of structural system performance, component performance, analysis, and design practices for ordinary standard bridges. The SDC has been developed with input from the Caltrans Offices of Structure Design, Earthquake Engineering and Design Support, and Materials and Foundations. Memo20-1 outlines the bridge category and classification, seismic performance criteria, seismic design philosophy and approach, seismic demands and capacities on structural components and seismic design practices that collectively make up Caltrans’ seismic design methodology.

### LOCAL

---

#### City of Manteca General Plan

##### POLICIES: GEOLOGIC AND SEISMIC SAFETY

- S-P-1. The City shall require preparation of geological reports and/or geological engineering reports for proposed new development located in areas of potentially significant geological hazards, including potential subsidence (collapsible surface soils) due to groundwater extraction.
- S-P-2. The City shall require new development to mitigate the potential impacts of geologic hazards through Building Plan review.
- S-P-3. The City shall require new development to mitigate the potential impacts of seismic induced settlement of uncompacted fill and liquefaction (water-saturated soil) due to the presence of a high water table.
- S-P-4. The City shall maintain an inventory of pre-1940 unreinforced masonry buildings within the city. No change in use to a higher occupancy or more intensive use shall be approved in such structures until an engineering evaluation of the structure has been conducted and any structural deficiencies corrected. The Redevelopment Agency shall be encouraged to assist property owners in reinforcing buildings.
- S-P-5. The City shall ensure that all public facilities, such as buildings, water tanks, and reservoirs, are structurally sound and able to withstand seismic shaking and the effects of seismically induced ground failure.
- S-P-6. The City shall comply with the California State seismic and building standards in the design and siting of critical facilities, including police and fire stations, school facilities, hospitals, hazardous materials manufacturing and storage facilities, and large public assembly halls.

##### IMPLEMENTATION: GEOLOGIC AND SEISMIC SAFETY

- S-I-1. All new development shall comply with the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements that stipulate building structural material and reinforcement.
- S-I-2. All new development shall comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 19100 et seq. (Earthquake Protection Law), which requires that buildings be designed to resist stresses produced by natural forces such as earthquakes and wind.
- S-I-3. The City shall inventory potentially hazardous buildings within the city and adopt a mitigation program, including requirements for strengthening buildings, changing the use of the buildings to an acceptable occupancy level, or demolishing the buildings.

### 3.6.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on geology and soils if it will:

- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - Strong seismic ground shaking; or
  - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;
- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
- 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;
- Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property;

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### **Impact 3.6-1: The proposed project may expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic related ground failure (less than significant)**

The California Geologic Survey (CGS) evaluates faults and determines if a fault should be zoned as active, potentially active, or inactive. All active faults are incorporated into a Special Studies Zone, also referred to as an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The Project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone.

The 2010 Fault Activity Map provided by the California Department of Conservation identified potential seismic sources within 100 kilometers (62 miles) of the Project site. Two of the closest known faults classified as active by the California Geological Survey are the Greenville fault, located approximately 23 miles to the west, and the Foothills Fault System, located approximately 33 miles to the east. The Vernalis Fault is located approximately 13 miles to the west. Other faults that could potentially affect the proposed Project include the Mount Diablo, Calaveras, Hayward, Ortigalita and San Andreas Faults.

According to the California Geological Survey's Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment Program, Manteca is considered to be within an area that is predicted to have a 10 percent probability that a seismic event would produce horizontal ground shaking of 10 to 20 percent within a 50-year period. This level of ground shaking correlates to a Modified Mercalli intensity of V to VII, light to strong. As a result of these factors the California Geological Survey has defined the entire county as a seismic hazard zone. The Uniform Building Code places all of California in the zone of greatest earthquake severity because recent studies indicate high potential for severe ground shaking.

There will always be a potential for groundshaking caused by seismic activity anywhere in California, including the Project site. Seismic activity could come from a known active fault such as the Greenville fault, or any number of other faults in the region. In order to minimize potential damage to the buildings and site improvements, all construction in California is required to be designed in accordance with the latest seismic design standards of the California Building Code. As discussed under Section 3.6.2 Regulatory Setting, the California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 16 addresses structural design and Chapter 18 addresses soils and foundations.

Collectively, these state requirements, which have been adopted by the City of Manteca, include design standards and requirements that are intended to minimize impacts to structures in seismically active areas of California. Section 1613 specifically provides structural design standards for earthquake loads. Section 1803.5.11 and 1803.5.12 provide requirements for geotechnical investigations for structures assigned varying Seismic Design Categories in accordance with Section 1613. Additionally, the City of Manteca has adopted Design and Construction Standards and incorporated numerous policies relative to seismicity to ensure the health and safety of all people.

General Plan Policy S-P-1 requires the preparation of geological reports and/or geological engineering reports for proposed new development located in areas of potentially significant geological hazards, including potential subsidence (collapsible surface soils) due to groundwater extraction. General Plan Policy S-P-2 requires new development to mitigate the potential impacts of geologic hazards through Building Plan review. General Plan Policy S-P-3 requires new development to mitigate the potential impacts of seismic induced settlement of uncompacted fill and liquefaction (water-saturated soil) due to the presence of a high water table. General Plan Policy S-P-5 is intended to ensure that all public facilities, such as buildings, water tanks, and reservoirs, are structurally sound and able to withstand seismic shaking and the effects of seismically induced ground failure. General Plan policy S-P-6 requires compliance with the California State seismic and building standards in the design and siting of critical facilities, including police and fire stations, school facilities, hospitals, hazardous materials manufacturing and storage facilities, and large public assembly halls.

Design of each individual structure and infrastructure would be in accordance with standards and policies, which would reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level. Because each individual phase of the Project must be designed in conformance with these state and local standards and policies, any potential impact would be *less than significant*.

### **Impact 3.6-2: Implementation and construction of the proposed project may result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (less than significant)**

According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, polluted stormwater runoff is a leading cause of impairment to the nearly 40 percent of surveyed U.S. water bodies which do not meet water quality standards. Over land or via storm sewer systems, polluted runoff is discharged, often untreated, directly into local water bodies. Soil erosion and the loss of topsoil is one of the most common sources of polluted stormwater runoff during construction activities. When left uncontrolled, storm water runoff can erode soil and cause sedimentation in waterways, which collectively result in the destruction of fish, wildlife, and aquatic life habitats; a loss in aesthetic value; and threats to public health due to contaminated food, drinking water supplies, and recreational waterways.

Mandated by Congress under the Clean Water Act, the NPDES Stormwater Program is a comprehensive two-phased national program for addressing the non-agricultural sources of stormwater discharges which adversely affect the quality of our nation's waters. The program uses the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting mechanism to require the

implementation of controls designed to prevent harmful pollutants, including soil erosion, from being washed by stormwater runoff into local water bodies. The construction activities for the proposed project would be governed by the General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ (amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ), which states:

*“...Particular attention must be paid to large, mass graded sites where the potential for soil exposure to the erosive effects of rainfall and wind is great and where there is potential for significant sediment discharge from the site to surface waters. Until permanent vegetation is established, soil cover is the most cost-effective and expeditious method to protect soil particles from detachment and transport by rainfall. Temporary soil stabilization can be the single most important factor in reducing erosion at construction sites. The discharger is required to consider measures such as: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. These erosion control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. Erosion control BMPs should be the primary means of preventing storm water contamination, and sediment control techniques should be used to capture any soil that becomes eroded...”*

General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ (amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ) further states that:

*“Sediment control BMPs should be the secondary means of preventing storm water contamination. When erosion control techniques are ineffective, sediment control techniques should be used to capture any soil that becomes eroded. The discharger is required to consider perimeter control measures such as: installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes. These sediment control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed...Inappropriate management of run-on and runoff can result in excessive physical impacts to receiving waters from sediment and increased flows. The discharger is required to manage all run-on and runoff from a project site. Examples include: installing berms and other temporary run-on and runoff diversions...All measures must be periodically inspected, maintained and repaired to ensure that receiving water quality is protected. Frequent inspections coupled with thorough documentation and timely repair is necessary to ensure that all measures are functioning as intended...”*

To ensure that construction activities are covered under General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ (amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ), projects in California must prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and sediments to meet water quality standards. Such BMPs may include: temporary erosion control measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover. The BMPs and overall SWPPP is reviewed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as part of the permitting process. The SWPPP, once approved, is kept on site and

## 3.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

---

implemented during construction activities and must be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB and/or the lead agency.

The NRCS Custom Soils Report identifies the Project site as having a “slight” potential for erosion. This is largely due to the fact that the Project site is relatively flat. Regardless of the potential for erosion, there is always the potential for human caused erosion associated with construction activities associated with each phase or component of the project or through the operational phase of a project. Grading, excavation, removal of vegetation cover, and loading activities associated with construction activities in any phase of the project could temporarily expose soils and increase the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation during rail events. Construction activities in any phase of development can also result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that can adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas.

In accordance with the NPDES Stormwater Program, Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 requires an approved SWPPP for each individual phase or component of the project. The SWPPP must be designed to control erosion and the loss of topsoil to the extent practicable using BMPs that the RWQCB has deemed effective in controlling erosion, sedimentation, runoff during construction activities. The RWQCB has stated that these erosion control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. The specific controls are subject to the review and approval by the RWQCB and are existing regulatory requirements. Consistency with these RWQCB regulations and standards regarding preparing and maintaining a SWPPP for each individual phase of the project, would ensure that the impact is **less than significant** relative to this topic.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.6-1:** *For an individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase, the Project proponent, or their contractor, shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the RWQCB to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ). The NOI shall be submitted prior to clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation. The NOI should only cover the area proposed for clearing, grading, and disturbance to the ground for the work to be performed at that time (i.e. it does not need to include the entire project or an entire phase). In accordance with the General Permit requirements, the Permittee can either close out the General Construction Permit once all work and requirements are completed, or amend the General Construction Permit to add additional areas for disturbance while closing out areas where work is completed.*

*The SWPPP shall be designed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the RWQCB has deemed as effective at reducing erosion, controlling sediment, and managing runoff. These include: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. Sediment control BMPs, installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes, installing berms and other temporary run-on and*

runoff diversions. These BMPs are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. Final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by City of Manteca and the RWQCB. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB.

**Impact 3.6-3: The proposed project has the potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of project implementation, and potentially result in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse (less than significant)**

***Liquefaction***

Soil liquefaction results from loss of strength during cyclic loading, such as imposed by earthquakes. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, uniformly graded, fine-grained sands. Soil data from the NRCS Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2013b) suggests that the potential for liquefaction is moderate to high given that the soils are high in sand and the water table is exceptionally high. The City of Manteca General Plan Draft EIR has indicated that “Given that there is a relatively high water table, liquefaction could be a significant impact within the Study Area.”

General Plan Policy S-P-1 requires the preparation of geological reports and/or geological engineering reports for proposed new development located in areas of potentially significant geological hazards, including potential subsidence (collapsible surface soils) due to groundwater extraction. General Plan Policy S-P-2 requires new development to mitigate the potential impacts of geologic hazards through Building Plan review. General Plan Policy S-P-3 requires new development to mitigate the potential impacts of seismic induced settlement of uncompacted fill and liquefaction (water-saturated soil) due to the presence of a high water table. General Plan Policy S-P-5 is intended to ensure that all public facilities, such as buildings, water tanks, and reservoirs, are structurally sound and able to withstand seismic shaking and the effects of seismically induced ground failure. General Plan Implementation Measure S-I-1 requires all new development to comply with the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements that stipulate building structural material and reinforcement.

The General Plan Draft EIR indicates that with the implementation of goals, policies, and implementation measures from the 2023 General Plan Safety Element the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

***Lateral Spreading:*** Lateral spreading typically results when ground shaking moves soil toward an area where the soil integrity is weak or unsupported, and it typically occurs on the surface of a slope, although it does not occur strictly on steep slopes. Oftentimes, lateral spreading is also directly associated with areas of liquefaction. Since the potential for liquefaction is moderate to high, the potential for lateral spreading is present.

General Plan Policy S-P-1 requires the preparation of geological reports and/or geological engineering reports for proposed new development located in areas of potentially significant

geological hazards, including potential subsidence (collapsible surface soils) due to groundwater extraction. General Plan Policy S-P-2 requires new development to mitigate the potential impacts of geologic hazards through Building Plan review. General Plan Policy S-P-3 requires new development to mitigate the potential impacts of seismic induced settlement of uncompacted fill and liquefaction (water-saturated soil) due to the presence of a high water table. General Plan Implementation Measure S-I-1 requires all new development to comply with the current Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements that stipulate building structural material and reinforcement. The General Plan Draft EIR indicates that with the implementation of goals, policies, and implementation measures from the 2023 General Plan Safety Element the potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant impact.

**Landslides:** Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides is construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e. cut and fill). The Project site is essentially flat; therefore, the potential for a landslide in the Project site is non-existent.

**Collapsible Soils:** Collapsible soils undergo a rearrangement of their grains and a loss of cementation, resulting in substantial and rapid settlement under relatively low loads. Collapsible soils occur predominantly at the base of mountain ranges, where Holocene-age alluvial fan and wash sediments have been deposited during rapid run-off events. Differential settlement of structures typically occurs when heavily irrigated landscape areas are near a building foundation. Examples of common problems associated with collapsible soils include tilting floors, cracking or separation in structures, sagging floors, and nonfunctional windows and doors. Soil data from the NRCS Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2014) suggests a low potential for collapsible soils on the Project site.

**Subsidence:** Land subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of an area with little or no horizontal motion due to changes taking place underground. It is a natural process, although it can also occur (and is greatly accelerated) as a result of human activities. Common causes of land subsidence from human activity include: pumping water, oil, and gas from underground reservoirs; dissolution of limestone aquifers (sinkholes); collapse of underground mines; drainage of organic soils; and initial wetting of dry soils. Subsidence has not been identified in the Manteca General Plan.

### **Conclusion**

The Project site does not have a significant risk of becoming unstable as a result landslide, subsidence, or collapse. There is a potential for liquefaction in Manteca, including the project site, given the sandy soils combined with a high water table. The potential for liquefaction could affect any individual phase of the project. With the implementation of General Plan policies and implementation measures, as well as Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.6-2:** *Prior to earthmoving activities for any individual phase, or portion of an individual phase, a certified geotechnical engineer, or equivalent, shall be retained to perform a final geotechnical evaluation of the soils at a design-level for the area to be graded in the individual*

*phase as required by the requirements of the California Building Code Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 18, Section 1803.1.1.2 related to expansive soils and other soil conditions. The evaluation shall be prepared in accordance with the standards and requirements outlined in California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 16, Chapter 17, and Chapter 18, which addresses structural design, tests and inspections, and soils and foundation standards. The final geotechnical evaluation shall include design recommendations to ensure that soil conditions do not pose a threat to the health and safety of people or structures. The grading and improvement plans, as well as any building plans shall be designed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the final geotechnical evaluation for that individual phase or a portion of an individual phase.*

#### **Impact 3.6-4: Potential for expansive soils to create substantial risks to life or property (less than significant with mitigation)**

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. Expansion is a typical characteristic of clay-type soils. Expansive soils shrink and swell in volume during changes in moisture content, such as a result of seasonal rain events, and can cause damage to foundations, concrete slabs, roadway improvements, and pavement sections.

According to the *Custom Soils Report*, the soils in the Project site have a low shrink-swell potential. This potential is directly related to the linear extensibility of the soils.

The California Building Code Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 18, Section 1803.1.1.2 requires specific geotechnical evaluation when a preliminary geotechnical evaluation determines that expansive or other special soil conditions are present, which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects. The City of Manteca also requires a final geotechnical evaluation to be performed at a design-level to ensure that the foundations, structures, roadway sections, sidewalks, and other improvements can accommodate the specific soils, including expansive soils, at those locations. Mitigation Measure 3.6-2, presented below, provides the requirement for a final geotechnical evaluation in accordance with the standards and requirements outlined in the California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 16, Chapter 17, and Chapter 18, which addresses structural design, tests and inspections, and soils and foundation standards. The final geotechnical evaluation for each individual phase or component of the project would include design recommendations to ensure that the specific soil conditions in the particular area of development do not pose a threat to the health and safety of people or structures. The grading and improvement plans, as well as the building plans for each individual phase or component of the project, are required to be designed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the final geotechnical evaluation. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES


##### **Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-2**

*This page left intentionally blank.*

**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

**Figure 3.6-1: Earthquake Fault Map**


- Quaternary Faults
- Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones



1:600,000

Data sources: US Geological Survey;  
San Joaquin County GIS;  
Map date: June 11, 2014.

Dr. Nova Planning Group  
A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section discusses regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed Project. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to urban uses. This section provides a background discussion of greenhouse gases and climate change linkages and effects of global climate change. This section is organized with an existing setting, regulatory setting, approach/methodology, and impact analysis. The analysis and discussion of the GHG and climate change impacts in this section focuses on the proposed Project's consistency with local, regional, and statewide climate change planning efforts and discusses the context of these planning efforts as they relate to the proposed Project.

### 3.7.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE LINKAGES

Various gases in the Earth's atmosphere, classified as atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the Earth's surface temperature. Solar radiation enters Earth's atmosphere from space, and a portion of the radiation is absorbed by the Earth's surface. The Earth emits this radiation back toward space, but the properties of the radiation change from high-frequency solar radiation to lower-frequency infrared radiation.

Naturally occurring greenhouse gases include water vapor (H<sub>2</sub>O), carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). Several classes of halogenated substances that contain fluorine, chlorine, or bromine are also greenhouse gases, but they are, for the most part, solely a product of industrial activities. Although the direct greenhouse gases CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O occur naturally in the atmosphere, human activities have changed their atmospheric concentrations. From the pre-industrial era (i.e., ending about 1750) to 2005, concentrations of these three greenhouse gases have increased globally by 36, 148, and 18 percent, respectively (IPCC 2007)<sup>1</sup>.

Greenhouse gases, which are transparent to solar radiation, are effective in absorbing infrared radiation. As a result, this radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is now retained, resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon is known as the greenhouse effect. Among the prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), water vapor, nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs).

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential,

---

1 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. "Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policymakers."

[http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/publications\\_ipcc\\_fourth\\_assessment\\_report\\_wg1\\_report\\_the\\_physical\\_science\\_basis.htm](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_ipcc_fourth_assessment_report_wg1_report_the_physical_science_basis.htm)

## 3.7 GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

---

commercial, and agricultural sectors (California Air Resources Board, 2012)<sup>2</sup>. In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of GHGs, followed by electricity generation (California Air Resources Board, 2012).

As the name implies, global climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern, respectively. California produced 492 million gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>) in 2004 (California Energy Commission 2006a)<sup>3</sup>. By 2020, California is projected to produce 507 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year.<sup>4</sup>

Carbon dioxide equivalents are a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential of a GHG, is also dependent on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. Expressing GHG emissions in carbon dioxide equivalents takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO<sub>2</sub> were being emitted.

Consumption of fossil fuels in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2008, accounting for 36.9% of total GHG emissions in the state (California Air Resources Board, 2012). This category was followed by the electric power sector (including both in-state and out of-state sources) (24.8%) and the industrial sector (21.1%) (California Air Resources Board, 2012).

### EFFECTS OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

---

The effects of increasing global temperature are far-reaching and extremely difficult to quantify. The scientific community continues to study the effects of global climate change. In general, increases in the ambient global temperature as a result of increased GHGs are anticipated to result in rising sea levels, which could threaten coastal areas through accelerated coastal erosion, threats to levees and inland water systems and disruption to coastal wetlands and habitat.

If the temperature of the ocean warms, it is anticipated that the winter snow season would be shortened. Snowpack in the Sierra Nevada provides both water supply (runoff) and storage (within the snowpack before melting), which is a major source of supply for the state. The snowpack portion of the supply could potentially decline by 70% to 90% by the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Cal

---

<sup>2</sup> California Air Resources Board. 2012. "Greenhouse Gas Inventory Data, 2000-2009." <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>

<sup>3</sup> California Energy Commission. 2006a. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990 to 2004. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/archive/archive.htm>

<sup>4</sup> California Air Resources Board. 2010. "Functional Equivalent Document prepared for the California Cap on GHG Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms."

EPA 2006)<sup>5</sup>. This phenomenon could lead to significant challenges securing an adequate water supply for a growing state population. Further, the increased ocean temperature could result in increased moisture flux into the state; however, since this would likely increasingly come in the form of rain rather than snow in the high elevations, increased precipitation could lead to increased potential and severity of flood events, placing more pressure on California's levee/flood control system.

Sea level has risen approximately seven inches during the last century and it is predicted to rise more in the future. Some estimates anticipate a rise of an additional 22 to 35 inches by 2100, depending on the future GHG emissions levels (Cal EPA 2006). A recent estimate (2013) by the Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the California Climate Action Team (CO-CAT) anticipates that sea-levels south of the Cape Mendocino could rise between 16.56 inches (1.38 ft) to 65.76 inches (5.48 ft). If this occurs, resultant effects could include increased coastal flooding, saltwater intrusion and disruption of wetlands (Cal EPA 2006). As the existing climate throughout California changes over time, mass migration of species, or failure of species to migrate in time to adapt to the perturbations in climate, could also result. Under the emissions scenarios of the Climate Scenarios report (Cal EPA 2006), the impacts of global warming in California are anticipated to include, but are not limited to, the following.

### **Public Health**

Higher temperatures are expected to increase the frequency, duration, and intensity of conditions conducive to air pollution formation. For example, days with weather conducive to ozone formation are projected to increase from 25% to 35% under the lower warming range and to 75% to 85% under the medium warming range. In addition, if global background ozone levels increase as predicted in some scenarios, it may become impossible to meet local air quality standards. Air quality could be further compromised by increases in wildfires, which emit fine particulate matter that can travel long distances depending on wind conditions. The Climate Scenarios report indicates that large wildfires could become up to 55% more frequent if GHG emissions are not significantly reduced.

In addition, under the higher warming scenario, there could be up to 100 more days per year with temperatures above 90°F in Los Angeles and 95°F in Sacramento by 2100. This is a large increase over historical patterns and approximately twice the increase projected if temperatures remain within or below the lower warming range. Rising temperatures will increase the risk of death from dehydration, heat stroke/exhaustion, heart attack, stroke, and respiratory distress caused by extreme heat.

---

5 California Environmental Protection Agency, Climate Action Team. 2006. Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature.

[http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate\\_action\\_team/reports/](http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/reports/)

### **Water Resources**

A vast network of man-made reservoirs and aqueducts capture and transport water throughout the state from northern California rivers and the Colorado River. The current distribution system relies on Sierra Nevada snow pack to supply water during the dry spring and summer months. Rising temperatures, potentially compounded by decreases in precipitation, could severely reduce spring snow pack, increasing the risk of summer water shortages.

The state's water supplies are also at risk from rising sea levels. An influx of saltwater would degrade California's estuaries, wetlands, and groundwater aquifers. Saltwater intrusion caused by rising sea levels is a major threat to the quality and reliability of water within the southern edge of the Sacramento/San Joaquin River Delta, a major state fresh water supply. Global warming is also projected to seriously affect agricultural areas, with California farmers projected to lose as much as 25% of the water supply they need; decrease the potential for hydropower production within the state (although the effects on hydropower are uncertain); and seriously harm winter tourism. Under the lower warming range, the snow dependent winter recreational season at lower elevations could be reduced by as much as one month. If temperatures reach the higher warming range and precipitation declines, there might be many years with insufficient snow for skiing, snowboarding, and other snow dependent recreational activities.

If GHG emissions continue unabated, more precipitation will fall as rain instead of snow, and the snow that does fall will melt earlier, reducing the Sierra Nevada spring snow pack by as much as 70% to 90%. Under the lower warming scenario, snow pack losses are expected to be only half as large as those expected if temperatures were to rise to the higher warming range. How much snow pack will be lost depends in part on future precipitation patterns, the projections for which remain uncertain. However, even under the wetter climate projections, the loss of snow pack would pose challenges to water managers, hamper hydropower generation, and nearly eliminate all skiing and other snow-related recreational activities.

### **Agriculture**

Increased GHG emissions are expected to cause widespread changes to the agriculture industry reducing the quantity and quality of agricultural products statewide. Although higher carbon dioxide levels can stimulate plant production and increase plant water-use efficiency, California's farmers will face greater water demand for crops and a less reliable water supply as temperatures rise.

Plant growth tends to be slow at low temperatures, increasing with rising temperatures up to a threshold. However, faster growth can result in less-than-optimal development for many crops, so rising temperatures are likely to worsen the quantity and quality of yield for a number of California's agricultural products. Products likely to be most affected include wine grapes, fruits and nuts, and milk.

Crop growth and development will be affected, as will the intensity and frequency of pest and disease outbreaks. Rising temperatures will likely aggravate ozone pollution, which makes plants more susceptible to disease and pests and interferes with plant growth.

In addition, continued global warming will likely shift the ranges of existing invasive plants and weeds and alter competition patterns with native plants. Range expansion is expected in many species while range contractions are less likely in rapidly evolving species with significant populations already established. Should range contractions occur, it is likely that new or different weed species will fill the emerging gaps. Continued global warming is also likely to alter the abundance and types of many pests, lengthen pests' breeding season, and increase pathogen growth rates.

### **Forests and Landscapes**

Global warming is expected to alter the distribution and character of natural vegetation thereby resulting in a possible increased risk of large of wildfires. If temperatures rise into the medium warming range, the risk of large wildfires in California could increase by as much as 55%, which is almost twice the increase expected if temperatures stay in the lower warming range. However, since wildfire risk is determined by a combination of factors, including precipitation, winds, temperature, and landscape and vegetation conditions, future risks will not be uniform throughout the state. For example, if precipitation increases as temperatures rise, wildfires in southern California are expected to increase by approximately 30% toward the end of the century. In contrast, precipitation decreases could increase wildfires in northern California by up to 90%.

Moreover, continued global warming will alter natural ecosystems and biological diversity within the state. For example, alpine and sub-alpine ecosystems are expected to decline by as much as 60% to 80% by the end of the century as a result of increasing temperatures. The productivity of the state's forests is also expected to decrease as a result of global warming.

### **Rising Sea Levels**

Rising sea levels, more intense coastal storms, and warmer water temperatures will increasingly threaten the state's coastal regions. Under the higher warming scenario, sea level is anticipated to rise between 16.56 inches (1.38 ft) to 65.76 inches (5.48 ft) by 2100. Elevations of this magnitude would inundate coastal areas with saltwater, accelerate coastal erosion, threaten vital levees and inland water systems, and disrupt wetlands and natural habitats.

## **ENERGY CONSUMPTION**

---

The consumption of nonrenewable energy (primarily gasoline and diesel fuel) associated with the operation of passenger, public transit, and commercial vehicles results in GHG emissions that ultimately result in global climate change. Alternative fuels such as natural gas, ethanol, and electricity (unless derived from solar, wind, nuclear, or other energy sources that do not produce carbon emissions) also result in GHG emissions and contribute to global climate change.

### **Electricity Consumption**

California relies on a regional power system composed of a diverse mix of natural gas, renewable, hydroelectric, and nuclear generation resources. Approximately 71 percent of the electrical power needed to meet California's demand is produced in the state. Approximately 29 percent of its electricity demand is imported from the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest (California Energy

Commission, 2012)<sup>6</sup>. In 2010, California's in-state generated electricity was derived from natural gas (53.4 percent), large hydroelectric resources (14.6 percent), coal (1.7 percent), nuclear sources (15.7 percent), and renewable resources that include geothermal, biomass, small hydroelectric resources, wind, and solar (14.6 percent) (California Energy Commission, 2012).

According to the California Energy Commission (CEC), total statewide electricity consumption increased from 166,979 gigawatt-hours (GWh) in 1980 to 228,038 GWh in 1990, which is an estimated annual growth rate of 3.66 percent. The statewide electricity consumption in 1997 was 246,225 GWh, reflecting an annual growth rate of 1.14 percent between 1990 and 1997 (California Energy Commission Energy Almanac, 2012). Statewide consumption was 274,985 GWh in 2010, an annual growth rate of 0.9 percent between 1997 and 2010.

### **Oil**

The primary energy source for the United States is oil, which is refined to produce fuels like gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel. Oil is a finite, nonrenewable energy source. World consumption of petroleum products has grown steadily in the last several decades. As of 2009, world consumption of oil had reached 96 million barrels per day. The United States, with approximately five percent of the world's population, accounts for approximately 19 percent of world oil consumption, or approximately 18.6 million barrels per day (The World Factbook 2009, Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2009). The transportation sector relies heavily on oil. In California, petroleum based fuels currently provide approximately 96 percent of the state's transportation energy needs (California Energy Commission, 2012).

### **Natural Gas/Propane**

The state produces approximately 12 percent of its natural gas, while obtaining 22 percent from Canada and 65 percent from the Rockies and the Southwest (California Energy Commission, 2012). In 2006, California produced 325.6 billion cubic feet of natural gas (California Energy Commission, 2012).

## 3.7.2 REGULATORY SETTING

### **FEDERAL**

---

#### **Clean Air Act**

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) was first signed into law in 1970. In 1977, and again in 1990, the law was substantially amended. The FCAA is the foundation for a national air pollution control effort, and it is composed of the following basic elements: NAAQS for criteria air pollutants, hazardous air pollutant standards, state attainment plans, motor National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) vehicle emissions standards, stationary source emissions standards and permits, acid rain control measures, stratospheric ozone protection, and enforcement provisions.

---

<sup>6</sup> California Energy Commission (2012). Energy Almanac. Retrieved August 2012, from <http://energyalmanac.ca.gov/overview/index.html>

The EPA is responsible for administering the FCAA. The FCAA requires the EPA to set NAAQS for several problem air pollutants based on human health and welfare criteria. Two types of NAAQS were established: primary standards, which protect public health, and secondary standards, which protect the public welfare from non-health-related adverse effects such as visibility reduction.

### **Energy Policy and Conservation Act**

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 sought to ensure that all vehicles sold in the U.S. would meet certain fuel economy goals. Through this Act, Congress established the first fuel economy standards for on-road motor vehicles in the United States. Pursuant to the Act, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration, which is part of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), is responsible for establishing additional vehicle standards and for revising existing standards.

Since 1990, the fuel economy standard for new passenger cars has been 27.5 mpg. Since 1996, the fuel economy standard for new light trucks (gross vehicle weight of 8,500 pounds or less) has been 20.7 mpg. Heavy-duty vehicles (i.e., vehicles and trucks over 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight) are not currently subject to fuel economy standards. Compliance with federal fuel economy standards is determined on the basis of each manufacturer's average fuel economy for the portion of its vehicles produced for sale in the U.S. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program, which is administered by the EPA, was created to determine vehicle manufacturers' compliance with the fuel economy standards. The EPA calculates a CAFE value for each manufacturer based on city and highway fuel economy test results and vehicle sales. Based on the information generated under the CAFE program, the USDOT is authorized to assess penalties for noncompliance.

### **Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct)**

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (EPAct) was passed to reduce the country's dependence on foreign petroleum and improve air quality. EPAct includes several parts intended to build an inventory of alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) in large, centrally fueled fleets in metropolitan areas. EPAct requires certain federal, state, and local government and private fleets to purchase a percentage of light duty AFVs capable of running on alternative fuels each year. In addition, financial incentives are included in EPAct. Federal tax deductions will be allowed for businesses and individuals to cover the incremental cost of AFVs. States are also required by the act to consider a variety of incentive programs to help promote AFVs.

### **Energy Policy Act of 2005**

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 was signed into law on August 8, 2005. Generally, the act provides for renewed and expanded tax credits for electricity generated by qualified energy sources, such as landfill gas; provides bond financing, tax incentives, grants, and loan guarantees for a clean renewable energy and rural community electrification; and establishes a federal purchase requirement for renewable energy.

### **Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)**

ISTEA (49 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.) promoted the development of intermodal transportation systems to maximize mobility as well as address national and local interests in air quality and energy. ISTEA contained factors that metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), such as SJCOG, were to address in developing transportation plans and programs, including some energy-related factors. To meet the ISTEA requirements, MPOs adopted explicit policies defining the social, economic, energy, and environmental values that were to guide transportation decisions in that metropolitan area. The planning process was then to address these policies. Another requirement was to consider the consistency of transportation planning with federal, state, and local energy goals. Through this requirement, energy consumption was expected to become a criterion, along with cost and other values that determine the best transportation solution.

### **The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)**

SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. § 507), renewed the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) of 1998 (23 U.S.C.; 49 U.S.C.) through FY 2009. SAFETEA-LU authorized the federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit. SAFETEA-LU addressed the many challenges facing our transportation system today—such as improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment—as well as laying the groundwork for addressing future challenges. SAFETEA-LU promoted more efficient and effective federal surface transportation programs by focusing on transportation issues of national significance, while giving state and local transportation decision makers more flexibility to solve transportation problems in their communities. SAFETEA-LU was extended in March of 2010 for nine months, and expired in December of the same year. In June 2012, SAFETEA-LU was replaced by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), which will take effect October 1, 2012.

### **Federal Climate Change Policy**

According to the EPA, “the United States government has established a comprehensive policy to address climate change” that includes slowing the growth of emissions; strengthening science, technology, and institutions; and enhancing international cooperation. To implement this policy, “the Federal government is using voluntary and incentive-based programs to reduce emissions and has established programs to promote climate technology and science.” The federal government’s goal is to reduce the greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity (a measurement of GHG emissions per unit of economic activity) of the American economy by 18 percent over the 10-year period from 2002 to 2012. In addition, the EPA administers multiple programs that encourage voluntary GHG reductions, including “ENERGY STAR”, “Climate Leaders”, and Methane Voluntary Programs. However, as of this writing, there are no adopted federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws directly regulating GHG emissions.

### **Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule**

On September 22, 2009, EPA issued a final rule for mandatory reporting of GHGs from large GHG emissions sources in the United States. In general, this national reporting requirement will provide EPA with accurate and timely GHG emissions data from facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. This publically available data will allow the reporters to track their own emissions, compare them to similar facilities, and aid in identifying cost effective opportunities to reduce emissions in the future. Reporting is at the facility level, except that certain suppliers of fossil fuels and industrial greenhouse gases along with vehicle and engine manufacturers will report at the corporate level. An estimated 85% of the total U.S. GHG emissions, from approximately 10,000 facilities, are covered by this final rule.

## STATE

---

### **Assembly Bill 1493**

In response to AB 1493, CARB approved amendments to the California Code of Regulations (CCR) adding GHG emission standards to California's existing motor vehicle emission standards. Amendments to CCR Title 13 Sections 1900 (CCR 13 1900) and 1961 (CCR 13 1961), and adoption of Section 1961.1 (CCR 13 1961.1) require automobile manufacturers to meet fleet average GHG emission limits for all passenger cars, light-duty trucks within various weight criteria, and medium-duty passenger vehicle weight classes beginning with the 2009 model year. Emission limits are further reduced each model year through 2016. For passenger cars and light-duty trucks 3,750 pounds or less loaded vehicle weight (LVW), the 2016 GHG emission limits are approximately 37 percent lower than during the first year of the regulations in 2009. For medium-duty passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks 3,751 LVW to 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight (GVW), GHG emissions are reduced approximately 24 percent between 2009 and 2016.

CARB requested a waiver of federal preemption of California's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards. The intent of the waiver is to allow California to enact emissions standards to reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles in accordance with the regulation amendments to the CCRs that fulfill the requirements of AB 1493. The EPA granted a waiver to California to implement its greenhouse gas emissions standards for cars.

### **Assembly Bill 1007**

Assembly Bill 1007, (Pavley, Chapter 371, Statutes of 2005) directed the CEC to prepare a plan to increase the use of alternative fuels in California. As a result, the CEC prepared the State Alternative Fuels Plan in consultation with the state, federal, and local agencies. The plan presents strategies and actions California must take to increase the use of alternative non-petroleum fuels in a manner that minimizes costs to California and maximizes the economic benefits of in-state production. The Plan assessed various alternative fuels and developed fuel portfolios to meet California's goals to reduce petroleum consumption, increase alternative fuels use, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase in-state production of biofuels without causing a significant degradation of public health and environmental quality.

### **Bioenergy Action Plan – Executive Order #S-06-06**

Executive Order #S-06-06 establishes targets for the use and production of biofuels and biopower and directs state agencies to work together to advance biomass programs in California while providing environmental protection and mitigation. The executive order establishes the following target to increase the production and use of bioenergy, including ethanol and biodiesel fuels made from renewable resources: produce a minimum of 20 percent of its biofuels within California by 2010, 40 percent by 2020, and 75 percent by 2050. The executive order also calls for the state to meet a target for use of biomass electricity.

### **California Executive Orders S-3-05 and S-20-06, and Assembly Bill 32**

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05. The goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California’s GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the 2020 and 3) 80% below the 1990 levels by the year 2050.

In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that CARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases.” Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state’s Climate Action Team.

### **Assembly Bill 32- Climate Change Scoping Plan**

**2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan:** On December 11, 2008 ARB adopted its *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (2008 Scoping Plan), which functions as a roadmap of ARB’s plans to achieve GHG reductions in California required by AB 32 through subsequently enacted regulations. The 2008 Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California has implemented to reduce CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions by 169 million metric tons (MMT), or approximately 30 percent, from the state’s projected 2020 emissions level of 596 MMT of CO<sub>2</sub>e under a business-as-usual scenario. (This is a reduction of 42 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e, or almost 10 percent, from 2002–2004 average emissions, but requires the reductions in the face of population and economic growth through 2020.) The 2008 Scoping Plan also breaks down the amount of GHG emissions reductions ARB recommends for each emissions sector of the state’s GHG inventory. The 2008 Scoping Plan calls for the largest reductions in GHG emissions to be achieved by implementing the following measures and standards:

- improved emissions standards for light-duty vehicles (estimated reductions of 31.7 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e),
- the Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (15.0 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e),
- energy efficiency measures in buildings and appliances and the widespread development of combined heat and power systems (26.3 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e), and
- a renewable portfolio standard for electricity production (21.3 MMT CO<sub>2</sub>e).

**First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan:** In June 2013, CARB kicked off a public process intended develop the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan (2014 Scoping Plan). The

public process included: regional workshops, input/advise from stakeholders, advise from the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, public review and comment of a draft Scoping Plan, and ultimately public hearings. On May 22, 2014, the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan was approved by the Board.

The 2014 Scoping Plan indicates that California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 greenhouse gas limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 as required by AB 32. The set of actions the State is taking is driving down greenhouse emissions and moving the State steadily in the direction of a cleaner energy economy. For instance, the 2014 Scoping Plan indicates that currently, about 23 percent of the State's electricity comes from renewable power and that this will increase to at least 33 percent by 2020 under new requirements set in place in 2011. The 2014 Scoping Plan indicates that collectively, the State's set of vehicle, fuels, and land use policies will cut in half emissions from passenger transportation and drivers' fuel costs over the next 20 years. The 2014 Scoping Plan cites California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) and California's vehicle GHG standards (Pavley) as two standards that have, and will continue to, dramatically scale up emission reductions in the future. The 2014 Scoping Plan cites work by regulators on developing a national GHG standard and corresponding fuel efficiency standard for medium- and heavy-duty trucks as well as California's pioneering zero emission vehicles (ZEV) regulation as areas where California is making major strides toward reducing the future GHG emission. The 2014 Scoping Plan indicates that seven Metropolitan Planning Organizations have adopted Sustainable Community Strategies that are intended to help drive GHG emission reductions, by creating more livable communities that offer greater housing and transportation options; improved access to resources and services; safer, more vibrant neighborhoods; and healthier lifestyles where people can live, work, and play without having to travel long distances or sit through congestion. Lastly, the 2014 Scoping Plan cites the Cap-and-Trade Program launched by California, as a program that will ensure that California remains on track to continually reduce emissions and meet the 2020 limit and play a critical role in keeping California on the right emissions reduction trajectory to meet ongoing reduction targets at the lowest possible cost.

### **California Strategy to Reduce Petroleum Dependence (AB 2076)**

In response to the requirements of AB 2076 (Chapter 936, Statutes of 2000), the CEC and the CARB developed a strategy to reduce petroleum dependence in California. The strategy, *Reducing California's Petroleum Dependence*, was adopted by the CEC and CARB in 2003. The strategy recommends that California reduce on-road gasoline and diesel fuel demand to 15 percent below 2003 demand levels by 2020 and maintain that level for the foreseeable future; the Governor and Legislature work to establish national fuel economy standards that double the fuel efficiency of new cars, light trucks, and sport utility vehicles (SUVs); and increase the use of non-petroleum fuels to 20 percent of on-road fuel consumption by 2020 and 30 percent by 2030.

### **Climate Action Program at Caltrans**

The California Department of Transportation, Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, prepared a Climate Action Program in response to new regulatory directives. The goal of the Climate Action Program is to promote clean and energy efficient transportation, and provide

guidance for mainstreaming energy and climate change issues into business operations. The overall approach to lower fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> from transportation is twofold: (1) reduce congestion and improve efficiency of transportation systems through smart land use, operational improvements, and Intelligent Transportation Systems; and (2) institutionalize energy efficiency and GHG emission reduction measures and technology into planning, project development, operations, and maintenance of transportation facilities, fleets, buildings, and equipment.

The reasoning underlying the Climate Action Program is the conclusion that “the most effective approach to addressing GHG reduction, in the short-to-medium term, is strong technology policy and market mechanisms to encourage innovations. Rapid development and availability of alternative fuels and vehicles, increased efficiency in new cars and trucks (light and heavy duty), and super clean fuels are the most direct approach to reducing GHG emissions from motor vehicles (emission performance standards and fuel or carbon performance standards).”

### **Governor’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard (Executive Order #S-01-07)**

Executive Order #S-01-07 establishes a statewide goal to reduce the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020 through establishment of a Low Carbon Fuel Standard. The Low Carbon Fuel Standard is incorporated into the State Alternative Fuels Plan and is one of the proposed discrete early action GHG reduction measures identified by CARB pursuant to AB 32.

### **Senate Bill 97 (SB 97)**

Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007) required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop recommended amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines for addressing greenhouse gas emissions. OPR prepared its recommended amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines to provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of greenhouse gas emissions in draft CEQA documents. The Amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.

### **Senate Bill 375**

Sen. Bill No. 375 (Stats. 2008, ch. 728) (SB 375) was built on AB 32 (California’s 2006 climate change law). SB 375’s core provision is a requirement for regional transportation agencies to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in order to reduce GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. The SCS is one component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The SCS outlines the region’s plan for combining transportation resources, such as roads and mass transit, with a realistic land use pattern, in order to meet a state target for reducing GHG emissions. The strategy must take into account the region’s housing needs, transportation demands, and protection of resource and farmlands.

Additionally, SB 375 modified the state’s Housing Element Law to achieve consistency between the land use pattern outlined in the SCS and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation. The legislation also substantially improved cities’ and counties’ accountability for carrying out their housing element plans.

Finally, SB 375 amended the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) to ease the environmental review of developments that help reduce the growth of GHG emissions.

### **California Building Energy Efficiency Standards**

Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, known as the Building Energy Efficiency Standards, was established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. On January 1, 2010, the California Building Standards Commission adopted CALGreen and became the first state in the United States to adopt a statewide green building standards code. CALGreen requires new buildings to reduce water consumption by 20 percent, divert 50 percent of construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting materials.

### **CEQA Guidelines Appendix F**

In order to assure that energy implications are considered in project decisions, the California Environmental Quality Act requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. The goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy.

## **LOCAL**

---

### **San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Climate Change Action Plan**

In August 2008, the San Joaquin Valley APCD adopted its Climate Change Action Plan. The Climate Change Action Plan directed the SJVAPCD's Air Pollution Control Officer to develop guidance to assist APCD staff, Valley businesses, land use agencies and other permitting agencies in addressing GHG emissions as part of the CEQA process. Regarding CEQA guidance, some of the goals of the Climate Change Action Plan are to assist local land use agencies, developers and the public by identifying and quantifying GHG emission reduction measures for development projects and by providing tools to streamline evaluation of project-specific GHG effects, and to assist Valley businesses in complying with State law related to GHG emissions.

A product of this direction to provide CEQA guidance is the Final Staff Report – Climate Change Action Plan: Addressing GHG Emissions Impacts, presented to the APCD Board in December 2009. A central component of the Final Staff Report is the establishment of Best Performance Standards, which are specifications or project design elements that identify effective, feasible GHG emission reduction measures. Emission reductions achieved through Best Performance Standards implementation would be pre-quantified, thus negating the need for project-specific quantification of GHG emissions.

For projects not implementing Best Performance Standards, demonstration of a 29% reduction in GHG emissions from business-as-usual conditions is required to determine that a project would have a less than cumulatively significant impact. Appendix J of the Final Staff Report provides a table of GHG emission reduction measures for development projects, along with a point value that corresponds to a percentage decrease in GHG emissions when available.

### **2014 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy**

The 2014 San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Plan, which has been named “Valley Visions San Joaquin,” will be the first Regional Transportation Plan in San Joaquin County to contain a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), the result of the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (i.e., SB-375). The SCS will coordinate future transportation investments and land use strategies to prioritize a multi-modal investment plan covering a 27-year period extending out to 2040.

The RTP is a long-range transportation plan that guides the region’s transportation improvements over a minimum of 20-years and is updated every four. Using growth forecasts and economic trends projected out over study timeframe, the RTP considers the role of transportation in the broader context of economic, environmental, and quality-of-life goals for the future, identifying regional transportation strategies to address our mobility needs. The 2014 RTP will address all transportation modes including motor vehicles, transit (commuter and local), rail (commuter and inter-regional), goods movement (rail, truck, and water), bicycle and pedestrian facilities, aviation systems, transportation systems management (TSM) and transportation demand management (TDM) programs, and other projects considered over the planning horizon of 2040. Regional transportation improvement projects proposed to be funded, in whole or in part, in the state transportation improvement program must be included in the adopted RTP.

The eight counties of the San Joaquin Valley are coordinating on some aspects of these planning efforts to maximize resources, with each area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) developing a separate plan. MPOs are responsible for setting transportation policy and priorities for a region and documenting how transportation funds will be spent in a Regional Transportation Plan. Specifically, the San Joaquin County SCS will:

- Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region
- Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region
- Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region
- Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region
- Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region
- Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region
- Quantify the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions projected to be achieved by the SCS

The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for the 2014 San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Plan are as follows:

- 5% - per capita reduction from 2005 levels by 2020
- 10%--per capita reduction from 2005 levels by 2035

### 3.7.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, climate change-related impacts are considered significant if implementation of the proposed Project would do any of the following:

1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

In accordance with AB 32, the City of Manteca, as lead agency, has prepared a quantitative GHG analysis for the proposed Project in order to demonstrate that the proposed Project would promote sustainability and implement operational GHG emission reduction strategies that would reduce the project's GHG emissions from Business as Usual (BAU) levels by 29 percent, in compliance with AB 32 and the Scoping Plan, and in accordance with the guidance from the SJVAPCD.

The significance thresholds for GHG emissions should be related to compliance with AB 32, and the City of Manteca, as lead agency, has chosen to utilize a threshold of significance for GHG emissions based on the guidance from the SJVAPCD that a development project must show a minimum GHG emission reduction of 29 percent from projected 2005 Business as Usual (BAU) levels by the year 2020. The BAU level is the 2005 scenario, which corresponds to pre-AB 32. The BAU levels does not assume the use of Paveley and Low Carbon fuels, which is a result of legislation after AB 32. Thus, the proposed Project's BAU levels were evaluated in order to determine the net decrease in the proposed Project's GHG emissions over time.

Using this methodology, if the proposed Project does not show a 29 percent reduction from projected BAU levels compared to the project's estimated 2020 levels, the project would be considered to result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. GHG emission reduction measures could include, but are not limited to, compliance with local, State, or federal plans or strategies for GHG reductions, on-site and off-site mitigation recommendations from the Office of the Attorney General, and project design features. It should be noted that the proposed Project would be required to comply with the minimum mandated measures of 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen Code), such as a 20 percent mandatory reduction in indoor water use and diversion of 50 percent of construction waste from landfills. A variety of voluntary CalGreen Code measures also exists that would further reduce GHG emissions, but are not mandatory.

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Impact 3.7-1: Potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment or potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (less than significant with mitigation)**

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Therefore, the cumulative global emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change can be attributed to every nation, region, and city, and virtually every individual on Earth. A project’s GHG emissions are at a micro-scale relative to global emissions, but could result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to a significant cumulative macro-scale impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would contribute to increases of GHG emissions that are associated with global climate change. Estimated GHG emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of CO<sub>2</sub> and other GHG pollutants, such as methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), from mobile sources and utility usage.

The proposed Project’s short-term construction-related and long-term operational GHG emissions for Buildout of the proposed Project, which collectively includes Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, and Future Phases, were estimated using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod)<sup>TM</sup> (v.2013.2.2). CalEEMod is a statewide model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify GHG emissions from land use projects. The model quantifies direct GHG emissions from construction and operation (including vehicle use), as well as indirect GHG emissions, such as GHG emissions from energy use, solid waste disposal, vegetation planting and/or removal, and water use. Emissions are expressed in annual metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent units of measure (i.e., MTCO<sub>2</sub>e), based on the global warming potential of the individual pollutants.

**Short-Term Construction GHG Emissions:** Estimated increases in GHG emissions associated with construction of the proposed Project (all phases collectively) are summarized in Table 3.7-1.

**TABLE 3.7-1: CONSTRUCTION GHG EMISSIONS (UNMITIGATED METRIC TONS/YR)**

	<i>Bio- CO2</i>	<i>NBio- CO2</i>	<i>Total CO2</i>	<i>CH4</i>	<i>N2O</i>	<i>CO2e</i>
2016	0.0000	1,174.8124	1,174.8124	0.1311	0.0000	1,177.5652
2017	0.0000	1,292.3371	1,292.3371	0.1019	0.0000	1,294.4768
2018	0.0000	1,266.6928	1,266.6928	0.0991	0.0000	1,268.7735
2019	0.0000	861.3200	861.3200	0.0858	0.0000	863.1211
2020	0.0000	25.6632	25.6632	1.3800e-003	0.0000	25.6922
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>4,620.8254</b>	<b>4,620.8254</b>	<b>0.4192</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>4,629.6287</b>

SOURCES: CAL EEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

As presented in the table, short-term construction emissions of GHG associated with development of all phases collectively are estimated to be 4,629.6 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. This represents a low of 25.7 and a

high of 1,294.5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e emitted during each of the construction years (2016 through 2020). These construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are comparatively much lower than emissions associated with operational phases of a project. Cumulatively, these construction emissions would not generate a significant contribution to global climate change.

**Long-Term Operational GHG Emissions:** The long-term operational GHG emissions estimate for buildout of the proposed Project, which collectively includes Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, and Future Phases, incorporates the potential area source and vehicle emissions, and emissions associated with utility and water usage, and wastewater and solid waste generation. The modeling included mitigation inputs for the year 2020 including the following:

#### Traffic Mitigation

- Increase Transit Accessibility in the Plan Area (minimum distance to transit stops is .2 miles)
- Improve Pedestrian Network so that the Plan Area connects to offsite pedestrian networks
- Provide traffic calming measures on all street segments and intersections

#### Energy Mitigation

- Exceed Title 24 by 15%
- Install High Efficiency Lighting
- Install High Efficiency Appliances within buildings

#### Water Mitigation

- Apply a Water Conservation Strategy to achieve a 20% reduction in indoor and outdoor water usage
- Utilize the City's reclaimed water system to irrigate outdoor landscaping, including medians once available (i.e. installation recycled water infrastructure to the Plan Area)
- Install low flow bathroom faucet
- Install low-flow kitchen faucet
- Install low-flow toilet
- Install low-flow shower
- Use water-efficient irrigation systems

#### Solid Waste Mitigation

- Institute Recycling and Composting Services to achieve a 50% reduction in waste disposal

Estimated GHG emissions associated with the buildout of the proposed Project (all phases) in 2020 with and without the above mitigation incorporated are summarized in Table 3.7-2 and 3.7-3. As shown in the table, the annual 2020 GHG emissions associated with buildout of the proposed Project (all phases) would be 22,636.9 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e with the above referenced mitigation incorporated and 27,855.7 without mitigation. The mitigation results in a decrease of 5,218.8 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e.

## 3.7 GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

**TABLE 3.7-2: OPERATIONAL GHG EMISSIONS 2020 (UNMITIGATED METRIC TONS/YR)**

	<i>Bio- CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>NBio- CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>Total CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub>e</i>
Area	0.0000	0.0939	0.0939	2.5000e-004	0.0000	0.0992
Energy	0.0000	4,205.0682	4,205.0682	0.1556	0.0512	4,224.2191
Mobile	0.0000	22,230.8187	22,230.8187	0.7229	0.0000	22,245.9993
Waste	462.7057	0.0000	462.7057	27.3451	0.0000	1,036.9533
Water	21.2731	264.3073	285.5804	2.1969	0.0541	348.4752
<b>Total</b>	<b>483.9788</b>	<b>26,700.2881</b>	<b>27,184.2669</b>	<b>30.4208</b>	<b>0.1053</b>	<b>27,855.7461</b>

SOURCES: CALEEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

**TABLE 3.7-3: OPERATIONAL GHG EMISSIONS 2020 (MITIGATED METRIC TONS/YR)**

	<i>Bio- CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>NBio- CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>Total CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub>e</i>
Area	0.0000	0.0939	0.0939	2.5000e-004	0.0000	0.0992
Energy	0.0000	3,689.3169	3,689.3169	0.1366	0.0449	3,706.1158
Mobile	0.0000	18,127.8279	18,127.8279	0.6069	0.0000	18,140.5722
Waste	231.3529	0.0000	231.3529	13.6726	0.0000	518.4767
Water	17.0185	204.3932	221.4116	1.7572	0.0432	271.7003
<b>Total</b>	<b>248.3713</b>	<b>22,021.6319</b>	<b>22,270.0032</b>	<b>16.1735</b>	<b>0.0881</b>	<b>22,636.9641</b>

SOURCES: CALEEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

The significance thresholds for GHG emissions should be related to compliance with AB 32, and the City of Manteca, as lead agency, has chosen to utilize a threshold of significance for GHG emissions based on the guidance from the SJVAPCD that a development project must show a minimum GHG emission reduction of 29 percent from projected Business as Usual (BAU) levels (i.e., 2005 scenario) by the year 2020. Thus, the proposed Project's (all phases) Business as Usual levels were evaluated in order to determine the net decrease in the proposed Project's (all phases) GHG emissions over time. Table 3.7-4 presents the projected BAU GHG emissions, which are estimated to be 35,803.7 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e.

**TABLE 3.7-4: OPERATIONAL GHG EMISSIONS BUSINESS AS USUAL (UNMITIGATED METRIC TONS/YR)**

	<i>Bio- CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>NBio- CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>Total CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>CH<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>N<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>CO<sub>2</sub>e</i>
Area	0.0000	0.0939	0.0939	4.4000e-004	0.0000	0.1030
Energy	0.0000	4,205.0682	4,205.0682	0.1556	0.0512	4,224.2191
Mobile	0.0000	30,130.0649	30,130.0649	3.0414	0.0000	30,193.9344
Waste	462.7057	0.0000	462.7057	27.3451	0.0000	1,036.9533
Water	21.2731	264.3073	285.5804	2.1969	0.0541	348.4752
<b>Total</b>	<b>483.9788</b>	<b>34,599.5343</b>	<b>35,083.5131</b>	<b>32.7395</b>	<b>0.1053</b>	<b>35,803.6850</b>

SOURCES: CALEEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

Consequently, the proposed Project (all phases) would result in approximately a 36.8 percent reduction in annual GHG emissions from the BAU level by 2020 ( $[(35,803.7 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{e} - 22,637.0 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{e}) / 35,803.7 \text{ MTCO}_2\text{e}] \times 100\% = 36.8\%$ ). The reduction in GHG emissions would be attributable to the traffic, energy, water, and solid waste mitigation model inputs as well as the

advancement of vehicle and equipment efficiency, and more stringent standards and regulations as time progresses, such as State regulation emission reductions (e.g., Pavley, Low Carbon Fuel Standard, and Renewable Portfolio Standard). It should be noted that although a reduction related to such attributes would occur for every development project, CalEEMod takes into consideration how much of each attribute is applied for each specific project based on the size of the project and associated land uses.

In addition, as stated previously, the proposed Project (all phases) would be required to comply with the minimum mandatory measures of the CalGreen Code, which would result in an estimated 1.8 percent reduction. Furthermore, reduction of cumulative ROG and NOx emissions due to the Indirect Source Rule mitigation (discussed in Section 3.1 Air Quality) would subsequently result in an associated reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The total reduction in GHG emissions from BAU levels will exceed the minimum reduction threshold of 29 percent per the guidance provided by the SJVAPCD.

**Energy Consumption:** As shown in Table 3.7-3 above, “Energy” is one of the categories that were modeled for GHG emissions. The total GHG 2020 emissions generated from the “Energy” category is 4,224.2 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e without mitigation and 3,706.1 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e with mitigation. The following discussion includes a more detailed breakdown of energy consumption in terms of natural gas and electricity consumption. The modeling was performed with and without mitigation. The mitigation measures incorporated into the model are intended to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, and maintenance/landscaping. The mitigation assumed in the modeling includes:

- Exceed Title 24 by 15%
- Install High Efficiency Lighting
- Install High Efficiency Appliances within all Industrial and Commercial buildings

Natural Gas: Unmitigated natural gas energy consumption by land uses within the proposed project (all phases) is presented in Table 3.7-5 below. This table also includes the GHG emissions that are generated by the natural gas use. Table 3.7.6 shows the natural gas consumption by land uses within the proposed project (all phases) with mitigation incorporated.

As shown, the mitigation incorporated would result in a reduction of 3,071,286.00 kBtu of natural gas consumption on an annual basis. This represents a reduction of 12.4 percent in natural gas consumption in a year.

## 3.7 GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

**TABLE 3.7-5: NATURAL GAS USE AND GHG EMISSIONS BY LAND USE (UNMITIGATED)**

Land Use(all phases of development)	Natural Gas Use	Bio-CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	kBTU	MT/yr					
High Turnover (Sit Down Restaurant)	6.66E+06	0.0000	355.4118	355.4118	6.8100e-003	6.5200e-003	357.5747
Hotel	1.03E+07	0.0000	548.4957	548.4957	0.0105	0.0101	551.8338
Hotel	4.20E+06	0.0000	224.0335	224.0335	4.2900e-003	4.1100e-003	225.3969
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Recreational Swimming Pool	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	3.29E+06	0.0000	175.3752	175.3752	3.3600e-003	3.2200e-003	176.4425
Regional Shopping Center	4.04E+05	0.0000	21.5667	21.5667	4.1000e-004	4.0000e-004	21.6979
City Park	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,827,344.00</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1,324.8828</b>	<b>1,324.8828</b>	<b>0.0254</b>	<b>0.0243</b>	<b>1,332.9459</b>

SOURCES: CAL EEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

**TABLE 3.7-6: NATURAL GAS USE AND GHG EMISSIONS BY LAND USE (MITIGATED)**

Land Use(all phases of development)	Natural Gas Use	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	kBTU	MT/yr					
High Turnover (Sit Down Restaurant)	6.28E+06	0.0000	334.9981	334.9981	6.4200e-003	6.1400e-003	337.0368
Hotel	3.57E+06	0.0000	190.7393	190.7393	3.6600e-003	3.5000e-003	191.9001
Hotel	8.75E+06	0.0000	466.9823	466.9823	8.9500e-003	8.5600e-003	469.8243
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Recreational Swimming Pool	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	2.81E+06	0.0000	149.8395	149.8395	2.8700e-003	2.7500e-003	150.7514
Regional Shopping Center	3.45E+05	0.0000	18.4264	18.4264	3.5000e-004	3.4000e-004	18.5386
City Park	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,756,058.00</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>1,160.9856</b>	<b>1,160.9856</b>	<b>0.0223</b>	<b>0.0213</b>	<b>1,168.0512</b>

SOURCES: CAL EEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

**Electricity:** Unmitigated electricity energy consumption by land uses within the proposed project (all phases) is presented in Table 3.7-7 below. This table also includes the GHG emissions that are generated by the electricity use. Table 3.7.8 shows the electricity consumption by land uses within the proposed project (all phases) with mitigation incorporated.

As shown, the mitigation incorporated would result in a reduction 1,209,479.00 kWh of electricity consumption on an annual basis. This represents a reduction of 12.2 percent in electricity consumption in a year.

**TABLE 3.7-7: ELECTRICITY USE AND GHG EMISSIONS BY LAND USE (UNMITIGATED)**

<i>Land Use (all phases of development)</i>	<i>Electricity Use</i>	<i>Total CO2</i>	<i>CH4</i>	<i>N2O</i>	<i>CO2e</i>
	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
City Park	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
High Turnover (Sit Down Restaurant)	2,006,890.00	583.8264	0.0264	5.4600e-003	586.0739
Hotel	1,123,110.00	326.7262	0.0148	3.0600e-003	327.9840
Hotel	2,749,690.00	799.9158	0.0362	7.4800e-003	802.9952
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Recreational Swimming Pool	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	3,580,550.00	1,041.6239	0.0471	9.7400e-003	1,045.6338
Regional Shopping Center	440,317.00	128.0932	5.7900e-003	1.2000e-003	128.5863
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,900,557.00</b>	<b>2,880.1854</b>	<b>0.1302</b>	<b>0.0269</b>	<b>2,891.2732</b>

SOURCES: CALSEEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

**TABLE 3.7-8: ELECTRICITY USE AND GHG EMISSIONS BY LAND USE (MITIGATED)**

<i>Land Use (all phases of development)</i>	<i>Electricity Use</i>	<i>Total CO2</i>	<i>CH4</i>	<i>N2O</i>	<i>CO2e</i>
	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
City Park	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
High Turnover (Sit Down Restaurant)	1,859,500.00	540.9487	0.0245	5.0600e-003	543.0312
Hotel	2,374,680.00	690.8209	0.0312	6.4600e-003	693.4803
Hotel	969,939.00	282.1663	0.0128	2.6400e-003	283.2525
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Recreational Swimming Pool	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Regional Shopping Center	3,105,110.00	903.3112	0.0409	8.4500e-003	906.7887
Regional Shopping Center	381,849.00	111.0843	5.0200e-003	1.0400e-003	111.5119
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,691,078.00</b>	<b>2,528.3313</b>	<b>0.1143</b>	<b>0.0237</b>	<b>2,538.0646</b>

SOURCES: CALSEEMOD (v.2013.2.2)

**Conclusion:** As stated previously, short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed Project. With the implementation of the following mitigation measure and those presented in Section 3.1 Air Quality, the overall annual GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project (all phases) would be reduced by over 36.8 percent by the year 2020, consistent with applicable standards and thresholds of a 29 percent reduction. Because the proposed Project (all phases) would meet the 29 percent minimum reduction threshold, the proposed Project (all phases) would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target.

As previously discussed, the Final Staff Report for the SJVAPCD's Climate Change Action Plan provides a table of GHG emission reduction measures for development projects, along with a point value that corresponds to a percentage decrease in GHG emissions when available. According to the Final Staff Report, projects achieving a 29% reduction in GHG emissions would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. The percentage reduction is consistent with the GHG reduction percentage sought by the state's Scoping Plan. As discussed, the GHG emission reductions anticipated from project features plus the proposed

## 3.7 GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

---

mitigation measures would be at 36.8%. Therefore, the proposed Project (all phases) would be consistent with the reduction target set in the Climate Change Action Plan.

Overall, the proposed Project (all phases) would be consistent with the reduction targets established by the Scoping Plan and the APCD. Based on the criteria set forth in the APCD's Climate Change Action Plan, the proposed Project (all phases) would have an individual and cumulative impact that is less than significant.

The project's energy requirements would be reduced by 12.4 percent (natural gas) and 12.2 percent (electricity) with the incorporation of mitigation. The energy requirements for the proposed Project (all phases) would come from PG&E and would not adversely affect the local and regional energy supplies or cause a need for additional capacity. PG&E manages the supply and transmission of electricity and natural gas for the region in an effort to maintain a quality supply at base and peak periods of demand. The proposed Project (all phases) will comply with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, known as the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. This includes the CALGreen requirements for new buildings to reduce water consumption by 20 percent, divert 50 percent of construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting materials. The City will review individual building plans as they are prepared to ensure that they comply with the latest Title 24 requirements, including CALGreen.

Implementation of the proposed Project (all phases) would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation related to GHG reduction, and impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change would be considered **less-than-significant** with the implementation of mitigation measures.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.7-1:** *To reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Consumption, the project proponent shall institute measures to reduce wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, and maintenance/landscaping. As the individual phases, or portions of individual phases, are designed and undergo Design Review by the City of Manteca, there should be an explanation as to why certain measures were incorporated in the individual phases, or portions of individual phases and why other measures were dismissed. The following measures should be incorporated into the individual phases, or portions of individual phases, as applicable:*

- *Increase transit accessibility in the Plan Area by ensuring a minimum distance of 0.2 miles to transit stops*
- *Ensure that the pedestrian network within the Plan Area connects to offsite pedestrian networks*
- *Provide traffic calming measures on all street segments and intersections*
- *Exceed Title 24 by 15% for energy and green building standards (using a baseline of 2015 Title 24 requirements)*
- *Install high efficiency lighting and appliance within all buildings*
- *Apply a water conservation strategy to achieve a 15% reduction in indoor/outdoor water usage (using a baseline of 2015 average water usage)*

- *Install recycled water infrastructure within the outdoor landscaping areas, including medians, to make the project available for the use of reclaimed water. The City's reclaimed water system is anticipated in the reasonably foreseeable future, but to the extent that the City's reclaimed water system is not available to provide recycled water for irrigation irrigate outdoor landscaping of an individual phase, or portion of the individual phase, the project proponent must still install recycled water infrastructure such that it can be connected when the City's reclaimed water system becomes available.*
- *Install low-flow faucets, toilets, and showers as applicable*
- *Use water-efficient irrigation systems throughout the Plan Area*
- *Institute Recycling and Composting Services to achieve a 50% reduction in waste disposal (compared to a baseline of a business as usual approach in 2015)*

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

The purpose of this section is to disclose and analyze the potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials related to the Plan Area and general vicinity, and to analyze the potential for exposure of people to hazards and hazardous materials as the project is built and operated in the future. This section is based in part on the following technical studies: *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City of Manteca as amended through 2013), *Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report* (City of Manteca 2003), and *Preliminary Wetland Delineation, French Camp Outlet Canal Improvements and Manteca Family Entertainment Zone Project* (De Novo 2014). There were no NOP comments received during the public review period(s) regarding this topic.

### 3.8.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### PHYSICAL SETTING

The Plan Area is located in the City of Manteca, San Joaquin County, California. The Plan Area is located on the Lathrop, California, USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle, Township 2 South, Range 6 East. The UTM coordinates for the center point of the Plan Area are 652688.47536 W, 4183417.94368 N (zone 10N, NAD 83, meters). The Lat/Long coordinates are 37.7853 N, -121.2660 W (WGS 84, decimal degrees).

The Plan Area is located to the north and west of the Stadium Shopping Center, to the west of Milo Candini Drive, to the east of McKinley Avenue, to the south of the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF), and to the north of State Route 120. The property is comprised of approximately 210.7 acres, of which 28.5 acres are already developed (Big League Dreams) and 182.2 acres would be developed with various public serving regional and local recreation, parks and sporting facilities including visitor serving commercial uses and public infrastructure to be developed in phases.

Vegetation in the Plan Area can be broken up into upland and wetland communities. Common plant species observed within the upland communities include: wild oat (*Avena barbata*), rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), softchess (*Bromus hordeaceus*) alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), Italian thistle (*Carduus pycnocephalus*), rough pigweed (*Amaranthus retroflexus*), sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), tarragon (*Artemisia dracunculus*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), telegraphweed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*), sow thistle (*Sonchus asper*), telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), barley (*Hordeum* sp.), milkthistle (*Silybum marianum*), mustard (*Brassica niger*), and heliotrope (*Heliotropium curassavicum*).

Common plant species in the wetland communities include: tapertip rush (*Juncus acuminatus*), tule (*Schoenoplectus acutus*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), hyssop loosestrife (*Lythrum hyssopifolia*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), black willow (*Salix goodingia*), stinging nettles (*Urtica dioica*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), willow herb (*Epilobium brachycarpum*), horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*), Canadian waterweed (*Elodea canadensis*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), spiny sowthistle (*Sonchus asper*), horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), cocklebur (*Xanthium strumarium*), and yellow sweetclover (*Melilotus officinalis*).

## 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Plan Area has been leveled for agricultural uses. Topographic features within the Plan Area include level agricultural fields, an irrigation canal, and wetland areas. Elevation ranges from approximately 20 feet to 25 feet above mean sea level (MSL).

The USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey indicates the presence of five soil series occurring within the Plan Area. Table 3.8-1 identifies the soils found in the Plan Area.

**TABLE 3.8-1: USDA SOIL SERIES INFORMATION**

<i>SOIL SERIES</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>SOURCE MATERIAL</i>	<i>PEDON/DEPTH</i>	<i>DRAINAGE</i>
Bisgani	loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	40 to 60 inches	Poorly drained
Delhi	Loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Wind-modified alluvium	40 to 60 inches	Well drained
Timor	Loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	50 to 60 inches	Well drained
Tinnin	Loamy coarse sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	53 to 75 inches	Well drained
Veritas	Fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from mixed rock sources	54 to 70 inches	Moderately well drained

- SOURCE: USDA/NRCS, WEB SOIL SURVEY, 2014.

### HAZARDS ASSESSMENT

The Plan Area was assessed for environmental hazards. The objective of the assessment was to provide an evaluation of current and historical use of the Plan Area to assess whether such use has, or is expected to, result in environmental degradation of the Plan Area.

#### Site Reconnaissance

A site reconnaissance was conducted on March 28, 2014. On the date of the site reconnaissance the Plan Area was observed to be largely under agricultural use. The only structure located on the property is a single-wide mobile home unit that was formerly used in conjunction with the Manteca Police Department shooting range, which was located on the site. The shooting range will need to be decommissioned and inspected for possible contamination from ammunition prior to any ground disturbance. The former Manteca Police Department facility is located approximately at the proposed intersection of the Wawona Street and the Loop Road, which is anticipated to be built in Phase 2 or 3. Figure 3.8-1 illustrates the location of these sites.

There are several dirt farm-roadways that transect the Plan Area. The north-south farm-road that is located just north of the former shooting range serves as a scrap yard for remnant construction and/or farming materials (i.e. remnant pipes, etc.). These materials will need to be inspected/tested for possible contamination and asbestos, and appropriately disposed of prior to any ground disturbance in this area. The scrap materials appear in aerial photos before at least 2003. The area with the remnant construction and/or farming materials is located in an area that is anticipated to be built after Phase 4 (labeled as Future Phases in the Master Plan).

There is an area on the western side of the project near McKinley that has historically served as a farm yard for agricultural equipment, implements, etc. At the time of the site reconnaissance, the area would void of farming equipment and supplies.

There is an overhead transmission lines that bisect the Plan Area from the northeast to the southwest. Additionally, there is an irrigation canal that bisects the Plan Area from the south to northwest. The irrigation canal is proposed to be undergrounded.

### **Adjoining Properties**

The Plan Area is located on the fringe of development, with a commercial development and recreational facility located to the east, agricultural land to the northeast, a wastewater treatment plant to the north, a railroad to the northwest, and west, agricultural and rural residential land to the west, and SR 120 to the south.

### **Interviews**

Interviews with various persons familiar with the site vicinity, including representatives of the City of Manteca, were conducted for the purpose of identifying past and present uses, which may have contributed to Recognized Environmental Conditions in the Plan Area. Results of those interviews are discussed in the following sections.

#### OCCUPANTS

The Plan Area is vacant agricultural land as of the date of the site reconnaissance, therefore no occupants were interviewed.

#### OWNER OR KEY SITE MANAGER

The City of Manteca is the owner of the property and has confirmed the Plan Area has historically been vacant and used for agricultural purposes, with the exception of the shooting range for the Manteca Police Department as of the date of the site reconnaissance.

#### GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

The City of Manteca is the owner of the property and has confirmed the Plan Area has historically been vacant and used for agricultural purposes, with the exception of the shooting range for the Manteca Police Department as of the date of the site reconnaissance.

#### ABANDONED PROPERTIES

The Plan Area is not treated as a previously abandoned property. There is no evidence of potential unauthorized uses of the Plan Area or evidence of uncontrolled access to the site.

### **Historical Use Information**

Historical information was reviewed to develop a history of the previous uses of the Plan Area and surrounding area, in order to evaluate the Plan Area and adjoining properties for evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions. Standard historical sources reviewed during the preparation of this report included the following, as available:

#### AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

## 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

---

Historical aerial photographs of the Plan Area and general vicinity were reviewed for the Plan Area. The Plan Area has historically been vacant agricultural land consistent with what was observed on the date of the site reconnaissance. The only structure located on the property is a single-wide mobile home unit that was formerly used in conjunction with the Manteca Police Department shooting range, which was located on the site. The shooting range will need to be decommissioned and inspected for possible contamination from ammunition prior to any ground disturbance.

There are several dirt farm-roadways that transect the Plan Area. The north-south farm-road that is located just north of the shooting range serves as a scrap yard for remnant construction and/or farming materials (i.e. remnant pipes, etc.). These materials will need to be inspected/tested for possible asbestos and/or other hazards, and appropriately disposed of prior to any ground disturbance in this area. The scrap materials appear in aerial photos before at least 2003.

There is an area on the western side of the project near McKinley that has historically served as a farm yard for agricultural equipment, implements, etc. There are no records of above ground or below ground storage tanks, but it is anticipated that the area was used to fuel farm equipment and there is a possibility of accidental spills/releases in this area associated with the historical uses. The soils in this area will need to be inspected/tested for possible contamination, and if found to have soil contaminated, the soil must be appropriately disposed of prior to any ground disturbance in this area.

There is an overhead transmission lines that bisect the Plan Area from the northeast to the southwest. Additionally, there is an irrigation canal that bisects the Plan Area from the south to northwest. The irrigation canal is proposed to be undergrounded.

The Plan Area remains largely unchanged from 2003 to present.

### BUILDING DEPARTMENT RECORDS

Given the lack of historical or recent development in the Plan Area, it was not deemed warranted to inquire about building department records in order for the environmental professional to make a determination regarding Recognized Environmental Conditions in the Plan Area.

### LOCAL STREET DIRECTORIES

Given the lack of historical or recent development in the Plan Area, the site does not have a business address in local street directories.

### ZONING AND LAND USE RECORDS

Zoning information for the Plan Area was retrieved from the Manteca General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map. According to the reviewed maps, the Plan Area is designated and zoned Public/Quasi-Public.

### OTHER HISTORICAL SOURCES

There is no active or abandoned oil/gas wells located in the Plan Area. Additionally, there are no environmental liens on the property. Review of additional historical sources was not warranted in order for the Environmental Professional to make a determination as to evidence of potential Recognized Environmental Conditions in the Plan Area.

### **Cortese List**

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. DTSC is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other State and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List.

The CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains the *Envirostor Data Management System*, which provides information on hazardous waste facilities (both permitted and corrective action) as well as any available site cleanup information. There is one site located within Manteca. This Site is known as the Gordon Research Center, which is a 3.67-acre site located within a residential district of Manteca. This site does not pose a hazardous threat to the proposed project.

The CA Water Resources Control Board maintains the *Geotracker*, which is a database system that tracks and archives compliance data from authorized or unauthorized discharges of waste to land, or unauthorized releases of hazardous substances from underground storage tanks. There are two LUST cleanup sites located to the north of the Plan Area. The ABF Freight site is located at 2427 Yosemite Avenue and is closed. The Frank's One Stop site is located at 2072 Yosemite Avenue and is an open case with verification monitoring in effect. There are no active or closed cases located in the Plan Area.

There are four Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup and Abatement Orders located in Manteca. These include animal and food processing facilities, none of which are located on or adjacent to the Plan Area.

CalRecycle maintains the Solid Waste Information System (SWIS), which is a database of solid waste facilities. The SWIS data identifies active, planned and closed sites. The Plan Area does not have any active or planned solid waste facilities listed in the database.

None of the records reviewed for the Plan Area indicates that a Recognized Environmental Condition is associated with the Plan Area.

### **Transportation of Hazardous Materials**

The transportation of hazardous materials within the City of Manteca Planning Area is subject to various federal, state, and local regulations. The following provisions are included in the California Vehicle Code (CVC) and pertain to the transportation of hazardous related materials.

## 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

---

- The Highway Patrol designates the routes in California which are to be used for the transportation of explosives. (Section 31616)
- The CVC applies when the explosives are transported as a delivery service for hire or in quantities in excess of 1,000 pounds. The transportation of explosives in quantities of 1,000 pounds or less, or other than on a public highway, is subject to the California Health and Safety Code. (Section 31601(a))
- It is illegal to transport explosives or inhalation hazards on any public highway not designated for that purpose, unless the use of the highway is required to permit delivery of, or the loading of, such materials. (Section 31602(b) and Section 32104(a))
- When transporting explosives through or into a city for which a route has not been designated by the Highway Patrol, drivers must follow routes as may be prescribed or established by local authorities. (Section 31614(a))
- Inhalation hazards and poison gases are subject to additional safeguards. These materials are highly toxic, spread rapidly, and require rapid and widespread evacuation if there is loss of containment or a fire. The Highway Patrol designates through routes to be used for the transportation of inhalation hazards. It may also designate separate through routes for the transportation of inhalation hazards composed of any chemical rocket propellant. (Section 32100 and Section 32102(b))

In addition to area roadways, hazardous materials are routinely transported on Union Pacific Railroad lines that make up the western boundary of the site. The risk of accidents, and more specifically accidents involving hazardous materials, is relatively low. The U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration found the UPRR company train accident rate to be 4.18 train accidents per one million train miles traveled, resulting in a less than 0.001% chance of an accident. Risk of a railroad accident containing hazardous materials is considered much lower, as only an average of eight accidents involving hazardous material spills occur annually in California.

The Union Pacific Railroad Company does implement a security plan in compliance with the Department of Transportation Final Rule 49 CFR Part 172 Hazardous Materials (HM 232): Security Requirements for Offerors and Transporters of Hazardous Materials. The plan includes requirements to enhance the security of transported hazardous materials and ensures proper cleanup procedures in the instance of an accidental release.

### FIRE HAZARDS

---

Wild fires are a major hazard in the State of California. Wild fires burn natural vegetation on developed and undeveloped lands and include timber, brush, woodland, and grass fires. While low intensity wild fires have a role in the County's ecosystem, wild fires put human health and safety, structures (e.g., homes, schools, businesses, etc.), air quality, recreation areas, water quality, wildlife habitat and ecosystem health, and forest resources at risk.

Wildland fire hazards exist in varying degrees in the foothill portion of the County located to the east and southwest of the Plan Area. The Plan Area is located in the valley floor, which is predominantly under agricultural or urban use. This area has a low fire hazard risk.

## 3.8.2 REGULATORY SETTING

### FEDERAL

The primary federal agencies that are responsible for overseeing regulations and policies regarding hazardous materials are the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Department of Transportation (DOT). Several laws governing the transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials are governed by these agencies as well as oversight for contaminated sites cleanup. Federal laws and regulations that are applicable to hazards and hazardous materials are presented below.

#### **Resource Conservation and Recovery Act**

The 1976 Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the 1984 RCRA Amendments regulate the treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. The legislation mandated that hazardous wastes be tracked from the point of generation to their ultimate fate in the environment. This includes detailed tracking of hazardous materials during transport and permitting of hazardous material handling facilities.

The 1984 RCRA amendments provided the framework for a regulatory program designed to prevent releases from USTs. The program establishes tank and leak detection standards, including spill and overflow protection devices for new tanks. The tanks must also meet performance standards to ensure that the stored material will not corrode the tanks. Owners and operators of USTs had until December 1998 to meet the new tank standards. As of 2001, an estimated 85 percent of USTs were in compliance with the required standards.

#### **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act**

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (the Act) introduced active federal involvement to emergency response, site remediation, and spill prevention, most notably the Superfund program. The Act was intended to be comprehensive in encompassing both the prevention of, and response to, uncontrolled hazardous substances releases. The Act deals with environmental response, providing mechanisms for reacting to emergencies and to chronic hazardous material releases. In addition to establishing procedures to prevent and remedy problems, it establishes a system for compensating appropriate individuals and assigning appropriate liability. It is designed to plan for and respond to failure in other regulatory programs and to remedy problems resulting from action taken before the era of comprehensive regulatory protection.

#### **Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act**

The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act authorizes the U.S. Department of Transportation Office of Pipeline Safety to regulate pipeline transportation of natural (flammable, toxic, or corrosive) gas and other gases as well as the transportation and storage of liquefied natural gas. The Office of Pipeline Safety regulates the design, construction, inspection, testing, operation, and maintenance of pipeline facilities. While the federal government is primarily responsible for developing, issuing, and enforcing pipeline safety regulations, the pipeline safety statutes provide for State assumption

of the intrastate regulatory, inspection, and enforcement responsibilities under an annual certification. To qualify for certification, a state must adopt the minimum federal regulations and may adopt additional or more stringent regulations as long as they are not incompatible.

### STATE

---

The primary state agencies that are responsible for overseeing regulations and policies regarding hazardous materials are the California Office of Emergency Services (OES), California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA), Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), California Water Quality Control Board, and the California Air Resources Board. Several laws governing the generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials are administered by these agencies. State laws and regulations that are applicable to hazards and hazardous materials are presented below.

#### **California Health and Safety Code**

Cal-EPA has established rules governing the use of hazardous materials and the management of hazardous wastes. Many of these regulations are embodied in the California Health and Safety Code. The code includes regulations that govern safe drinking water, substances control, land reuse and revitalization, remediation, restoration, and methamphetamine contaminated cleanups.

#### **California Code of Regulations Title 22 and Title 26**

The California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22 provides state regulations for hazardous materials, and CCR Title 26 provides regulation of hazardous materials management. In 1996, Cal/EPA established the “Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program” (Unified Program) which consolidated the six administrative components of hazardous waste and materials into one program.

### LOCAL

---

#### **City of Manteca General Plan**

##### ***Policies: Hazardous Materials Safety***

S-P-16. The City shall maintain an awareness of hazardous materials throughout the Manteca region.

S-P-17. City approvals of all new development shall consider the potential for the production, use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials and provide for reasonable controls on such hazardous materials.

S-P-18. Within its authority, the City shall regulate the production, use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials to protect the health of Manteca residents.

***Implementation: Hazardous Materials Safety***

S-I-10. The City shall require businesses that manufacture, store, use, or transport significant quantities of hazardous materials to identify annually such materials and their quantities.

S-I-11. The City shall require the submittal of lists of hazardous materials used in existing and proposed industrial and commercial businesses within the City of Manteca. The list shall be maintained through the Manteca Fire Department and updated through periodic review.

S-I-12. The City shall work with San Joaquin County and other public agencies to inform consumers about household use and disposal of hazardous materials.

S-I-13. Cooperate fully with Union Pacific Railroad and other agencies, such as the CHP, in the event of a hazardous material emergency.

S-I-14. Continue the City hazardous waste pick-up program for household hazardous materials.

***Policies: Emergency Procedures***

S-P-19. The City shall maintain and periodically update the City's Emergency Plan.

***Implementation Policies: Emergency Procedures***

S-I-15. The City shall conduct periodic emergency response exercises to test the effectiveness of City emergency response procedures.

S-I-16. The City shall review County and State emergency response procedures that must be coordinated with City procedures.

**Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA)**

The California Environmental Protection Agency designates specific local agencies as Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPA), typically at the county level. The San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health is the CUPA designated for San Joaquin County. The San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health is responsible for the implementation of statewide programs within its jurisdiction, including: Underground storage of hazardous substances (USTs), Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMP) requirements, California Accidental Release Prevention (Cal-ARP) program, etc. Implementation of these programs involves permitting, inspecting, providing education/guidance, investigations, and enforcement.

**3.8.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES****THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact from hazards and hazardous materials if it will:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

## 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

---

- 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.
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- 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.

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

#### **Impact 3.8-1: Potential to create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (less than significant with mitigation)**

**Construction Phase Impacts:** Construction activities would occur in phases through the development of the proposed project. Construction equipment and materials would likely require the use of petroleum based products (oil, gasoline, diesel fuel), and a variety of chemicals including paints, cleaners, and solvents. The use of these materials at a construction site will pose a reasonable risk of release into the environment if not properly handled, stored, and transported. A release into the environment could pose significant impacts to the health and welfare of people and/or wildlife, and could result in contamination of water (groundwater or surface water), habitat, and countless important resources. This is a potentially significant impact.

Like most agricultural and farming operations in the Central Valley, agricultural practices in the Plan Area have used agricultural chemicals including pesticides and herbicides as a standard practice. Although no contaminated soils have been identified in the Plan Area or the vicinity, residual concentrations of pesticides may be present in soil as a result of historic agricultural application and storage. Continuous spraying of crops over many years can potentially result in a residual buildup of pesticides, in farm soils. Of highest concern relative to agrichemicals are chlorinated herbicides, organophosphate pesticides, and organochlorine pesticides, such as such as Mecoprop (MCPP), Dinoseb, chlordane, dichloro-diphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), and dichloro-

diphenyl-dichloroethylene (DDE). There are no records of soil contamination in the Plan Area; however, the soils will need to be inspected/tested for possible residual agricultural chemicals prior to grading, and if found, the soil must be appropriately treated/disposed of prior to any ground disturbance. Because the majority of the Plan Area is, or was historically, used for agricultural purposes, soil testing should be performed as each Phase of the development occurs. This is a potentially significant impact.

The only structure located on the property is a single-wide mobile home unit that was formerly used in conjunction with the Manteca Police Department shooting range. This site is located approximately at the proposed intersection of the Wawona Street and the Loop Road. Figure 3.8-1 illustrates the location of this site. The single-wide mobile home unit will require removal prior to any construction, which is anticipated to be Phase 2 or 3.

If the mobile home is demolished, it will require evaluation for asbestos and lead containing materials. If such materials are present in the construction of the mobile home unit, special demolition and disposal practices are required to ensure their safe handling. This is a potentially significant impact.

The Manteca Police Department shooting range will need to be inspected for possible lead contamination from ammunition prior to any ground disturbance. Once it is inspected, a plan for the proper cleanup and decommissioning of the shooting range will need to be prepared and approved by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. This is a potentially significant impact.

The north-south farm-road that is located just north of the shooting range serves as a scrap yard for remnant construction and/or farming materials (i.e. remnant pipes, etc.). These materials will need to be inspected/tested for possible asbestos and/or other hazards, and appropriately disposed of prior to any ground disturbance in this area. The area with the remnant construction and/or farming materials is located in an area that is anticipated to be built after Phase 4 (labeled as Future Phases in the Master Plan). This is a potentially significant impact.

The area on the western side of the project near McKinley that historically served as a farm yard for agricultural equipment, implements, etc. will need to be inspected/tested for possible soil contamination from accidental spills/releases, and if found to have soil contamination, the soil must be appropriately disposed of prior to any ground disturbance in this area. The area near McKinley that historically served as a farm yard for agricultural equipment, implements, etc. is located in an area that is anticipated to be built after Phase 4 (labeled as Future Phases in the Master Plan). This is a potentially significant impact.

Mitigation measures presented below are intended to require final inspection/testing of materials and soil in areas where the potential for residual agricultural chemicals (pesticides/fertilizers) or where other contamination from past uses may present in the Plan Area, and if contamination is found, measures are presented to ensure that the agricultural residues or contaminated/hazardous material is properly handled and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. Mitigation measures presented below also require a Soils

## 3.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

---

Management Plan (SMP) to be submitted and approved by the San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The SMP will establish management practices for handling hazardous materials, including fuels, paints, cleaners, solvents, etc., during construction. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will ensure that these potential impacts are reduced to a **less than significant** level.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.8-1:** *The project proponent shall hire a qualified consultant to perform a Phase 2 ESA prior to the issuance of grading permits or demolition permits for construction activities in the following areas that have been deemed to have potential hazardous conditions present:*

- *Prior to grading activities in areas previously used for agricultural uses.*
- *Prior to removal of the single-wide mobile home unit that was formerly used in conjunction with the Manteca Police Department shooting range.*
- *Prior to grading activities on the shooting range site.*
- *Prior to removal of the remnant construction and/or farming materials (i.e. remnant pipes, etc.) on the project site, most notably those located on the north-south farm-road that is located just north of the shooting range.*
- *Prior to grading activities in the area on the western side of the project near McKinley that historically served as a farm yard for agricultural equipment, implements, etc.*

*The intent of the Phase 2 ESA is to: 1) sample the soils for residual agrichemicals, 2) sample any areas that appear stained, and 3) investigate whether any of the buildings or facilities contain asbestos-containing materials and lead that could become friable or mobile during demolition activities. If toxic levels of residual agrichemicals are found, the contaminated soil shall be excavated from the site and disposed of at an off-site disposal facility designed to accept such waste. If any stained soils are found, the contaminated soil shall be excavated from the site and disposed of at an off-site disposal facility designed to accept such waste. If asbestos-containing materials and/or lead are found in the buildings, a Cal-OSHA certified ACBM and lead based paint contractor shall be retained to remove the asbestos-containing materials and lead in accordance with EPA and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) standards. In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal/OSHA asbestos and lead worker construction standards. The ACBM and lead shall be disposed of properly at an appropriate offsite disposal facility.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.8-2:** *A Soils Management Plan (SMP) shall be submitted and approved by the San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health prior to the issuance of a grading permit on lands that are determined to be contaminated after Phase 2 ESA (soils testing). The SMP shall be specific to the area that is contaminated and shall include the following:*

- *Land use history, including description and locations of known contamination;*

- *An earthwork schedule;*
- *The project proponent shall describe methods which will be used to properly handle and/or dispose of soil which may be classified as hazardous or contain contaminants at levels of potential concern, including the identification of legal discharge areas;*
- *The SMP shall discuss, as necessary, the reuse of soil on site in accordance with applicable criteria to protect construction workers or future workers on site;*
- *A SMP summary report, which includes all analytical data and other findings, must be submitted once the earthwork has been completed.*

*The approved SMP shall be posted and maintained onsite during construction activities and all construction personnel shall acknowledge that they have reviewed and understand the plan.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.8-3:** *Prior to the issuance of a business license that requires the use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials, the business owner shall submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) to San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department (CUPA) for review and approval.*

#### OPERATIONAL PHASE IMPACTS

The operational phase of the project will occur after construction is completed and business operators/employees and guests move in to occupy the structures and facilities on a day-to-day basis.

The proposed project includes a hotel, commercial facilities, and recreational facilities. Each of these facilities will likely use a variety of hazardous materials commonly found in urban areas including: paints, cleaners, and cleaning solvents. If handled appropriately, these materials do not pose a significant risk. These facilities will store and use these materials. The waterpark will likely require pool cleaning chemicals including chlorine, acid, and other hazardous chemicals normally used in pool maintenance. Pesticides, fertilizers, and fuel will be required to maintain the landscaping, and potentially the ball fields if they are constructed with grass surfaces in lieu of artificial turf. There will be a risk of release of these materials into the environment if they are not stored and handled in accordance with best management practices approved by San Joaquin County Environmental Health Division and the Manteca Fire Department. Implementation of the following mitigation measure will ensure that the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this issue.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

*Implement **Mitigation Measure 3.8-3***

### **Impact 3.8-2: Potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school (less than significant)**

The proposed project is not anticipated to have businesses that would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. In addition, there are no existing or planned schools within a quarter mile of the Plan Area. The closest schools include Sierra High School (0.5 miles east), Stella Brockman Elementary School (1.0 miles northeast), Brock Elliot Elementary School (1.0 miles east), and Manteca High School (2.4 miles east). There are a variety of other schools located beyond three miles from the Plan Area. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact with regards to this environmental issue.

### **Impact 3.8-3: Potential to result in impacts from being included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (less than significant)**

The hazards assessment included a site reconnaissance, interviews, historical land use research, and database research. The assessment revealed no evidence of historical or existing Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the Plan Area. Furthermore, the proposed project would not result in the transportation, use, disposal, release, emission, or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact with regards to this environmental issue.

### **Impact 3.8-4: Potential for the project to result in a safety hazards for people residing or working on the project site as a result of public airport or public use airport (less than significant)**

There are no documented public airports or public use airports within close proximity to the Plan Area. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact with regards to this environmental issue.

### **Impact 3.8-5: Potential for the project to result in safety hazards for people residing or working on the project site as a result of a private airstrip (less than significant)**

There are no documented private airstrips within close proximity to the Plan Area. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact with regards to this environmental issue.

### **Impact 3.8-6: Potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (less than significant)**

The Office of Emergency Services (OES) maintains an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that serves as the official Emergency Plan for San Joaquin County. It includes planned operational functions

and overall responsibilities of County Departments during an emergency situation. The Emergency Plan also contains a threat summary for San Joaquin County, which addresses the potential for natural, technological and human-caused disasters (County Code, Title 4-3007).

The County OES also prepared a Hazardous Materials Area Plan (§2720 H&S, 2008) that describes the hazardous materials response system developed to protect public health, prevent environmental damage and ensure proper use and disposal of hazardous materials. The plan establishes effective response capabilities to contain and control releases, establishes oversight of long-term cleanup and mitigation of residual releases, and integrates multi-jurisdiction and agency coordination. This plan is now implemented by the San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department.


The San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department maintains a Hazardous Materials Management Plan/ Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMMP/HMBP). The HMMP/HMBP describes agency roles, strategies and processes for responding to emergencies involving hazardous materials. The Environmental Health Department maintains a Hazardous Materials Database and Risk and Flood Maps available to the public on its website.

In San Joaquin County, all major roads are available for evacuation, depending on the location and type of emergency that arises. The proposed project does not include any actions that would impair or physically interfere with any of San Joaquin County's emergency plans or evacuation routes. Future uses in the Plan Area will have access to the County resources that establish protocols for safe use, handling and transport of hazardous materials. Construction activities are not expected to result in any unknown significant road closures, traffic detours, or congestion that could hinder the emergency vehicle access or evacuation in the event of an emergency. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact with regards to this environmental issue.

### **Impact 3.8-7: Potential to expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death from wildland fires (less than significant)**


The risk of wildfire is related to a variety of parameters, including fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidity levels and fuel moisture contents) and topography (degree of slope). Steep slopes contribute to fire hazard by intensifying the effects of wind and making fire suppression difficult. Fuels such as grass are highly flammable because they have a high surface area to mass ratio and require less heat to reach the ignition point. The County has areas with an abundance of flashy fuels (i.e. grassland) in the foothill areas of the eastern and western portion of the County. The Plan Area is located in an area that is predominately agricultural and urban, which is not at a significant risk of wildfire. The proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact with regards to this environmental issue.

*This page left intentionally blank.*



**Legend**

- Project Boundary
- Potential Hazardous Sites



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

Figure 3.8-1: Potential Hazardous Sites

Data sources: ArcGIS Online Basemap Imagery with Transportation. Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section describes the regulatory setting, regional hydrology and water quality, impacts that are likely to result from project implementation, and measures to reduce potential impacts to water quality. This section is based in part on the following documents, reports and studies: *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City of Manteca as amended through 2013), *Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report* (City of Manteca 2003), *California Water Plan Update 2013* (DWR 2013), *California's Groundwater Bulletin 118, San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin, Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin* (DWR 2006), *California's Groundwater* (DWR 2003), *Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan* (SJRG 2013), *Custom Soils Report for San Joaquin County, California* (NRCS 2014), and *Web Soil Survey* (NRCS 2014). Comments received during the NOP comment period(s) regarding hydrology and water quality include: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

### 3.9.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### REGIONAL HYDROLOGY

---

San Joaquin County is located in the San Joaquin River watershed. The San Joaquin River is about 300 miles long. It begins in the Sierra Nevada mountain range on California's eastern border. The river runs down the western slope of the Sierra and flows roughly northwest through the Central Valley, to where it meets the Sacramento River at the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, a 1,000-square-mile maze of channels and islands that drains more than 40 percent of the state's lands (SJRG 2013).

Because the Central Valley receives relatively little rainfall (12 to 17 inches a year, falling mostly October through March), snowmelt runoff from the mountains is the main source of fresh water in the San Joaquin River. Over its 300-mile length, the San Joaquin River is fed by many other streams and rivers, most notably the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers.

Most of the surface water in the upper San Joaquin River is stored and diverted at Millerton Lakes' Friant Dam, near Fresno. From Friant Dam, water is pumped north through the Madera Canal and south through the Friant-Kern canal to irrigation districts and other water retailers, which then deliver the water directly to the end users in the southern portion of the watershed.

In the central and northern portions of the watershed, many agricultural and municipal users receive water from irrigation districts, such as the Modesto, Merced, Oakdale, South San Joaquin and Turlock Irrigation Districts. That water is provided through diversions from rivers that are tributary to the San Joaquin, such as the Mokelumne, Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers.

In an average year, about 1.5 million acre-feet of water is diverted from the San Joaquin River at Friant Dam, leaving little flow in the river until the Merced River joins the San Joaquin northwest of the City of Merced. Additional water also reaches the river via flows returning to the river from municipal wastewater treatment plants, as well as urban and agricultural runoff. The rest of the area's water supply needs are met by importing water from northern California (via the Central Valley Project) and by pumping water from the groundwater basin (SJRG 2013).

**Climate**

Summers in the region are warm and dry ranging from an average high in July of 93°F to an average low of approximately 59°F. Winters are cool and mild, with an average high of 53°F and a low of 37°F in January. The average annual precipitation is approximately 13.81 inches. Precipitation occurs as rain most of which falls between the months of November through April, peaking in January at 2.85 inches. The average temperatures range from December lows of 37.5 F to July highs of 94.3 F.

**Watersheds**

A watershed is a region that is bound by a divide that drains to a common watercourse or body of water. Watersheds serve an important biological function, oftentimes supporting an abundance of aquatic and terrestrial wildlife including special-status species and anadromous and native local fisheries. Watersheds provide conditions necessary for riparian habitat.

The State of California uses a hierarchical naming and numbering convention to define watershed areas for management purposes. This means that boundaries are defined according to size and topography, with multiple sub-watersheds within larger watersheds. Table 3.9-1 shows the primary watershed classification levels used by the State of California. The second column indicates the approximate size that a watershed area may be within a particular classification level, although variation in size is common.

**TABLE 3.9-1. STATE OF CALIFORNIA WATERSHED HIERARCHY NAMING CONVENTION**

<i>WATERSHED LEVEL</i>	<i>APPROXIMATE SQUARE MILES (ACRES)</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>
Hydrologic Region (HR)	12,735 (8,150,000)	Defined by large-scale topographic and geologic considerations. The State of California is divided into ten HRs.
Hydrologic Unit (HU)	672 (430,000)	Defined by surface drainage; may include a major river watershed, groundwater basin, or closed drainage, among others.
Hydrologic Area (HA)	244 (156,000)	Major subdivisions of hydrologic units, such as by major tributaries, groundwater attributes, or stream components.
Hydrologic Sub-Area (HSA)	195 (125,000)	A major segment of an HA with significant geographical characteristics or hydrological homogeneity.

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES, 2012

**Hydrologic Region**

San Joaquin County is located in the San Joaquin River Hydrological Region. The San Joaquin River is the principal river of the region, and all other streams of the region are tributary to it. The Mokelumne River and its tributary the Cosumnes River originate in the central Sierra Nevada, along with the more southerly Stanislaus and Tuolumne rivers. The Merced River flows from the south central Sierra Nevada and enters the San Joaquin near the City of Newman. The Chowchilla and Fresno rivers also originate in the Sierra south of the Merced River and trend westward toward the San Joaquin River. Creeks originating in the Coast Range and draining eastward into the San Joaquin River include Del Puerto Creek, Orestimba Creek, and Panoche Creek. Del Puerto Creek enters the San Joaquin near the City of Patterson, and Orestimba Creek enters north of the City of Newman. During flood years, Panoche Creek may enter the San Joaquin River or the Fresno Slough near the town of Mendota. The Kings River is a stream of the Tulare Lake Hydrologic

Region, but in flood years it may contribute to the San Joaquin River, flowing northward through the James Bypass and Fresno Slough to enter near the City of Mendota. The Mud, Salt, Berrenda, and Ash sloughs also add to the San Joaquin River, and numerous lesser streams and creeks also enter the system, originating in both the Sierra Nevada and the Coast Range. The entire San Joaquin river system drains northwesterly through the Delta to Suisun Bay (DWR 2013, pg. SJR-5).

The City of Manteca and much of the surrounding area is located in the Eastern San Joaquin River Subbasin. This groundwater basin covers approximately 1,105 square miles and extends from the Mokelumne River on the north and northwest; San Joaquin River on the west; Stanislaus River on the south; and consolidated bedrock on the east. The Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin is bounded on the south, southwest, and west by the Modesto, Delta-Mendota, and Tracy Subbasins, respectively and on the northwest and north by the Solano, South American, and Cosumnes Subbasins. The Solano and South American are subbasins of the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin (DWR 2006, pg. 1).

The Project site is located in the Oakwood Lake - San Joaquin River watershed. See Figure 3.9-1.

### **Groundwater**

The City of Manteca is located in the Eastern San Joaquin River Groundwater Basin. The basin is not adjudicated; however, a basin management plan has been created. The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan (ESJGB-GMP) (NSJCGB, 2004) was prepared in September 2004. The purpose of the ESJGB-GMP is “to review, enhance, assess, and coordinate existing groundwater management policies and programs in Eastern San Joaquin County and to develop new policies and programs to ensure the long-term sustainability of groundwater resources in Eastern San Joaquin County.” According to Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 (DWR, 2006), the ESJGB is in a critical condition of overdraft.

Most of the fresh groundwater is encountered at depths of less than 1,000 feet, and most of this shallow groundwater is unconfined. A discussion of basin hydrogeology is provided in the ESJGB-GMP. The Victor formation is the uppermost formation and extends from the ground surface to a maximum depth of about 150 feet. Compared to the underlying formations, the Victor formation is generally more permeable and the groundwater is typically unconfined.

The underlying Laguna formation includes discontinuous lenses of unconsolidated to semi-consolidated sands and silts interspersed with lesser amounts of clay and gravel. The Laguna formation is hydraulically connected to the Victor formation and is estimated to be 750 to 1,000 feet thick. Moderate permeability has been reported within the Laguna formation with some highly permeable coarse-grained beds. Most of the municipal and industrial wells in the region penetrate through the Victor formation into the Laguna formation.

Groundwater pumping in Manteca increased from 2,277 AFY in 1960 to a maximum of 14,933 AFY in 2004, prior to the South County Water Supply Program (SCWSP) delivering treated surface water to the City. According to the City’s 2005 UWMP, the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin was estimated in a 1985 study to be approximately 1 acre-foot per acre per year. Although groundwater pumping in some years has exceeded that rate, as part of the SCWSP, the City

intends to limit groundwater pumping to that rate or less. At this time, the area of the City's Primary Urban Service Area (PUSA) is 13,790 acres. Therefore, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to a long-term average of no greater than 13,790 ac-ft/yr. Groundwater pumping is not projected to reach 13,790 ac-ft/yr prior to 2035 unless the City alters its groundwater/surface water balance, or expands its PUSA.

The groundwater surface generally slopes from south to north, with the highest groundwater elevations occurring near Yosemite Avenue east of McKinley Avenue and the lowest groundwater elevations occurring along Roth Road. There are some localized depressions due to industrial and municipal groundwater pumping operations. Groundwater elevations in the fall, after the high-use summer months, average about 3 feet lower than groundwater elevations in the spring.

### LOCAL SETTING

---

The topography of the Project site is relatively flat with a five foot elevation gain throughout the Project site. There are no natural water courses in the Project site. The French Camp Outlet Canal (a manmade irrigation canal) traverses the project site. The current uses in the Project site and adjacent lands are a mix of agricultural, commercial, and industrial uses. Crop types include alfalfa and winter wheat. The Project site is in the Oakwood Lake - San Joaquin River watershed, which is part of the San Joaquin River watershed.

### Groundwater

The local groundwater basin and City groundwater use are described in the City's 2005 UWMP. A brief description of the groundwater basin and a discussion of historical and projected groundwater pumping are provided below.

#### BASIN BOUNDARIES, SOILS, AND STORAGE CAPACITY

The City's wells are located in the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin. The basin is not adjudicated; however, a basin management plan has been created. The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan (ESJGB-GMP) (NSJCGB, 2004) was prepared in September 2004. The purpose of the ESJGB-GMP is "to review, enhance, assess, and coordinate existing groundwater management policies and programs in Eastern San Joaquin County and to develop new policies and programs to ensure the long-term sustainability of groundwater resources in Eastern San Joaquin County." According to Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 (DWR, 2006), the ESJGB is in a critical condition of overdraft. Groundwater levels have declined in the basin since the 1960s with the lowest groundwater levels found in eastern San Joaquin County.

Most of the fresh groundwater is encountered at depths of less than 1,000 feet, and most of this shallow groundwater is unconfined. A discussion of basin hydrogeology is provided in the ESJGB-GMP. The Victor formation is the uppermost formation and extends from the ground surface to a maximum depth of about 150 feet. Compared to the underlying formations, the Victor formation is generally more permeable and the groundwater is typically unconfined.

The underlying Laguna formation includes discontinuous lenses of unconsolidated to semi-consolidated sands and silts interspersed with lesser amounts of clay and gravel. The Laguna formation is hydraulically connected to the Victor formation and is estimated to be 750 to 1,000 feet thick. Moderate permeability has been reported within the Laguna formation with some highly permeable coarse-grained beds. Most of the municipal and industrial wells in the Manteca area penetrate through the Victor formation into the Laguna formation.

#### PAST AND PROJECTED FUTURE GROUNDWATER PUMPING

Groundwater pumping in Manteca increased from 2,277 AFY in 1960 to a maximum of 14,933 AFY in 2004 prior to the SCWSP delivering treated surface water to the City. According to the City's 2005 UWMP, the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin was estimated in a 1985 study to be approximately 1 acre-foot per acre per year. Although groundwater pumping in some years has exceeded that rate, as part of the SCWSP, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to that rate or less. At this time, the area of the City's PUSA is 13,790 acres. Therefore, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to a long-term average of no greater than 13,790 afy. Groundwater pumping is not projected to reach 13,790 ac-ft/yr prior to 2035.

### **Drainage**

The City of Manteca provides and maintains a system of storm drains, detention basins, and pumping facilities as well as monitoring and control of the operations of the storm drain system. Additionally the City enforces storm drain regulations established by the US EPA and the State of California.

The City maintains a dynamic computer model of its storm drainage system. The model was formulated as an XP-SWMM model originally developed by the US EPA. The current version was advanced by a private sector organization, XP Software, Inc. The model provides analysis over time and offers the ability to maximize the efficiency of detention basin and pump operations along with the ability to monitor and control downstream water levels to minimize flooding problems with a minimum of new capital improvements.

The South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) owns a complex network of irrigation Laterals and Drains that run throughout the City limits. These facilities deliver irrigation water to various farming operations in the region, and they convey excess irrigation water and field runoff to downstream receiving waters, specifically the San Joaquin River. The City relies on SSJID's facilities to convey its storm water runoff to the San Joaquin River and will continue to do so through buildout of the City's General Plan.

The City and SSJID have a long-standing agreement that authorizes the City to discharge its storm water runoff into SSJID facilities for ultimate disposal to the San Joaquin River. In 1975 the City first entered into a storm drainage agreement with SSJID, and in 2006 the City renewed its drainage agreement with SSJID. Of the many requirements in the 2006 Agreement, the two most significant new requirements are that all storm water discharges into SSJID facilities must be monitored and controlled such that the capacity of SSJID's facilities is not exceeded, and that storm water quality must be controlled such that it complies with all applicable laws.

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

The City meets the first requirement by requiring all new development to attenuate its runoff in a storage facility before pumping it into SSJID's facilities. In addition, the City uses real-time water level monitoring stations at critical low points in the conveyance system complete with SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) facilities. Regarding the water quality requirement, the City is classified as a Phase II city by the State Water Resources Control Board. As such, the City, and consequently new development, is required to comply with the State Board's storm water NPDES permit for Phase II cities.

Per the City/SSJID Master Drainage Agreement, SSJID prohibits the direct discharge of storm water runoffs into its facilities. Accordingly, the City requires all new developments to attenuate its runoff in a storage facility before pumping it into SSJID's facilities. For surface attenuation facilities, there are two allowable basin types for non-residential applications: Interim Percolation Basin or Permanent Sole Use Percolation Basin.

### INTERIM PERCOLATION BASIN: RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS

Percolation basins may be used as an interim measure for retention and disposal of storm water runoff in those areas that will not receive storm drainage service from a major storm drain system by the time development occurs. When discharge capability to a major storm drain system becomes available, the basins are to be exchanged for or converted to detention basins with pumped discharge facilities. Interim percolation basins are to be sized to store two, 10-year, 48-hour duration storm runoff volumes over the entire contributing area.

### PERMANENT SOLE USE PERCOLATION BASIN: NON-RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS

Sole use percolation basins may be allowed as a permanent measure for retention and disposal of storm water runoff for large (minimum 80 acres) non-residential applications as approved by the City. Permanent percolation basins shall be designed to empty the entire runoff volume of a 10-year, 48-hour duration storm within 96 hours. The permanent percolation basin shall be oversized by 50%.

The groundwater separation distance between the bottom of the percolation basin and the seasonally high ground water table shall be 10 feet to reduce the risk of groundwater contamination. The City may allow an exception to this separation requirement for situations where the groundwater level is less than 10 feet but greater than 5 feet provided that the runoff is fully treated upstream of the percolation basin by pretreatment BMPs such as a regional CDS unit or other City-approved equivalent treatment device. For situations where the groundwater separation is less than 5 feet, percolation basins are prohibited.

The percolation basins require a minimum soil infiltration rate of 0.5 inch per hour, not exceeding 3 inch per hour, should not be used as temporary sediment traps during construction, and are not allowed at sites with Hydrologic Soil Type C and D, e.g., clay. As part of the percolation basin approval process, the developer must prepare an operations and maintenance plan for the facility documenting all maintenance and rehabilitation activities and costs for approval by the City. Access to percolation basin must be provided for regular maintenance activities.

Prior to acceptance of the Basin, the property owner must provide an approved fully funded mechanism or entity for funding all maintenance and rehabilitation needs of the basin. The maintenance entity must be permanent and responsible for meeting all storm water quality requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board.

#### LATERALS FOR STORM WATER CONVEYANCE

As previously described, SSJID owns a complex network of irrigation Laterals and Drains that run throughout the City's limits. The hydraulic connectivity of SSJID's system is as follows: 1) irrigation water is conveyed to farming operations via a vast network of Laterals; 2) the Laterals carry excess irrigation water and field runoff to several Drains; 3) the Drains convey water to a large central drain called the French Camp Outlet Canal (FCOC); and 4) the FCOC conveys water to the San Joaquin River.

A fundamental goal of previous storm drain master plans was to minimize the use of SSJID's Laterals for conveyance of storm water runoff to SSJID's Drains. Accordingly, previous master plans specified the construction of a separate storm water conveyance network that by-passed the Laterals and transported storm drainage directly to the Drains. Once the City's storm water reached the Drains, the Drains would continue to provide conveyance to the FCOC and to the San Joaquin River. In the 2013 SDMP, however, the City recognizes the opportunity to minimize infrastructure costs for all parties by abandoning the concept of separate conveyance systems and instead expanding the use of SSJID's Laterals. Laterals that are targeted to convey both storm water and irrigation water to Drains are called dual-use facilities.

This concept is viable since SSJID's Laterals are 1) found virtually everywhere in the existing and undeveloped areas of the City, 2) most of these Laterals are already 42-inch diameter pipe, which is a sufficient size for the City's drainage needs, and 3) SSJID already requires new development projects that disturb their Laterals to remove, realign and replace that infrastructure with an equal or larger diameter pipeline. For situations where the existing Lateral is 36-inch diameter, and SSJID does not require a 42-inch or larger pipe to be installed as a replacement, the City will require a minimum 42-inch diameter pipeline to be installed, and the developer will be reimbursed the upsizing cost for the larger diameter pipe via the Public Facilities Implementation Fee (PFIP) program.

#### PLANNED STORM DRAIN INFRASTRUCTURE

The Project site is bisected by the FCOC and two SSJID drain lines that feed into it (Drain 7 and Drain 8). Drain 7 travels underground within a box culvert in Daniels St. and daylights into an open ditch at the west terminal of Daniels St. Drain 8 conveys agricultural drainage and storm-water runoff from properties south of Highway 120 and travels under the highway in a box culvert and lets out into an open ditch that travels north to its confluence with Drain 7 to form the FCOC. The FCOC travels northwest across the Project site and then follows the alignment of the Union Pacific Railroad to the north. Storm drain runoff from all existing development within or near the FEZ (including Big League Dreams and the commercial development to the southeast) pump their runoff into this drain system. Big League Dreams maintains a storm drain basin on the west side of

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

the Project site that will eventually be replaced with additional ball fields and other facilities as part of the Master Plan. When this development occurs, the storage volume lost by the development of this basin will be replaced with the development of the Lake.

Development of the FEZ will require the relocation of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8. It is proposed that each of these facilities ultimately be converted from an open water canal to an underground conveyance system, and that these facilities will be routed north through the east utility corridor (just west of Big League Dreams) to the northern property boundary, then west to the current FCOC canal next to the railroad. The ultimate undergrounding of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 may be completed in phases. It is anticipated that the first phase would include undergrounding the portions of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 that occur within the Planning Area 16 in association with the hotel resort facility (i.e. from the southern project boundary to a point just north of Daniels Road). The balance of the FCOC is anticipated to be relocated to the new north-south alignment from Daniels to the northern property boundary then west to the existing FCOC as shown Figure 2-12; however, this section may be temporarily left as an open water canal until such time that the Planning Areas north of Daniels are developed. It is also possible that portions of the realigned FCOC (i.e. the east-west segment located along the northern project boundary) could be left open water in perpetuity as a buffer between the project and the WQCF.

It is anticipated that The FCOC carries a peak flow of approximately 150 cubic feet per second (cfs). To accommodate this flow, the channel will be replaced with dual 60-inch pipes. Installation of this conveyance system is expected to occur with the first phase of infrastructure, along with the construction of the Daniel Street extension to McKinley Avenue.

The Project site is divided into three major watersheds (each consisting of two sub-sheds). Runoff from each watershed will be collected by a network of pipe systems and conveyed to a storage facility serving the watershed. The peak volume from the design storm will be retained in the storage facility and then emptied (pumped) into the FCOC off-peak (when capacity in the FCOC is available). The three watersheds are described below:

- **Watershed A (80 acres):** This watershed consists of the north (A2) and northwest (A1) portions of the project. Runoff from this watershed will be conveyed to a basin located along the north edge of the site, just east of Street C1. In order to reduce the size of this basin, the future parking lots under the power line easements will be designed to accommodate an average of 3 inches of storage above the pavement during the design storm.
- **Watershed B (87 acres):** This watershed consists of the retail commercial area located at the center of the project (B1) and Big League Dreams (B2). Runoff from this watershed will be stored in a detention facility central to the commercial area. Two options are being explored; 1) a detention pond and 2) a lake. If Option 1 is chosen, it will operate much like other basins in the project. However, if Option 2 is chosen, the water elevation in the lake will be established to maintain approximately 24-inches freeboard that will serve as the storage area for peak runoff. Additionally, the Big League Dreams Parking lot will retain

runoff during a peak storm to an average depth of 4 inches. Storage in the Lake will be pumped into the FCOC via a pump station and force main.

- **Watershed C (44 acres):** This watershed consists of PA-16 (C2&C3) and the Southwest (C1) portion of the project. Runoff from this watershed will be conveyed to dual basins located at the south side of PA-16. These basins will be hydraulically connected and will outfall into Drain 8 via a storm drain pump station. Additionally, the two large parking lots within PA-16 site will retain an average of 6 inches of storage above the pavement during the design storm.
- **OPTION:** The city is considering sending the runoff from sub-shed C-2 to Basin B instead of Basin C. C-2 may require a lift station and force main to access Basin B. If this option is selected, Basin B will increase in volume (the storage volume required for sub-shed C3), and Basin C will decrease in volume by this same amount. This option can only be chosen if Option 1 is not implemented as outlined above.

The proposed storm drain system will include water quality features designed in conformance with the standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region, the City of Manteca, and SSJID. Storm water regulations for construction projects using Best Management Practices will be incorporated into the design. Discharge flow rates from each detention facility into the FCOC will be in conformance with the requirements of the City of Manteca and the SSJID. Figure 2-12 depicts both the proposed storm drainage components described above.

## **Flooding**

Flooding events can result in damage to structures, injury or loss of human and animal life, exposure of waterborne diseases, and damage to infrastructure. In addition, standing floodwater can destroy agricultural crops, undermine infrastructure and structural foundations, and contaminate groundwater.

The Project site lies within the larger area known as the Delta Basin, which historically was a tidal marsh formed in an overflow area of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. During the early part of the 20th century, over 80 percent of the Delta was reclaimed through construction of levees. There are over 1,100 miles of man-made levees protecting land in the Delta from flooding. The RD-17 levee system is designed to a 100-year protection standard. Land within the Project site along the levee frontage was acquired by RD-17 to construct levee improvements approximately in 2009/10. RD-17 has been working with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to analyze 200-year protection. The land RD-17 acquired to construct the 100-year improvements is anticipated to provide sufficient space for any additional incremental improvements to provide 200-year protection in the future. The Project site is currently located in Zone X, protected by levee, which by definition indicates an area protected by levees from the 1% annual chance flood. (Figure 3.9-2). A portion of the project site located along the eastern boundary is located within the 500-year flood zone.

### **Dam Failure**

The Project site is located within four dam failure inundation areas, New Melones Lake, and San Luis Reservoir, while the Lake McClure and Tulloch Reservoir dam inundation areas lie just outside the project site to the west. See Figure 3.9-3. Dam failure is generally a result of structural instability caused by improper design or construction, instability resulting from seismic shaking, or overtopping and erosion of the dam. Larger dams that are higher than 25 feet or with storage capacities over 50 acre-feet of water are regulated by the California Dam Safety Act, which is implemented by the California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSD). The DSD is responsible for inspecting and monitoring these dams. The Act also requires that dam owners submit to the California Office of Emergency Services inundation maps for dams that would cause significant loss of life or personal injury as a result of dam failure. The County Office of Emergency Services is responsible for developing and implementing a Dam Failure Plan that designates evacuation plans, the direction of floodwaters, and provides emergency information.

*New Melones Lake*, approximately 45 miles from the Project site, is an artificial lake in the central Sierra Nevada foothills of Calaveras- and Tuolumne County, near Jamestown. This reservoir created by the construction of the New Melones Dam across the Stanislaus River has a 2,400,000 acre-foot capacity with a surface area of 12,500 acres. When full, the shoreline is more than 100 miles.

The *San Luis Reservoir*, approximately 50 miles from the Project site, is an artificial lake on San Luis Creek in the eastern slopes of the Diablo Range of Merced County, approximately 12 miles west of Los Banos. The reservoir stores water taken from the San Joaquin-Sacramento River Delta. Water is pumped uphill into the reservoir from the O'Neill Forebay which is fed by the California Aqueduct and is released back into the forebay to continue downstream along the aqueduct as needed for farm irrigation and other uses. Depending on water levels, the reservoir is approximately nine miles long from north to south at its longest point, and five miles wide. At the eastern end of the reservoir is the San Luis Dam, or the B.F. Sisk Dam, the fourth largest embankment dam in the United States, which allows for a total capacity of 2,041,000 acre feet.

### **Stormwater Quality**

Potential hazards to surface water quality include the following nonpoint pollution problems: high turbidity from sediment resulting from erosion of improperly graded construction projects, concentration of nitrates and dissolved solids from agriculture or surfacing septic tank failures, contaminated street and lawn run-off from urban areas, and warm water drainage discharges into cold water streams.

The most critical period for surface water quality is following a rainstorm which produces significant amounts of drainage runoff into streams at low flow, resulting in poor dilution of contaminants in the low flowing stream. Such conditions are most frequent during the fall at the beginning of the rainy season when stream flows are near their lowest annual levels. Besides the greases, oils, pesticides, litter, and organic matter associated with such runoff, heavy metals such as copper, zinc, and cadmium can cause considerable harm to aquatic organisms when introduced to streams in low flow conditions.

Urban stormwater runoff was managed as a non-point discharge (a source not readily identifiable) under the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500, Section 208) until the mid-1980's. However, since then, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency has continued to develop implementing rules which categorize urban runoff as a point source (an identifiable source) subject to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. Rules now affect medium and large urban areas, and further rulemaking is expected as programs are developed to meet requirements of Federal water pollution control laws.

Surface water pollution is also caused by erosion. Excessive and improperly managed grading, vegetation removal, quarrying, logging, and agricultural practices all lead to increased erosion of exposed earth and sedimentation of watercourses during rainy periods. In slower moving water bodies these same factors often cause a buildup of siltation, which ultimately reduces the capacity of the water system to percolate and recharge groundwater basins, as well as adversely affecting both aquatic resources and flood control efforts.

**303(d) Impaired Water Bodies:** Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires States to identify waters that do not meet water quality standards or objectives and thus, are considered "impaired." Once listed, Section 303(d) mandates prioritization and development of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The TMDL is a tool that establishes the allowable loadings or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody and thereby the basis for the States to establish water quality-based controls. The purpose of TMDLs is to ensure that beneficial uses are restored and that water quality objectives are achieved.

According to the California Water Quality Control Monitoring Council, which is part of California Environmental Protection Agency, Natural Resources, there are many areas within the San Joaquin County which are considered Section 303(d) impaired waterbodies. Those areas in the regional vicinity of the Project site that are impaired are referred as Delta Waterways (Southern Portion) by the Water Quality Control Monitoring Council. This includes 3,125 acres listed as early as 1996 for Chlorpyrifos (Agriculture, Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers), DDT (Agriculture), Diazinon (Agriculture, Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers), Electrical Conductivity (Agriculture), Group A Pesticides (Agriculture), Invasive Species (Source Unknown), Mercury (Resource Extraction), and Unknown Toxicity (Source Unknown).

### 3.9.2 REGULATORY SETTING

There are a number of regulatory agencies whose responsibility includes the oversight of the water resources of the state and nation including the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the US Environmental Protection Agency, the State Water Resources Board, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The following is an overview of the federal, state and local regulations that are applicable to the proposed Project.

### FEDERAL AND STATE

---

#### **Clean Water Act (CWA)**

The Clean Water Act (CWA), initially passed in 1972, regulates the discharge of pollutants into watersheds throughout the nation. Section 402(p) of the act establishes a framework for regulating municipal and industrial stormwater discharges under the NPDES Program. Section 402(p) requires that stormwater associated with industrial activity that discharges either directly to surface waters or indirectly through municipal separate storm sewers must be regulated by an NPDES permit.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) is responsible for implementing the Clean Water Act and does so through issuing NPDES permits to cities and counties through regional water quality control boards. Federal regulations allow two permitting options for stormwater discharges (individual permits and general permits). The SWRCB elected to adopt a statewide general permit (Water Quality Order No. 2013-001-DWQ-DWQ).

#### **Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)**

San Joaquin County is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), a Federal program administered by FEMA. Participants in the NFIP must satisfy certain mandated floodplain management criteria. The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 has adopted as a desired level of protection, an expectation that developments should be protected from floodwater damage of the Intermediate Regional Flood (IRF). The IRF is defined as a flood that has an average frequency of occurrence on the order of once in 100 years, although such a flood may occur in any given year. Communities are occasionally audited by the Department of Water Resources to insure the proper implementation of FEMA floodplain management regulations.

#### **200-Year Flood Protection in Central Valley**

Both State policy and recently enacted State legislation (Senate Bill 5) call for 200-year (0.5% annual chance) flood protection to be the minimum level of protection for urban and urbanizing areas in the Central Valley. Senate Bill 5 (SB5) requires that the 200-year protection be consistent with criteria used or developed by the Department of Water Resources. SB 5 requires all urban and urbanizing areas in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys to achieve 200-year flood protection in order to approve development. The new law restricts approval of development after 2015 if “adequate progress” towards achieving this standard is not met. Urban and urbanizing areas protected by State-Federal project levees cannot use “adequate progress” as a condition to approve development after 2025.

The RD-17 levee system is designed to a 100-year protection standard. Land within the Project site along the levee frontage was acquired by RD-17 to construct levee improvements approximately in 2009/10. RD-17 has been working with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to analyze 200-year protection. The land RD-17 acquired to construct the 100-year improvements is anticipated to provide sufficient space for any additional incremental improvements to provide 200-year protection in the future.

### California Water Code

The Federal Clean Water Act places the primary responsibility for the control of surface water pollution and for planning the development and use of water resources with the states, although this does establish certain guidelines for the States to follow in developing their programs and allows the Environmental Protection Agency to withdraw control from states with inadequate implementation mechanisms.

California's primary statute governing water quality and water pollution issues with respect to both surface waters and groundwater is the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970 (Division 7 of the California Water Code) (Porter-Cologne Act). The Porter-Cologne Act grants the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) and each of the RWQCBs power to protect water quality, and is the primary vehicle for implementation of California's responsibilities under the Federal Clean Water Act. The Porter-Cologne Act grants the SWRCB and the RWQCBs authority and responsibility to adopt plans and policies, to regulate discharges to surface and groundwater, to regulate waste disposal sites and to require cleanup of discharges of hazardous materials and other pollutants. The Porter-Cologne Act also establishes reporting requirements for unintended discharges of any hazardous substance, sewage, or oil or petroleum product.

Each RWQCB must formulate and adopt a water quality control plan (Basin Plan) for its region the regional plans are to conform to the policies set forth in the Porter-Cologne Act and established by the SWRCB in its State water policy. The Porter-Cologne Act also provides that a RWQCB may include within its regional plan water discharge prohibitions applicable to particular conditions, areas, or types of waste.

The Water Code Section 13260 requires all dischargers of waste that may affect water quality in waters of the state to prepare and provide a water quality discharge report to the RWQCB. Section 13260a-c is as follows:

(a) Each of the following persons shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of the discharge, containing the information that may be required by the regional board:

(1) A person discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the state, other than into a community sewer system.

(2) A person who is a citizen, domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, outside the boundaries of the state in a manner that could affect the quality of the waters of the state within any region.

(3) A person operating, or proposing to construct, an injection well.

(b) No report of waste discharge need be filed pursuant to subdivision (a) if the requirement is waived pursuant to Section 13269.

(c) Each person subject to subdivision (a) shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of waste discharge relative to any material change or proposed change in the character, location, or volume of the discharge.

### **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)**

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits are required for discharges of pollutants to navigable waters of the United States, which includes any discharge to surface waters, including lakes, rivers, streams, bays, the ocean, dry stream beds, wetlands, and storm sewers that are tributary to any surface water body. NPDES permits are issued under the Federal Clean Water Act, Title IV, Permits and Licenses, Section 402 (33 USC 466 et seq.)

The RWQCB issues these permits in lieu of direct issuance by the Environmental Protection Agency, subject to review and approval by the Environmental Protection Agency Regional Administrator. The terms of these NPDES permits implement pertinent provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and the Act's implementing regulations, including pre-treatment, sludge management, effluent limitations for specific industries, and anti-degradation. In general, the discharge of pollutants is to be eliminated or reduced as much as practicable so as to achieve the Clean Water Act's goal of "fishable and swimmable" navigable (surface) waters. Technically, all NPDES permits issued by the RWQCB are also Waste Discharge Requirements issued under the authority of the CWA.

These NPDES permits regulate discharges from publicly owned treatment works, industrial discharges, stormwater runoff, dewatering operations, and groundwater cleanup discharges. NPDES permits are issued for five years or less, and are therefore to be updated regularly. The rapid and dramatic population and urban growth in the Central Valley Region has caused a significant increase in NPDES permit applications for new waste discharges. To expedite the permit issuance process, the SWRCB has adopted several general NPDES permits, each of which regulates numerous discharges of similar types of wastes. The SWRCB has issued general permits for stormwater runoff from industrial and construction sites statewide. Stormwater discharges from industrial and construction activities in the Central Valley Region can be covered under these general permits, which are administered jointly by the SWRCB and RWQCB.

### **Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Valley Region**

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Valley Region (Basin Plan) includes a summary of beneficial water uses, water quality objectives needed to protect the identified beneficial uses, and implementation measures. The Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for all the ground and surface waters of the region. The term "water quality standards," as used in the Federal Clean Water Act, includes both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of quality that must be met and maintained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan includes an implementation plan describing the actions by the RWQCB and others that are necessary to achieve and maintain the water quality standards.

The RWQCB regulates waste discharges to minimize and control their effects on the quality of the region's ground and surface water. Permits are issued under a number of programs and

authorities. The terms and conditions of these discharge permits are enforced through a variety of technical, administrative, and legal means. Water quality problems in the region are listed in the Basin Plan, along with the causes, where they are known. For water bodies with quality below the levels necessary to allow all the beneficial uses of the water to be met, plans for improving water quality are included. The Basin Plan reflects, incorporates, and implements applicable portions of a number of national and statewide water quality plans and policies, including the California Water Code and the Clean Water Act.

## LOCAL

---

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

#### POLICIES: DOMESTIC WATER

- PF-P-4. Secure sufficient sources of water to meet the needs of the existing community and planned residential and commercial growth.
- PF-P-5. City will continue to rely principally on groundwater resources for its municipal water in the near term, will participate in the regional improvements to deliver surface water to augment the City's groundwater supply.
- PF-P-6. The City shall develop new water sources as necessary to serve new development.
- PF-P-7. The City shall develop new water storage facilities and major distribution lines as necessary to serve new development.
- PF-P-8. The City will provide water for future development to maintain a balance of jobs and housing.
- PF-P-9. City water services shall not be extended to unincorporated areas except in extraordinary circumstances. Existing commitments for City water service outside the City limits shall continue to be honored.
- PF-P-10. Development of private water wells within the City limits shall be allowed only where the City makes a finding that it cannot feasibly provide water service. Such systems shall only be allowed to be used until such time as City water service becomes available.
- PF-P-11. The City will develop and implement water conservation measures as necessary elements of the water system.
- PF-P-12. The City shall continue to assess a water development fee on all new commercial, industrial, and residential development sufficient to fund systemwide capacity improvements. The water development fee schedule shall be periodically reviewed and revised as necessary.
- PF-P-13. Ensure that all new development provides for and funds a fair share of the costs for adequate water distribution, including line extensions, easements, and plant expansions.
- PF-P-14. The City shall continuously monitor water flows through the City's water system to identify areas of potential water loss and cases of under billing for water service and shall make improvements in the systems as necessary.
- PF-P-15. The City shall monitor water quality regularly and take necessary measures to prevent contamination.

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

- PF-P-16. The City of Manteca shall include a groundwater analysis as a technical analysis of water system capacity in the update of the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP), and shall prepare an environmental analysis in the PFIP that addresses the quality and availability of groundwater.
- PF-P-17. The City of Manteca shall consider incremental increases in the demands on groundwater supply and water quality when reviewing development applications.

### POLICIES: MAJOR DRAINAGE

- PF-P-26. The City shall continue to complete gaps in the drainage system in areas of existing development.
- PF-P-27. The City shall require the dedication and improvement of drainage detention basins as a condition of development approval according to the standards of the Drainage Master Plan. The responsibility for the dedication and improvement of detention basins shall be based on the prorated share of stormwater runoff resulting from each development.
- PF-P-28. Storm drainage systems within new development areas shall include open drainage corridors where feasible to supplement or replace an underground piped drainage system. The drainage systems would provide for short-term storm water detention, storm water conveyance for storm waters exceeding a 10-year event, storm water quality treatment, bike and pedestrian paths, and visual open space within neighborhoods. The width and length of the corridors would be determined by the stormwater management requirements. The drainage systems would provide a pedestrian connection between parks and access to open space from residential neighborhoods. The neighborhoods would be designed with homes oriented to, rather than backing on the open space corridor.

### POLICIES: FLOOD SAFETY

- S-P-7. Regulate all uses and development in areas subject to potential flooding through zoning and other land use regulations.
- S-P-8. Cooperate with other agencies in the pursuit of a regional approach to flood issues.
- S-P-9. Combine flood control, recreation, water quality, and open space functions where feasible.
- S-P-10. Ensure that any existing structures subject to the 200-year flood provide adequate protection from flood hazards.
- S-P-11. Ensure that the impacts of potential flooding are adequately analyzed when considering areas for future urban expansion.
- S-P-12. New residential development, including mobilehomes, shall be constructed so that the lowest floor is at least one foot above the 200-year flood level.
- S-P-13. Non-residential development shall be anchored and floodproofed in accord with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards to prevent damage or causing damage due to a 200-year flood or, alternatively, elevated to at least one foot above the 200-year flood level.

- S-P-14. When improvements to existing developments are made costing at least 50 percent of the current market value of the structure before improvements, the structure shall be brought into compliance with FEMA standards.
- S-P-15. Ensure the city is in compliance with the Central Valley Flood Protect Plan.

#### 8.3.1 POLICIES: WATER CONSERVATION

- RC-P-1. The City shall continue to implement water conservation standards for all commercial and industrial development, and for all existing and new residential development.
- RC-P-2. The City shall explore potential uses of treated wastewater when such opportunities become available.
- RC-P-3. The City shall protect the quantity of Manteca's groundwater.
- RC-P-4. The City shall require water conservation in both City operations and private development to minimize the need for the development of new water sources.
- RC-P-5. Development of private water wells within the city limits shall be allowed only where the City makes a finding that municipal water service is not readily and feasibly available, and such private well systems shall only be allowed to be used until such time as City water service becomes available.

#### 8.5.1 POLICIES: SOILS AND EROSION CONTROL

- RC-P-10. Minimize soil erosion and loss of topsoil from land development activities, wind, and water flow.

#### 8.6.1 POLICIES: WATER QUALITY

- RC-P-11. Minimize sedimentation and loss of topsoil from soil erosion.
- RC-P-12. Minimize pollution of waterways and other surface water bodies from urban runoff.
- RC-P-13. Protect the quality of Manteca's groundwater.
- RC-P-14. Encourage participation by the County and surrounding communities in a basin-wide groundwater management study.
- RC-P-15. Once sewer service has been extended to incorporated areas, new septic tanks shall not be permitted.

### 3.9.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on the environment associated with hydrology and water quality if it will:

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;
- 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

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted;

- 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 that would result in substantial erosion, siltation, run-off or flooding on- or off-site;
- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site;
- 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;
- Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;
- Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows;
- Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or
- Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

---

#### **Impact 3.9-1: The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction (less than significant with mitigation)**

**Construction-Related Water Quality Impacts:** According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, polluted stormwater runoff is a leading cause of impairment to the nearly 40 percent of surveyed U.S. water bodies which do not meet water quality standards. Over land or via storm sewer systems, polluted runoff is discharged, often untreated, directly into local water bodies. Soil erosion is one of the most common sources of polluted stormwater runoff during construction activities. When left uncontrolled, storm water runoff can erode soil and cause sedimentation in waterways, which collectively result in the destruction of fish, wildlife, and aquatic life habitats; a loss in aesthetic value; and threats to public health due to contaminated food, drinking water supplies, and recreational waterways.

Mandated by Congress under the Clean Water Act, the NPDES Stormwater Program is a comprehensive two-phased national program for addressing the non-agricultural sources of stormwater discharges which adversely affect the quality of our nation's waters. The program uses the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting mechanism to require the implementation of controls designed to prevent harmful pollutants, including soil erosion, from being washed by stormwater runoff into local water bodies. The construction activities for the proposed project would be governed by the General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ (amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ), which states:

*“...Particular attention must be paid to large, mass graded sites where the potential for soil exposure to the erosive effects of rainfall and wind is great and where there is potential for significant sediment discharge from the site to surface waters. Until permanent vegetation is established, soil cover is the most cost-effective and expeditious method to protect soil particles from detachment and transport by rainfall. Temporary soil stabilization can be the single most important factor in reducing erosion at construction sites. The discharger is required to consider measures such as: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. These erosion control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. Erosion control BMPs should be the primary means of preventing storm water contamination, and sediment control techniques should be used to capture any soil that becomes eroded...”*

General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ (amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ) further states that:

*“Sediment control BMPs should be the secondary means of preventing storm water contamination. When erosion control techniques are ineffective, sediment control techniques should be used to capture any soil that becomes eroded. The discharger is required to consider perimeter control measures such as: installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes. These sediment control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed...Inappropriate management of run-on and runoff can result in excessive physical impacts to receiving waters from sediment and increased flows. The discharger is required to manage all run-on and runoff from a project site. Examples include: installing berms and other temporary run-on and runoff diversions...All measures must be periodically inspected, maintained and repaired to ensure that receiving water quality is protected. Frequent inspections coupled with thorough documentation and timely repair is necessary to ensure that all measures are functioning as intended...”*

Grading, excavation, removal of vegetation cover, and loading activities associated with construction activities could temporarily increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. Construction activities also could result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas. To ensure that construction activities are covered under General Permit 2009-0009-DWQ (amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ), projects in California must prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and sediments to meet water quality standards. Such BMPs may include: temporary erosion control measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover. The BMPs and overall SWPPP is reviewed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as part of the permitting process. The SWPPP, once approved, is kept on site and implemented during construction

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

activities and must be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB and/or the lead agency.

In accordance with the NPDES Stormwater Program, Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 contained in Section 3.6 Geology and Soils, ensures compliance with existing regulatory requirements to prepare a SWPPP designed to control erosion and the loss of topsoil to the extent practicable using BMPs that the RWQCB has deemed effective in controlling erosion, sedimentation, runoff during construction activities. The RWQCB has stated that these erosion control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. The specific controls are subject to the review and approval by the RWQCB and are an existing regulatory requirement.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 requires, for an individual phase, or a portion of an individual phase, the Project proponent, or their contractor, to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the RWQCB to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ). The NOI must be submitted prior to clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation. The NOI would only cover the area proposed for clearing, grading, and disturbance to the ground for the work to be performed at that time (i.e. it does not need to include the entire project or an entire phase). In accordance with the General Permit requirements, the Permittee can either close out the General Construction Permit once all work and requirements are completed, or amend the General Construction Permit to add additional areas for disturbance while closing out areas where work is completed.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 requires the SWPPP to be designed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the RWQCB has deemed as effective at reducing erosion, controlling sediment, and managing runoff. These include: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. Sediment control BMPs, installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes, installing berms and other temporary run-on and runoff diversions. These BMPs are only examples of what could be considered and does not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-1, the proposed Project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **Implement Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 (provided in Section 3.6 Geology and Soils)**

**Impact 3.9-2: The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation (less than significant with mitigation)**

**Operational Impacts:** The long-term operations of the proposed Project (all phases) could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff. The proposed Project would result in new impervious areas associated with roadways, driveways, parking lots, buildings, and landscape areas. Normal activities in these developed areas include the use of various automotive petroleum products (i.e. oil, grease, fuel), common household hazardous materials, heavy metals, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and sediment. Within urban areas, these pollutants are generally called nonpoint source pollutants. The pollutant levels vary based on factors such as time between storm events, volume of storm event, type of uses, and density of people.

The drainage collection system within the City of Manteca consists of gravity pipes, retention/detention/surge basins, pump station, force mains, outfalls, and irrigation canals/ditches. The collection system for the proposed project will be designed to contain the 10-year storm event within the pipe system and basins while maintaining one foot of freeboard. The streets will be designed in combination with the pipe system to convey the 100-year storm event to the basins and pump station in accordance with City standards. Early phases of development may rely on temporary basins in order to delay the construction of the overall storm drainage system. The final design of all onsite and offsite storm drain infrastructure improvements is subject to the review and approval of the City of Manteca.

The ongoing operational phase of the proposed Project (all phases) requires discharge of stormwater into the French Camp Outlet Canal. The discharge of stormwater must be treated through BMPs prior to its discharge to the French Camp Outlet Canal. The City of Manteca implements best management practices to the extent they are technologically achievable to prevent and reduce pollutants. Under the City's standard practices, the owner or operator of a commercial establishment shall provide reasonable protection from accidental discharge of prohibited materials or other wastes into the municipal storm drain system or watercourses. Facilities to prevent accidental discharge of prohibited materials or other wastes shall be provided and maintained at the owner or operator's expense. The City imposes the same standards on municipal owned projects, such as the proposed project.

There are various non-structural and structural stormwater BMPs that can be implemented to reduce water pollution. Non-structural BMPs are typically aimed at prevention of pollution through public education and outreach. Non-structural BMPs include: school educational programs, newsletters, website information, commercial, billboards/advertisements, river cleanups, and storm drain stenciling. Structural BMPs are aimed at the physical collection, filtering, and detaining of stormwater. Structural BMPs include items such as drop inlet filters, vault filters, hydrodynamic separators, surface detention basins, and underground detention facilities.

Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 and 3.4-6 contained in Section 3.4 Biological Resources would ensure that BMPs are implemented to reduce the amount of pollution in stormwater discharged from the

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Project site into the Delta during the operational phase of the project. The management of water quality through obtaining a General Industrial Stormwater Permit and implementing BMPs is intended to ensure that water quality does not degrade to levels that would violate water quality standards. These are existing regulatory requirements. Implementation of the proposed Project with the proper mitigation controls would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

### **Impact 3.9.3: The proposed project has the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge (less than significant)**

The proposed Project would result in new impervious surfaces and could reduce rainwater infiltration and groundwater recharge. Infiltration rates vary depending on the overlying soil types. In general, sandy soils have higher infiltration rates and can contribute to significant amounts of ground water recharge; clay soils tend to have lower percolation potential; and impervious surfaces such as pavement significantly reduce infiltration capacity and increase surface water runoff.

Table 3.9-2 below identifies the soils in the Project site and the soils infiltration rate. The Project site has soils with a hydrologic rating of “A”, which is indicative of soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

**TABLE 3.9-2: SOILS HYDROLOGIC RATING**

<i>SOIL SERIES</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>SOURCE MATERIAL</i>	<i>RATING</i>
Bisgani	Loamy coarse sand, partially drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	A
Delhi	Loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Wind-modified alluvium	A
Timor	Loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	A
Tinnin	Loamy coarse sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from granitic rock sources	A
Veritas	Fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Alluvium derived from mixed rock sources	A

*SOURCE: NCRS 2014*

The infiltration rate of the soils on the Project site is considered high. Development of the proposed Project will cover at least 50% of the existing Project site with impervious surfaces and could reduce rainwater infiltration and groundwater recharge further. The collection of rainwater for those areas of impervious surfaces will be routed into the proposed Project’s storm drainage system and eventually flow into the San Joaquin River. The ball fields will remain largely pervious. The exact design of the drainage basin is not known at this time, therefore, it is not known whether the drainage basin will percolate or not (i.e. unlined or lined).

The project site is located in the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin. The basin is not adjudicated; however, a basin management plan has been created. The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan (ESJGB-GMP) (NSJCGB, 2004) was prepared in September 2004. The purpose of the ESJGB-GMP is “to review, enhance, assess, and coordinate

existing groundwater management policies and programs in Eastern San Joaquin County and to develop new policies and programs to ensure the long-term sustainability of groundwater resources in Eastern San Joaquin County.” According to Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 (DWR, 2006), the ESJGB is in a critical condition of overdraft. Groundwater levels have declined in the basin since the 1960s with the lowest groundwater levels found in eastern San Joaquin County.

Most of the fresh groundwater is encountered at depths of less than 1,000 feet, and most of this shallow groundwater is unconfined. The Victor formation is the uppermost formation and extends from the ground surface to a maximum depth of about 150 feet. Compared to the underlying formations, the Victor formation is generally more permeable and the groundwater is typically unconfined. The underlying Laguna formation includes discontinuous lenses of unconsolidated to semi-consolidated sands and silts interspersed with lesser amounts of clay and gravel. The Laguna formation is hydraulically connected to the Victor formation and is estimated to be 750 to 1,000 feet thick. Moderate permeability has been reported within the Laguna formation with some highly permeable coarse-grained beds. Most of the municipal and industrial wells in the Manteca area penetrate through the Victor formation into the Laguna formation.

Groundwater pumping in Manteca increased from 2,277 AFY in 1960 to a maximum of 14,933 AFY in 2004 prior to the SCWSP delivering treated surface water to the City. According to the City’s 2005 UWMP, the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin was estimated in a 1985 study to be approximately 1 acre-foot per acre per year. Although groundwater pumping in some years has exceeded that rate, as part of the SCWSP, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to that rate or less. At this time, the area of the City’s PUSA is 13,790 acres. Therefore, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to a long-term average of no greater than 13,790 ac-ft/yr. Groundwater pumping is not projected to reach 13,790 ac-ft/yr prior to 2035.

While the Project site’s soils have a high infiltration rate based on the high percentage of sands, much of the groundwater recharge in the basin occurs in the sand and gravels along the San Joaquin River from Sierra snowmelt flowing downstream. Precipitation in the region is 13.81 inches, most of which falls between November through April. A portion of this annual rainfall infiltrates the soil and groundwater basin, while a portion is discharged downstream into the Delta. While the proposed project would reduce the amount of pervious surfaces within the project site, it will retain at least 50% of the site as a pervious surface.

For the reasons mentioned above, the proposed Project would not cause the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

### **Impact 3.9-4: The proposed project has the potential to alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, or polluted runoff (less than significant)**

Currently, runoff from within the Project site is collected in a system of shallow agricultural and roadside ditches. Public storm drain facilities are not currently installed in the agricultural fields. The project site does, however, contain the French Camp Outlet Canal which functions as a storm drainage outlet for runoff through the City of Manteca.

Storm water in the planning area will flow to drain 7 in Zone 34, which has not had flooding issues. Drain 7 is the main existing dual-use facility in Zone 34. There are no additional dual-use facilities proposed for Drain 7 in Zone 34. The City has assessed the need for infrastructure improvements in the planning area. Specifically, two 36 inch culverts will need to be replaced with a single 10 foot by 8 foot box culvert. Although this upgrade has been assessed, it is a Group 2 project and it has been planned to occur sometime after 2018. Storm drain monitoring is conducted for drain 7 at the North East corner of Daniel Street and Junction Drive and at the North East corner of Daniel Drive and Stonum Lane. A City storm drain pump station for the Big League Dreams Park is in a position to serve the project site.

To account for increased impervious surfaces in the planning area several additions to the existing infrastructure have been proposed for the South Drain storm pump station infrastructure. According to the FEZ Utility Master Plan, these additions include four gravity mains, and one force main. The proposed project also includes the undergrounding of French Camp Outlet Canal.

The proposed stormwater collection system functions by attenuating its runoff in a storage facility before pumping it into the French Camp Outlet Canal. The City will use real-time water level monitoring stations at critical low points in the conveyance system complete with SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) facilities to determine when stormwater can be pumped into the French Camp Outlet Canal and when it must be retained.

The City and SSJID have a long-standing agreement that authorizes the City to discharge its storm water runoff into SSJID facilities for ultimate disposal to the San Joaquin River. The City / SSJID Master Drainage Agreement requires that all storm water discharges into SSJID facilities must be monitored and controlled such that the capacity of SSJID's facilities is not exceeded, and that storm water quality must be controlled such that it complies with all applicable laws. The proposed storm drainage system is consistent with these requirements.

The project will require the relocation of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8. It is proposed that each of these facilities ultimately be converted from an open water canal to an underground conveyance system, and that these facilities will be routed north through the east utility corridor (just west of Big League Dreams) to the northern property boundary, then west to the current FCOC canal next to the railroad. The ultimate undergrounding of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 may be completed in phases. It is anticipated that the first phase would include undergrounding the portions of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 that occur within the Planning Area 16 in association with the hotel resort facility (i.e. from the southern project boundary to a point just north of Daniels Road). The balance

of the FCOC is anticipated to be relocated to the new north-south alignment from Daniels to the northern property boundary then west to the existing FCOC as shown Figure 2-12; however, this section may be temporarily left as an open water canal until such time that the Planning Areas north of Daniels are developed. It is also possible that portions of the realigned FCOC (i.e. the east-west segment located along the northern project boundary) could be left open water in perpetuity as a buffer between the project and the WQCF.

It is anticipated that The FCOC carries a peak flow of approximately 150 cubic feet per second (cfs). To accommodate this flow, the channel will be replaced with dual 60-inch pipes. Installation of this conveyance system is expected to occur with the first phase of infrastructure, along with the construction of the Daniel Street extension to McKinley Avenue.

The exact sizing of the underground piping and basin will be engineered during the preparation of the improvement plans. The relatively shallow groundwater exists throughout the Project site and it is possible that this high ground water condition affect the design and construction of the storm drain system. Infiltration into the storm pipes through joints and underground structures can result in excessive pumping demands throughout the life of the proposed Project. This impact will be reduced by proper installation of pipes having rubber gasket sealed joints. Additionally, high groundwater can impact the effectiveness of detention basins. To the extent that groundwater enters the basins, the storage available for the runoff is diminished. The bottom of the basins will be designed to maintain a minimum of five feet of separation from groundwater or other design measures will be implemented such as impervious liners with sub drain systems.

Initial development phases may utilize interim retention (percolation) basins until the pump station, force main and basin are constructed.

The design and construction of flood control improvements included in the proposed storm drainage system is self-mitigating; therefore, the proposed Project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

### **Impact 3.9.5 The proposed project has the potential to otherwise substantially degrade water quality (less than significant with mitigation)**

***Water Quality Impacts from Discharges to 303(d) Listed Water Bodies:*** Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires States to identify waters that do not meet water quality standards or objectives and thus, are considered "impaired." Once listed, Section 303(d) mandates prioritization and development of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The TMDL is a tool that establishes the allowable loadings or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody and thereby the basis for the States to establish water quality-based controls. The purpose of TMDLs is to ensure that beneficial uses are restored and that water quality objectives are achieved.

According to the California Water Quality Control Monitoring Council, which is part of California Environmental Protection Agency, Natural Resources, there are many areas within the San Joaquin County which are considered Section 303(d) impaired waterbodies. Those areas in the regional vicinity of the Project site that are impaired are referred as Delta Waterways (Southern Portion) by the Water Quality Control Monitoring Council. This includes 3,125 acres listed as early as 1996 for

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

Chlorpyrifos (Agriculture, Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers), DDT (Agriculture), Diazinon (Agriculture, Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers), Electrical Conductivity (Agriculture), Group A Pesticides (Agriculture), Invasive Species (Source Unknown), Mercury (Resource Extraction), and Unknown Toxicity (Source Unknown).

The San Joaquin River is specifically listed by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) as an impaired water body due to mercury under the Clean Water Act. Mercury is a sediment-based pollutant that can be released into the water column during various in-water construction activities (e.g., construction of the storm drain outfall) that may disturb the sediment and cause turbidity. As a result, such activities may increase the likelihood of mercury exposure to the public and wildlife that utilize the San Joaquin River.

In accordance with the NPDES Stormwater Program, Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 contained in Section 3.6 Geology and Soils requires an approved SWPPP designed to control erosion and the loss of topsoil to the extent practicable using BMPs that the RWQCB has deemed effective in controlling erosion, sedimentation, runoff during construction activities. Such BMPs may include: temporary erosion control measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover. The BMPs and overall SWPPP is reviewed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as part of the permitting process. The SWPPP, once approved, is kept on site and implemented during construction activities and must be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB and/or the lead agency. The RWQCB has stated that these erosion control measures are only examples of what should be considered and should not preclude new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. The specific controls are subject to the review and approval by the RWQCB.

The ongoing operational phase of the proposed Project (all phases) requires discharge of stormwater into the French Camp Outlet Canal, which ultimately flows into the Delta. The discharge of stormwater must be treated through BMPs prior to its discharge to the French Camp Outlet Canal. Mitigation Measure 3.4-5 and 3.4-6 contained in Section 3.4 Biological Resources would ensure that BMPs are implemented to reduce the amount of pollution in stormwater discharged from the Project site into the French Camp Outlet Canal, which ultimately flows into the Delta during the operational phase of the project. There are various non-structural and structural stormwater BMPs that can be implemented to reduce water pollution. Non-structural BMPs are typically aimed at prevention of pollution through public education and outreach. Non-structural BMPs include: school educational programs, newsletters, website information, commercial, billboards/advertisements, river cleanups, and storm drain stenciling. Structural BMPs are aimed at the physical collection, filtering, and detaining of stormwater. Structural BMPs include items such as drop inlet filters, vault filters, hydrodynamic separators, surface detention basins, and underground detention facilities. The management of water quality through obtaining a General Industrial Stormwater Permit and implementing BMPs is intended to ensure that water quality does not degrade to levels that would violate water quality standards.

The use of BMPs are intended to treat runoff close to the source during the construction and long term operational phase of the project (All Phases) to reduce stormwater quality impacts. The

mitigation measures listed below are existing regulatory requirements. Implementation of proposed Project with these mitigation measures would have a *less-than-significant* impact relative to this topic.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

Implement **Mitigation Measure 3.6-1** (from Section 3.6 Geology and Soils) and **Mitigation Measures 3.4-5 and 3.4-6** (from Section 3.4 Biological Resources).

#### **Impact 3.9.6 Place housing or structures that would impede/redirect flows 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 (less than significant)**

As shown on Figure 3.9-2, the Project site is not within a 100-year flood zone as delineated by FEMA. Development of the proposed Project would not place housing or structures in a flood hazard area. As a result the proposed Project would have a *less-than-significant* impact relative to this topic.

#### **Impact 3.9.7 The proposed project has the potential to 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, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (less than significant)**

A tsunami is a sea wave caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. Tsunami can cause catastrophic damage to shallow or exposed shorelines. The Project site is approximately 50 miles from San Francisco Bay and 70 miles from the coast, which is sufficiently distant to preclude effects from a tsunami.

Seiches are changes or oscillations of water levels within a confined water body. Seiches are caused by fluctuation in the atmosphere, tidal currents or earthquakes. The effect of this phenomenon is a standing wave that would occur when influenced by the external causes. The Project site is not adjacent to any lakes that pose a risk of a seiche.

A mudflow is a type of mass wasting or landslide, where earth and surface materials are rapidly transported downhill under the force of gravity. Mudflow events are caused by a combination of factors, including soil type, soil profile, precipitation, and slope. Mudflow may be triggered by heavy rainfall that the soil is not able to sufficiently drain or absorb. As a result of this super-saturation, soil and rock materials become unstable and eventually slide away from their existing location. Soils most susceptible to mudflow are saturated, loose, non-plastic, uniformly graded, and fine-grained sand deposits. The Project site is relatively flat making the potential of mudflows low.

The Project site is subject to flood inundation as a result of dam failure from two reservoirs/lakes. Figure 3.9-3 shows areas that are susceptible to dam inundation. Dam failure is generally a result of structural instability caused by improper design or construction, instability resulting from

## 3.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

---

seismic shaking, or overtopping and erosion of the dam. As discussed previously, larger dams that are higher than 25 feet or with storage capacities over 50 acre-feet of water are regulated by the California Dam Safety Act, which is implemented by the California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSD). The DSD is responsible for inspecting and monitoring these dams. The Act also requires that dam owners submit to the California Office of Emergency Services inundation maps for dams that would cause significant loss of life or personal injury as a result of dam failure. The County Office of Emergency Services is responsible for developing and implementing a Dam Failure Plan that designates evacuation plans, the direction of floodwaters, and provides emergency information.


Regular inspection by DSD and maintenance by the dam owners ensure that the dams are kept in safe operating condition. As such, failure of these dams is considered to have an extremely low probability of occurring and is not considered to be a reasonably foreseeable event.

The Project site is subject to flood inundation as a result of levee failure. The levees protected the project site are maintained by Reclamation District 0017 (RD 17). The RD 17 levee system was originally constructed in the 1960's and substantially upgraded in 1988. In 1990 the RD 17 levee was accredited by FEMA, which removed large areas of Stockton, Lathrop, Manteca and the County from the 100-year floodplain.

Following the accreditation in 1990, standards for flood protection have been changing and in May 2007 FEMA extended an offer of a Provisionally Accredited Levee (PAL) Agreement for the RD 17 levee system. A PAL is a levee that meets the FEMA requirements for flood protection but requires additional supporting documentation. Since August 2007, RD 17 has been implementing improvements to the levee system and constructed a seepage berm (a bank of earth placed against the existing levee) along the east levee of the San Joaquin River with the RD 17 area. The purpose of these improvements is to meet the flood protection requirements of FEMA and maintain the levee accreditation. FEMA has determined based on the current condition of the levee and the additional supporting documentation, that the RD 17 levee will maintain its accreditation.

Regular inspection and maintenance by RD 17 ensure that the levees are kept in safe operating condition. As such, failure of the levee is considered to have an extremely low probability of occurring and is not considered to be a reasonably foreseeable event.


The proposed Project would not result in the exposure 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, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. This impact is considered ***less-than-significant***.



**Cataloging Unit (HUC-12)**

	Boscha Lake (Historical)-Stanislaus River		Oakwood Lake-San Joaquin River
	French Camp-San Joaquin River		Roberts Island-Trapper Slough
	Lower Lone Tree Creek		Union Island
	Lower Old River		Upper Old River
	Middle Lone Tree Creek		Walker Slough-French Camp Slough
	Middle River-San Joaquin River		Walthall Slough-San Joaquin River


**MANTECCA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**  
**Figure 3.9-1: Watersheds**



De Novo Planning Group  
 A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm





Data sources: USGS and USDA-NRCS Watershed Boundary Dataset; USGS National Hydrography Dataset; San Joaquin County GIS. Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECCA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**


Figure 3.9-2: FEMA Flood Map

-  X: 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard (500-yr Flood Zone)
-  X: Area of Minimal Hazard
-  X: Area with reduced flood risk due to levee
-  Levee

Data sources: FEMA Map Service Center 12/14/2014; San Joaquin County GIS; ArcGIS Online Imagery. Map date: December 14, 2014.

De Novo Planning Group  
A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

*This page left intentionally blank.*



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

**Figure 3.9-3: Dam Inundation Areas**

**Dam Inundation Area\***

- Inundation area shown on map is a combination of the following dam inundation areas:
- New Melones
- Lake McClure
- San Luis
- Pine Flat
- Tulloch

N



1:280,000

Data sources: Cal EMA Dam Inundation Areas, 2009; San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services Dam Failure Plan, 2003; ESRI StreetMap North America. Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section describes the existing land uses on the Project site and in the surrounding area, describes the applicable land use regulations, and evaluates the environmental effects of implementation of the proposed Project related to land use, population, and housing. Information in this section is based on information provided in the project materials, site surveys conducted by De Novo Planning Group in 2014, and the following reference documents: *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City of Manteca, 2013), *City of Manteca General Plan EIR* (City of Manteca, 2003), the *City of Manteca Municipal Code, Title 17 - Zoning* (City of Manteca, 2011), and the *San Joaquin County General Plan* (County of San Joaquin, 1992). No comments were received during the NOP review period(s) regarding environmental impacts associated with land use, population, or housing.

### 3.10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### EXISTING PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

---

The City of Manteca is located in southern San Joaquin County, approximately 15 miles from Stockton and Tracy and 18 miles from Modesto. State Route 99 travels through Manteca near the eastern edge of the city and State Route 120 travels through the city near the southern edge of the city. Manteca occupies an area of just under 16 square miles.

#### **Project Site**

The Project site is located in the western area of the City of Manteca (Figure 2-1). The Project site is located to the north and west of the Stadium Shopping Center, to the west of Milo Candini Drive, to the east of McKinley Avenue and the Union Pacific Railway right-of-way, to the south of the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF), and to the north of State Route 120. The Project site is comprised of approximately 210.7 acres; of which 28.5 is already developed (Big League Dreams) and 182.2 acres are undeveloped.

The approximately 210.7-acre Project site has relatively flat terrain. As shown in Figure 3.10-1, the majority of the Project site is composed of agricultural uses. The Big League Dreams ballpark, which is developed with six replica ballparks, an indoor soccer facility, two restaurants and other supporting facilities, is located on 28.5 acres in the eastern portion of the Project site. High voltage power lines, within Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) power line easements, traverse portions of the Project site running northeast/southwest. The undeveloped portion of the Project site is currently used for land application of treated effluent from the WQCF.

#### **Surrounding Land Uses**

**North:** The boundary on the north of the Project site is primarily occupied by a public use, the Manteca WQCF. A small portion of the eastern edge of the northern boundary is bordered by agricultural land.

**East:** The project site is bordered by agricultural, undeveloped land, and rural residential uses to the east.

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

**South:** The western portion of the Project site's southern boundary is bordered by primarily by SR 120. There is some additional vacant land to the south of the westernmost portion of the site. The Stadium Shopping Center is located to the south of the Big League Dreams portion of the Project site

**West:** To the west, the Project site is bounded by McKinley Avenue and the Union Pacific Railway right-of-way. The parcels located to the west of those right-of-ways are rural residential, agricultural, and undeveloped land. With the exception of the southernmost portion of the western boundary of the Project site, the majority of the western boundary of the Project site aligns with the City border and lands west of the Project site beyond the City's border are located in the unincorporated area of San Joaquin County.

### DEMOGRAPHICS

#### Population Trends

The City experienced a population increase from 2000 to 2010 of 17,841 persons (36.2%) as shown in Table 3.10-1. During the period from 2010 to 2014, population continued to increase in the City, resulting in a total population of 72,880 in 2014.

**TABLE 3.10-1: POPULATION GROWTH**

YEAR	POPULATION	CHANGE	PERCENT CHANGE
2000	49,255		
2010	67,096	17,841	36.2%
2014	72,880	5,784	8.6%

SOURCES: US CENSUS, 2000; DOF, 2014

#### Housing Stock

Table 3.10-2 summarizes the growth of the City's housing stock between 2000 and 2014. The number of housing units increased from 16,936 in 2000 to 23,132 in 2014. This represents 36.6 percent growth in the City's housing stock. The City's housing stock totaled 24,553 units in 2014.

**TABLE 3.10-2: HOUSING UNIT GROWTH**

YEAR	HOUSING UNITS	CHANGE	PERCENT CHANGE
2000	16,936		
2010	23,132	6,196	36.6%
2014	24,553	1,421	6.1%

SOURCES: US CENSUS 2000; DOF, 2014

#### Persons Per Dwelling Unit

The average number of persons residing in a dwelling unit in the City of Manteca in 2014 was 3.15 (DOF, 2014).

---

## FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE

---

Since 2010, the City of Manteca has been in the process of developing a plan for a comprehensive multipurpose public use zone called the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ). The plan is intended to encompass multiple projects and parcels that provide an extensive recreation complex featuring new and existing recreation, park, water, sports and other leisure amenities. The Project site is intended to be open and accessible to the general public, and to serve the state, region, and the Manteca community as a multipurpose recreation center and public park facility. The FEZ will feature a wide range of active and passive open space and developed uses that will support short term and longer term activities and community events for users ranging from local citizens, day and weekend regional visitors, as well as destination tourists.

The Master Plan for the FEZ was developed in cooperation with the two private sector developers who are proposing to design and build the facility. The Master Plan will provide the appropriate zoning designation for the FEZ as well as provide development standards to implement future development within the Project site.

Projects and uses in the FEZ may be constructed and operated through a series of third party agreements, concessions and/or licensing agreements which may include ground leases of up to 55 years, with some uses needing longer lease terms up to 99 years. Projects and uses may be constructed and operated through a series of private-public partnerships whereby private sector operators and vendors of various public facilities are selected to develop and operate components of the FEZ. These components may include: public active and passive recreation and park facilities and sports amenities, and various commercial operations that are ancillary to the foregoing public facilities.

The FEZ will include public active and passive recreation and sporting facilities to be operated by public agencies and/or private sector vendors or operators, including the addition of the ball fields associated with and adjacent to Big League Dreams (BLD) Park, as well as the addition of multi-purpose playfields, primarily for soccer.

Certain project components will be public visitor serving in support of the extended use of the various public recreation and sporting amenities (such as hotels, restaurants, retail, and conference centers). Proposed and future development projects will include recreation tourism facilities such as overnight lodging, conference/convention/ exhibition facilities and specialized recreation attractions such as an indoor water park available to overnight guests. The primary objective of such uses is to expand the access to current and future public sports and recreation facilities, and expand access for out-of-area public participation in tournaments and training camps. These features will enable and increase the number and duration of extended stay periods for visitors and help facilitate public access for broader uses such as special events and on-site educational activities. Certain components and phases of the FEZ may include commercial retail and restaurant uses that serve park facility patrons and tournament participants and spectators as well as local clientele.

### **Project Entitlements**

The project consists of the following components:

- 1) Approve the FEZ Master Plan.
- 2) Rezone of all parcels, APN's 241-31-53, 241-31-44, 241-31-18, 241-31-32 and portions of APN 241-31-16, 241-30-48, 241-31-48, 241-30-62 and 241-30-61 (Figure 2-5) from Public/Quasi Public (PQP) to Master Plan (MP).
- 3) Large Lot Tentative Parcel Map, to promote the various phases of development on the 210.7 acre site will be subdivided into large lots available for individual development. The large lot map will include approximately 19 parcels, which will roughly resemble the layout of the Planning Areas. Some land within the project site is located on legal parcels that extend beyond the project boundary (i.e. WQCF parcel is on same legal parcel as the northern portion of the project site) and will be parceled off to create a tentative parcel map for the entire project site without any development on the remainder parcel that extends beyond the project site.
- 4) Development Agreement
- 5) Lease Agreement
- 6) Formation of Communities Facilities District (or other finance district)

### **Specific Entitlements required for Phase 1 (Planning Area 16 - PA 16)**

In addition to the project entitlements outlined above for the overall project, specific entitlements are requested for the development of Phase 1 (Planning Area 16 – PA 16). These specific entitlements are provided below:

- 1) Site Plan Review for Phase 1 (PA 16)
- 2) Architectural Review for Phase 1 (PA 16)
- 3) Building Plans for Phase 1 (PA 16)
- 4) Conditional Use Permit for the LED sign associated with the Hotel facility for Phase 1 (PA 16)
- 5) Various Agreements: Development Agreement, Lease Agreement, and possibly a Management Agreement specifically for the operation of the PA 16.
- 6) Improvement Plans for Phase 1 (PA 16)
- 7) Final Map for Phase 1 (PA 16)

### **Master Plan**

The Master Plan will create an overlay zone to the existing zoning of Public/Quasi-Public (PQP). The Master Plan includes a comprehensive land plan with design standards and guidelines to guide the development of the 210.7 acres. The Master Plan provides for a multi-use development that

offers a significant opportunity for the City of Manteca to attract recreation, entertainment, retail, restaurant, and commercial uses.

The Project site incorporates the existing approximate twenty-eight (28) acre Big League Dreams (BLD) facility and provides an additional twenty-five (25) acres to expand BLD and provide soccer fields. There is approximately sixty-two (62) acres identified for a potential mix of indoor and outdoor entertainment/recreational uses including a location for an outdoor stadium. The Project site provides approximately thirty-three (33) acres of commercial shopping that will generate approximately three hundred sixty thousand (360,000) square feet of retail and dining type uses. There is approximately twenty-nine (29) acres provided for a hotel/lodge, convention center and indoor water park. The balance of the Project site (33.7 acres) is used for roadway infrastructure. The Master Plan is comprised of four basic design components: Retail and Restaurant, Recreation and Sports, Hotel, and Entertainment. Each is described below.

#### *RETAIL AND RESTAURANT*

The Destination Retail and Restaurant area provides an opportunity to attract job generation and economic development to the west side of Manteca. It is strategically located along the State Route 120 corridor to ensure project visibility for future end-users, and to provide access to the State Route 120 corridor. The relationship to the existing and proposed recreational facilities and the hotel provides for customer base.

#### *RECREATION AND SPORTS*

The proposed recreational and sports uses serve to augment the existing and established success of Big League Dreams. This will serve as the integral part of the overall Project site providing passive and active open space, recreation areas, sports fields, stadiums, as well as gathering spaces for the community. Located throughout the Project site, the recreation areas will remain easily accessible to all users of the FEZ through a well-integrated and well-planned internal street network that encourages both bicycle and pedestrian use.

#### *HOTEL*

The proposed hotel site will serve to provide lodging for users coming into town for the destination experience. It is to be a full service hotel with additional recreational and dining opportunities. A convention center shall be provided with the hotel and the hotel shall also provide recreation facilities that are complimentary to the FEZ, such as a water park.

#### *ENTERTAINMENT*

The proposed entertainment areas serve to provide enjoyment for the whole family. Through thoughtful design this central piece of the FEZ will serve to bring people together to enjoy communal leisure time. It will be comprised of a variety of recreation and leisure activities which may include: miniature golf, golf cart racers, arcade games, and Laser-tag, among other things.

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

### Land Use Concept

The Master Plan provides a comprehensive land use planning tool that provides the framework for development of the approximately 210.7 acre Project site. The intent of the Master Plan is to ensure a quality built environment that integrates a mix of land uses under a single uniform set of design and development standards. The FEZ Master Plan intends to build upon the success of the Big League Dreams facility by providing additional sports and field recreation, hotel and tourism, entertainment, retail, commercial and restaurant uses along the highly visible State Route 120 corridor. Although the FEZ may develop in multiple phases as individual land use/planning areas, the Master Plan will help the separate phases come together and operate as a cohesive and integrated entertainment/recreational facility.

The Master Project site is divided into 16 Planning Areas (“PAs”) with five land use categories to group similar land uses: Retail and Restaurant, Entertainment, Hotel Resort, Recreation and Sport (fields), and Parking. Table 3.10-3 provides a summary of the planning areas.

It is to be noted that Planning Areas 1-15 and Planning Area 16 have distinct design concepts that are defined independently of each other through the Master Plan. Planning Areas 1-15 are to be developed with an ‘Early California’ architectural and landscape theme. Planning Area 16 is a ‘Natural Rustic’ architectural and landscape theme. These two distinct themes work together to create a dynamic Master Plan with integrated uses and an integrated theme of Early California and Natural Rustic with Daniels St. creating the transition between the two themes.

**TABLE 3.10-3: PLANNING AREA PROJECT BUILD-OUT SUMMARY**

<i>Planning Area</i>	<i>Projected Land use</i>	<i>Gross Land Area (acre)</i>
PA-1	Outdoor Sports Fields	11.68
PA-1a	New Baseball/Softball Field	3.08
PA-1b	New Baseball/Softball Field	2.61
PA-2	Outdoor Sports Fields	4.02
PA-2a	Outdoor Sports Fields	3.32
PA-3	Retail, Food & Beverage	2.94
PA-4	Main Street Retail	3.61
PA-5	Retail, Dining and Entertainment	27.33
PA-6	Future FEZ Expansion	12.63
PA-7	Adventure Zone	6.97
PA-8	Indoors Sports	3.55
PA-9	Family Entertainment	6.95
PA-10	Family Entertainment	5.25
PA-11	Stadium	12.44
PA-12	Speed Zone/Outdoor Sports	8.99
PA-13	Parking	3.06
PA-14	Parking	4.22
PA-15	Parking	3.19
PA-16	Hotel, Conference Center & Indoor Water Park	28.03
FEZ Planning Area Totals		153.87
Existing Big League Dreams Site		28.43
Roads / R.O.W.		27.89
McKinley Avenue R.O.W. Expansion		0.48
<b>Totals</b>		<b>210.67</b>

The Planning Areas serve as the basis for all of the land use and development recommendations contained in the FEZ Master Plan. Table 3.10-4 below provides the Permitted, Conditionally Permitted and Not Permitted Use for each Planning Area. The uses shown as Permitted (P) are those uses which are deemed acceptable anywhere within that Planning Area. The Permitted uses are the land uses that, when developed in accordance with the FEZ Master Plan, will not require special requirements in order to address land use compatibility. The uses shown as Conditionally Permitted (C) require special consideration so they may be properly located and/or conditionally operated with respect to their effects on surrounding properties/land uses. Conditionally Permitted uses may require special conditions to make them acceptable at particular locations. To maintain the vision and purpose of the FEZ and to minimize incompatible characteristics, the Master Plan includes a list of Not Permitted (N) land uses per planning area.

**TABLE 3.10-4: PERMITTED AND CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USES**

Table 2.0.1 Permitted and Conditionally Permitted Uses																
FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PLANNING AREAS																
USES (see Appendix A)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1 Local public service and utilities	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
2 Temporary buildings and uses (1)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
3 Accessory uses (when located on the same parcel as the principal use and the principal use is conforming)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
4 Agricultural Tourism (2)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N
5 Community Garden	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
6 Equestrian Facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N
7 Kennel, Dog Training Facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N	C	N	N	N	N
8 Hotel and Lodge including recreational facilities & conventional center	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
9 Assembly Uses	N	N	P	P	P	N	P	P	N	N	P	N	N	N	N	P
10 Indoor Amusement/Entertainment Facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	P
11 Indoor Fitness and Sports Facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
12 Outdoor Commercial Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
13 Outdoor Community Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	P
14 Park and Public Plaza	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	P
15 Recreational Vehicle Park	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	N	C	N	C	N	N	N	N
16 Resource-Related Recreation	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N
17 School, Specialized Education and Training/Studio	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N
18 Theater/Auditorium	N	N	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	N	C	N	N	N	N	P
19 Parking Facility (3)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
20 Public Safety Facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	P
21 Child Day Care Center	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
22 Neighborhood Market	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
23 Office, Business and Professional	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
24 Personal Services	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
25 Restaurants, Cafes, Eating & Drinking Establishments	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
26 Drive-In & Drive-Through Use	N	N	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	N	N	N	N	N
27 Bar/Nightclub	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
28 Retail, General	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
29 Equipment Sales and Rental	N	N	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	N	N	N	N	N	N
30 Educational, cultural, institutional, and recreational uses serving the greater community	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
31 Auto & Vehicle Rental (4)	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	P
32 Residential	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
33 Broadcasting and Recording Studio	N	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	N	N	P
34 Wireless Telecommunication Facility- Major	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
34 Wireless Telecommunication Facility- Minor	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
35 Man-made Lake and recreational facility	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	N	P	P	N	P	N	N	N	N

P = Permitted  
 C = Conditionally Permitted  
 N = Not Permitted

Notes:

1. Temporary uses require a Temporary Use Permit per Manteca Zoning Ordinance.
2. See also following page for continued operation of Legal Non-conforming agricultural uses.
3. Parking Structures may be restricted in PA-13, PA-14 and PA-15.
4. Only if associated with specific recreational uses that take place as part of FEZ such as bicycles, paddle boats, etc.
5. Any outdoor storage that is integral to the operation of a permitted or conditionally permitted use shall be screened from view from public street. Refer to Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 17.80.
6. Number to left of uses corresponds to definitions in Appendix A.

Additionally, to help the FEZ develop with a cohesive design and appearance, the Master Plan provides development recommendations for the various Planning Areas within the FEZ. The development standards are specific to PA-1 through PA-15, collectively, with separate development standards for PA-16. The development standards and guidelines are intended to work in conjunction with the City of Manteca's Zoning Ordinance. In some cases the Master Plan standards may conflict with or may be more or less restrictive than the City's Zoning Ordinance. In these circumstances, the Master Plan design recommendations shall be used. Any regulations not contained or illustrated in the Master Plan are deferred to the regulations contained in the City's Zoning Ordinance.

### **Plan Adoption and Regulation**

The Master Plan is intended to be adopted by the City Council and to serve as a tool for the City of Manteca to implement. The Master Plan is to be used by designers, developers, builders, and planners, to guide development of the Project site. The land use, development standards, and design guidelines are provided to ensure that all proposed developments remain consistent with the vision established by the Master Plan as the Project is built over time. The Master Plan development concepts, design guidelines, and standards are in accordance with the City's General Plan, Municipal Ordinances, and City Standard Plans and Specifications. The Master Plan shall be used to review, process, and approve development proposals for the Project site including but not limited to site specific development applications and site improvement plans.

Formation of one or more Community Facilities Districts (CFD) is also anticipated for the FEZ. The objective in forming CFDs is to provide financing for public improvements associated with the project, which may supplement funds available from former redevelopment bond proceeds.

### **Implementation of the Plan**

The Family Entertainment Zone (FEZ) Master Plan is the mechanism to ensure that all future development within the Plan Area is consistent with the City of Manteca General Plan. The Master Plan will serve as a tool for the City of Manteca to implement the development of the Plan Area. Every effort has been made with the FEZ Master Plan to provide policies and regulations that are specific to the FEZ Plan Area.

If any situation arises in the implementation of the Master Plan that is not addressed by specific development regulations or guidelines or if an issue, condition, or situation arises that is not clearly addressed in the Master Plan, the Community Development Director ("Director") shall provide an interpretation based on such City codes, goals, policies, plans and requirements as most closely related to the subject matter of the issue or situation to be interpreted.

In some cases the Master Plan standards may conflict with or be more restrictive than the City's Zoning Ordinance. In these circumstances, the FEZ Master Plan standards and guidelines shall prevail. For any matters not specifically addressed by the Master Plan, the Manteca Municipal

Code shall apply and shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of the FEZ Master Plan.

Subsequent to adoption of the Master Plan, individual project applications will be reviewed to determine consistency with the Master Plan, the FEZ Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and any other applicable City of Manteca regulatory documents. All future applications including but not limited to Site Plans, Tentative Subdivision Maps, and Use Permits within the Plan Area will be subject to the requirements of this Master Plan and EIR.

Development Applications will be submitted to the City of Manteca Community Development Department and subject to the Fee Schedule adopted by City Council. The Community Development Department will conduct an initial review of the application for completeness and consistency with the adopted Master Plan, the FEZ EIR as well as other ordinances and standards. The Community Development Director may require additional studies and/or analyses that may include but not limited to: traffic and infrastructure studies.

The Community Development Director, acting upon any application that is determined to be complete shall process each individual project subject to entitlement processing as defined in the City's Municipal Code, Title 17, Zoning.

If the City determines that an Amendment to the Master Plan is warranted, an Amendment to the Master Plan may be requested. The request must provide adequate justification.

### **Master Plan Phasing**

Development of the FEZ will depend on market conditions and demand for infrastructure. A conceptual phasing scenario was put together to illustrate potential phasing of the project (Figure 2-13); however, the conceptual phasing scenario is not intended to restrict development of later phases just because a phase has not built out. The real-world phasing will be based on market. Phase 1 is intended to develop immediately following project entitlements/approvals (estimated 2015/2016 construction start with an open for operation in 2016/2017). However, the market may desire the development of Phase 3 before Phase 2, or Phase 4 before Phase 3. As such, this Phasing scenario, other than Phase 1, should be viewed as a potential phasing scenario for conceptual purposes. The following is a description of a conceptual phasing scenario for the FEZ:

#### ***Phase 1:***

It is preliminarily envisioned that Phase 1 development will include:

- A 500 room hotel including 30,000 square feet of conference/meeting/exhibition facility with 37,500 square feet of restaurant (food and beverage) space, community space, general retail, party rooms and related game rooms. Also will include a 75,000 square foot indoor multi-level waterpark.
- The extension of Daniels Street, in a westerly direction to connect to McKinley Avenue in the "T" intersection. Daniels Street will extend from its current terminus at the southeast

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

---

corner of the property, in a westerly direction, providing access to the proposed hotel and conference center site to the south, and to the Retail, Dining and Entertainment District of the FEZ to the north (PA-4 and PA-5).

- The service entrance to the northwest corner of the Stadium Shopping Center will be reconfigured to provide navigable truck turning movements into the rear of that parcel.
- Main Vehicular Entrance: The FEZ project will have its main vehicular entrance on Daniels Street, located northwest corner of the Stadium Shopping Center.
- A man-made lake or basin.

### ***Phase 2:***

- Partial construction of Buffer road and landscape along the northern edge of the overall property, north of Planning Areas 12 and 15.
- The extension of Wawona Street in a westerly direction, along the north side of the existing BLD complex, connecting to the FEZ loop road in a southwesterly direction, providing a view into the lake at the center of PA-5.
- PA-1: The development of 11.8 acre PA-1, with new multi-purpose turf playfields. The plan has been conceptualized such that three International Soccer Fields and two U-12 size fields would be provided, along with one U-8 size field at the northeast corner of the parcel. Alternately, the International Soccer Fields could be divided into two U-12 youth soccer fields, yielding a total of eight U-12 play fields, with the one U-8 size field. In addition, minor facilities for rest rooms, maintenance, storage and administrative offices may be provided in the parcel. PA-1 would be provided vehicular access by the extension of Milo Candini Dr. from its current terminus at the NE corner of Big League Dreams to the NE corner of FEZ (straight North).
- PA-15: Parking for the play fields would be offered through the build-out of a parking lot in PA-15, a 3.1-acre area, located in the PG&E right-of-way.
- PA-2, a 7.6-acre parcel lying to the west of PA-1, would provide additional multi-purpose playfields: two U-12 and two U-13 sized youth soccer fields.
- PA-14: A portion of the PA-14 parking lot would be constructed at this time, to serve parking needs of players and guests.
- PA-1a and PA-1b: The construction of two new ball fields to the west of the existing Big League Dreams complex.

### ***Phase 3:***

- PA-3, including the following:
- The FEZ entry archway that spans across Daniels Street, under which vehicles will drive to access the FEZ.

- Food and beverage enterprises that frame an east-west walkway that is aligned on axis with the existing Big League Dreams complex, extending in a westerly direction, toward the center of the FEZ. This serves as a vital connection between the existing sports facilities and the FEZ. Buildings are expected to be one to two stories tall.
- The FEZ loop road starting north of Daniels Street situated east of PA-5 to the proposed roundabout at Wawona Street.
- Additional restaurants at the northeast corner of Daniels Street and a new loop road that will wrap around the core of the FEZ.
- Shared surface parking that may serve retail/restaurants in PA-3 and the two new BLD ball fields (PA-1a and PA-1b, included in Phase 1 description above).

***Phase 4:***

- PA-4, including the following:
  - “Main Street Retail” framing a pedestrian plaza and walkway that runs in a north-south direction, providing a visual and pedestrian connection to PA-16 that lies to the south.
  - Additional restaurants at the northeast corner of Daniels Street and a new loop road that will wrap around the core of the FEZ.
- PA-5, including the following:
  - Initial partial build out of the Dining, Retail and Entertainment Village. Leasable space is envisioned to include stores, small shops, cafes, restaurants, and bistros.
  - The FEZ loop road will frame PA-5 like a “horseshoe” on its east, north, and west sides.

***Future Phases:***

- PA-6 occupies the southwestern most parcel, abutting residential lots to its west, and vacant land to its south. This parcel is intended to serve as expansion for the family entertainment offerings.
- PA-6 (portion) occupies the southwest corner of the street connection to McKinley Avenue. It is envisioned that a tourism and visitor center would be provided along with a potential relocation site for the Manteca Convention and Visitors Bureau, as well as a small bus terminal and temporary bus parking for tours connecting to Yosemite and the Sierras.
- PA-7 flanks Daniels Street, to its northeast. It also flanks the FEZ loop road, to its west.
- PA-8 incorporates an Indoor All-season Sports and Exhibition Center, and will be located to the north of the FEZ loop road, between Parcels 2 and 7. It is bordered by the PG&E power line right-of-way to its north.

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

---

- PA-9 is also bordered by the PG&E power line right-of-way to its north. It abuts McKinley Avenue to its west, and is slated for FEZ expansion.
- PA-10 is a continuation of FEZ expansion, and it's situated to the north of PA-9, to the north of the PG&E power line right-of-way.
- PA-11 is situated on a northwest axis from the heart of the FEZ, the lake, and is situated in the far northwest corner of the property, to the north of the PG&E power line right-of-way.
- PA-12 is also located to the north of the PG&E power line right-of-way. It spans the majority of the northern boundary of the overall property, abutting a boundary road with a set-aside landscape buffer, and then the WQCF to the north. The property is envisioned to serve as an outdoor sports zone.
- PA-13, PA-14, and PA-15 comprise the PG&E right-of-way that stretches diagonally across the property in a west/southwest- east/northeast direction. These planning areas are reserved strictly for shared parking for the entire FEZ property. Setbacks will be established to protect the PG&E towers.
- The North buffer road with access to Milo Candini Drive shall be in place prior to the development of PA's 11 and 12, or an alternative vehicle exit shall be provided north of the power lines that is acceptable to the Fire Department.

### ***Build Out and Phasing:***

Construction will have several phases, depending on market conditions and the availability of financing. It is currently anticipated that the timeframe for the construction is 8-12 years. Infrastructure extensions will be made, as needed, to service the constructed portions of the Project site.

### **Landscape Maintenance**

The public landscape components of the FEZ are critical elements of the community vision and feel. The maintenance of all common outdoor recreation space and public open space, as well as landscape easements will be funded through an Association established by the FEZ master developer and/or the City of Manteca. The establishment and preservation of a long term, viable maintenance plan is a key component for the FEZ; therefore, the City will maintain the right to assume landscape maintenance responsibilities in the case of neglect or default by, or at the request of, the FEZ Association. If the City assumes the maintenance responsibility, the property owners shall be responsible for all costs associated with said maintenance. Funding shall be provided by the property owners through the establishment of a Community Facilities District or other financing mechanism and shall include funds for administration along with replacement costs. The final method of maintenance financing mechanism shall be approved by City of Manteca.

Formation of one or more Community Facilities Districts (CFD) is also anticipated for all phases of the FEZ. The objective in forming CFDs is to provide financing for public improvements associated with the Project, which may supplement funds available from former redevelopment bond proceeds.

### 3.10.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### STATE

---

##### **Government Code**

California Government Code Section 65300 et seq. establishes the obligation of cities and counties to adopt and implement general plans. The general plan is a comprehensive, long-term, and general document that describes plans for the physical development of a jurisdiction and of any land outside its boundaries that, in the jurisdiction's judgment, bears relation to its planning. The general plan addresses a broad range of topics, including, at a minimum, land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. In addressing these topics, the general plan identifies the goals, objectives, policies, principles, standards, and plan proposals that support the jurisdiction's vision for the area. The general plan is a long-range document that typically addresses the physical character of an area over a 20-year period. Although the general plan serves as a blueprint for future development and identifies the overall vision for the planning area, it remains general enough to allow for flexibility in the approach taken to achieve the plan's goals.

The State Zoning Law (California Government Code Section 65800 et seq.) establishes that zoning ordinances, which are laws that define allowable land uses within a specific district, are required to be consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plans. When amendments to the general plan are made, corresponding changes in the zoning ordinance may be required within a reasonable time to ensure the land uses designated in the general plan would also be allowable by the zoning ordinance (Government Code, Section 65860, subd. [c]).

#### LOCAL

---

##### **City of Manteca General Plan (Manteca GP)**

As noted above, General Plans are prepared under a mandate from the State of California, which requires each city and county to prepare and adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for its jurisdiction and any adjacent related lands. State law requires General Plans to address seven mandated components: circulation, conservation, housing, land use, noise, open space, and safety. In addition to those components required by State law, the Manteca GP also contains optional elements, including Community Design, Economic Development, Public Facilities and Services, and Air Quality.

The Manteca GP is comprehensive, long-range, and general. The Manteca GP has the following purposes:

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

---

- To identify the community's land use, transportation, environmental, economic and social goals and policies as they relate to land use, conservation and development.
- To enable the City Council and the Planning Commission to establish long-range conservation and development policies.
- To provide a basis for judging whether specific private development proposals and public projects are in harmony with these policies.
- To inform citizens, developers, decision makers, and other jurisdictions of the policies that will guide development and conservation within the City.

**General Plan Land Use Map (2012):** The Manteca GP Land Use Map portrays the ultimate uses of land in the City of Manteca through land use designations. The Land Use Map designates the Project site as Public/Quasi-Public (Figure 3.10-2). Lands to the north of the Project site are also designated Public/Quasi-Public. To the west of the Project site, lands within the City's Planning Area are designated Light Industrial. To the south of the Project site, lands are designated General Commercial and SR 120, located to the south of the Project site, does not have a land use designation. Lands to the east of the Project site are primarily designated Light Industrial; the southernmost parcel located to the east of the Project site is designated Public/Quasi-Public.

*Public/Quasi-Public:* This designation provides for government-owned facilities, public and private schools, institutions, civic uses and public utilities, and quasi-public uses such as hospitals and churches.

*General Commercial:* The General Commercial designation provides for wholesale, warehousing, and heavy commercial uses, highway oriented commercial retail, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses. The designation is also intended to accommodate visitor commercial, lodging, commercial recreation and public gathering facilities, such as amphitheatres, or public gardens. The General Commercial designation allows for a maximum floor area ratio of 0.6 and maximum site coverage of 40%.

*Light Industrial:* The Light Industrial designation provides for industrial parks, warehouses, distribution centers, light manufacturing, public and quasi-public uses and similar and compatible uses. The Light Industrial designation allows for a maximum floor area ratio of 0.7 and maximum site coverage of 60%.

**City of Manteca General Plan Policies:** General Plan policies associated with specific environmental topics (aesthetics, air quality, agriculture, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils/mineral resources, hazards, hydrology/water quality, noise, public services/recreation, transportation, utilities, etc.) are discussed in the relevant chapters of this EIR. The following policies are related specifically to land use.

### ***Land Use Element Policies***

LU-P-1: Growth shall mitigate its own impacts and shall provide a positive benefit to the City of Manteca.

LU-P-2: Growth must contribute to a strong diversified economic base and an effective balance between employment and housing opportunities for all income levels.

LU-P-3: The City shall encourage a pattern of development that promotes the efficient and timely development of public services and facilities.

LU-P-4: The City shall encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with the boundary of the City.

LU-P-19: The City shall promote and assist the maintenance and expansion of Manteca's commercial sector to meet the needs of both Manteca residents and those living within Manteca's market area.

LU-P-20: The City shall promote the establishment, maintenance and expansion of businesses in Manteca that generate high retail sales taxes as important contributors to the local economy.

LU-P-22: New commercial development serving citywide and regional shopping needs shall be located along major arterial streets.

LU-P-23: New visitor-serving commercial development shall be located in areas with easy access to freeway interchanges.

LU-P-24: New commercial development shall be designed to avoid the appearance of strip development.

LU-P-27: The City shall monitor commercial development to balance growth in residential, commercial and industrial development.

LU-P-28: The City shall monitor revenues relative to new growth to ensure that projected cumulative revenue of all land uses in the City would be sufficient to support public service costs.

LU-P-29: The City shall support and encourage small business development and retention through providing appropriately zoned land and through such programs to reduce development and operations costs as may be available to the City.

LU-P-33: The City shall promote the development of "clean" industries that do not create problems or pose health risks associated with water and air pollution or potential leaks or spills. However, the City will designate appropriate locations that accommodate light industrial and heavy industrial uses.

LU-P-35: The City shall monitor employment development to maintain the balance of residential, commercial, and industrial development.

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

---

LU-P-37: The City shall designate adequate land, appropriately located for City, County, and School District facilities.

LU-P-38: The City shall designate adequate land, appropriately located for quasi-public uses such as hospitals, churches, private school facilities and utility uses.

LU-P-39: In determining appropriate locations for public and quasi-public uses, the City shall consider, among other things, proximity to major streets, the cost to develop access to public facilities, and the safety of pedestrians and motorists.

LU-P-40: Development shall be managed to ensure that adequate public facilities and services, as defined in the Public Services and Facilities Element, are planned and provided.

LU-P-43: The City shall promote the provision of both public and private open space within urbanized Manteca to provide visual contrast with the built-environment and to provide for the recreational needs of Manteca residents. Private open space shall not be considered for public use, other than as visual open space, and shall not be constrained from other uses as identified in the General Plan, unless as provided for by agreement with the land owner.

LU-P-44: The City shall develop an Open Space Master Plan that is consistent with the General Plan, the Bicycle Master Plan and Recreation Master Plan. The Open Space Master Plan should address the potential linkages between public plazas, promenades, parks, utility easements suitable for public access, landscape areas, nature preserves, open drainages, parks and similar public lands and right-of-ways that provide open space. The Open Space Master Plan may also identify future extensions of pedestrian and bikeway corridors, natural features, and nature preserve areas that may be suitable for acquisition by the City as public land or other agency to be held as public land in or in a public trust.

LU-P-47: The City shall develop and apply standards for pedestrian circulation that enable residents to select a reasonably direct and safe pedestrian route to schools, parks, transit stops and commercial services.

### **Municipal Code, Title 17 - Zoning**

The purpose of Title 17, Zoning, of the City's Municipal Code is to protect and promote public health, safety, peace, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare and to regulate land use and development in accordance with the Manteca GP.

**Zoning Map:** The Zoning Map identifies zoning districts within the City at the parcel level. The Zoning Map designates the Project site as PQP (Public/Quasi-Public) (Figure 3.10-2). Lands to the north of the Project site are also zoned PQP. To the west of the Project site, lands within the City are zoned M1 (Light Industrial); lands to the west that are beyond the City limits are not zoned by the City. To the south of the Project site, lands are zoned CG (General Commercial) and SR 120, located to the south of the Project site, does not have a zoning designation. Lands to the east of

the Project site are primarily zoned M1; the southernmost parcel located to the east of the Project site is zoned PQP.

*PQP (Public/Quasi-Public):* The PQP district provides for government-owned facilities, public and private schools, institutions, civic uses and public utilities, and quasi-public uses such as hospitals and religious institutions. Outdoor commercial recreation and outdoor community recreation uses are allowed in the PQP district.

*M1 (Light Industrial):* The M1 district provides for industrial parks, warehouses, distribution centers, light manufacturing, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses.

*CG (General Commercial):* The CG district provides for wholesale, warehousing, and heavy commercial uses, highway-oriented commercial retail, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses. The designation is also intended to accommodate visitor lodging, commercial recreation and public gathering facilities, such as amphitheaters, or public gardens. It also allows most neighborhood and mixed commercial uses.

### **County of San Joaquin General Plan (County GP)**

The San Joaquin County General Plan is a policy guide for physical and economic growth of the County. Unincorporated land located west of the Project site is under the jurisdiction of San Joaquin County. The County GP designates these lands for agricultural-general (A/G) uses (<http://sjmap.org/DistrictViewer/Viewer.asp>, 2014).

### **San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMCP)**

The San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) provides comprehensive measures for compensation and avoidance of impacts on various biological resources, including agricultural land. One of the primary goals of the SJMSCP is to preserve productive agriculture where that goal is compatible with protecting and preserving lands with biological resources and habitat. The SJMSCP is administered by the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG). The project proponent will pay fees to SJCOG on a per-acre basis for designated agricultural lands and habitat that are converted to urban use. SJCOG will then use these funds to purchase conservation easements on agricultural and habitat lands in the region. The purchase of conservation easements allow the landowners to retain ownership of the land and continue agricultural operations, essentially preserving such lands in perpetuity. The Project site is designated Category C – Agricultural Habitat Open Spaces, Pay Zone B by the SJSMSCP.

The City of Manteca is a permit holder and is responsible for local implementation responsibilities including collection of fees, maintenance of implementing ordinances/resolutions and coordinating with the JPA for annual reporting requirements.

### 3.10.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed Project will have a significant impact on land use and planning if it will:

- Physically divide an established community;
- 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;
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
- 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);
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; and/or
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

##### **Impact 3.10-1: The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. (no impact)**

The Project site is located at the western edge of the City of Manteca and is adjacent primarily undeveloped land, agricultural land, and the Manteca WQCF to the north, east, and west. The Project site would result in a northerly extension of developed uses, including the commercial lands south of the site and the Big League Dreams Ballpark located on the Project site. The Project would provide roadways and pedestrian pathways to connect the Project to the existing circulation system and to allow access to and from the site. Development of the Project site would not result in any physical barriers, such as a highway, wall, or other division, that would divide an existing community, but would serve as an orderly extension of existing development. The Project would have **no impact** in regards to the physical division of an established community.

**Impact 3.10-2: The proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. (less than significant)**

Land use plans, policies, and regulations that govern the land uses on the Project site and have jurisdiction over the Project include the Manteca GP, Manteca Zoning Code, and the SJCMSCP.

*MANTECA GENERAL PLAN*

Since general plans often contain numerous policies emphasizing differing legislative goals, a development project may be “consistent” with a general plan, taken as a whole, even though the project appears to be inconsistent or arguably inconsistent with some individual policies. (*Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Association v. City of Oakland* (1993) 23 Cal.App.4th 704, 719.)

*Land Use Element Policies*

LU-P-1: Growth shall mitigate its own impacts and shall provide a positive benefit to the City of Manteca.

- **Consistent:** *This EIR includes an in depth analysis of impacts for numerous topics, and provides mitigation requirements to offset each corresponding impact that has been identified. This includes requirements to pay fees, build infrastructure, and provide amenities desirable to the community to make a positive benefit to the City of Manteca.*

LU-P-2: Growth must contribute to a strong diversified economic base and an effective balance between employment and housing opportunities for all income levels.

- **Consistent:** *The project proposes a mix of commercial and recreational uses that are intended to provide strong diversified economic base and an effective balance between employment and the existing housing within the community. The project is not designated for housing and does not provide residential housing.*

LU-P-3: The City shall encourage a pattern of development that promotes the efficient and timely development of public services and facilities.

- **Consistent:** *The pattern of development is consistent with the land use and zoning requirements and the public services and facilities are available to serve the proposed uses. The development will be required to pay public service and facility impact fees related to the project.*

LU-P-19: The City shall promote and assist the maintenance and expansion of Manteca’s commercial sector to meet the needs of both Manteca residents and those living within Manteca’s market area.

- **Consistent:** *The project includes a mix of commercial and recreational uses that are intended to expand services currently offered by the Big League Dreams facilities, with added recreation, commercial, and hotel/lodging amenities for Manteca residents and visitors.*

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

---

LU-P-20: The City shall promote the establishment, maintenance and expansion of businesses in Manteca that generate high retail sales taxes as important contributors to the local economy.

- **Consistent:** *The project includes a mix of business opportunities that are anticipated to generate high retail sales taxes as important contributors to the local economy.*

LU-P-22: New commercial development serving citywide and regional shopping needs shall be located along major arterial streets.

- **Consistent:** *The project is located along major arterial streets, including Airport Blvd, and Daniels Street.*

LU-P-23: New visitor-serving commercial development shall be located in areas with easy access to freeway interchanges.

- **Consistent:** *The project is located along SR 120, with easy access from Airport Blvd.*

LU-P-24: New commercial development shall be designed to avoid the appearance of strip development.

- **Consistent:** *This project concept land use plan does not illustrate strip development design concepts.*

LU-P-29: The City shall support and encourage small business development and retention through providing appropriately zoned land and through such programs to reduce development and operations costs as may be available to the City.

- **Consistent:** *This project includes commercial land for a variety of small and large businesses (vendors).*

LU-P-35: The City shall monitor employment development to maintain the balance of residential, commercial, and industrial development.

- **Consistent:** *The project proposes a mix of commercial and recreational uses that help maintain the balance between housing and jobs.*

LU-P-39: In determining appropriate locations for public and quasi-public uses, the City shall consider, among other things, proximity to major streets, the cost to develop access to public facilities, and the safety of pedestrians and motorists.

- **Consistent:** *The project is a public and quasi-public development that is located along major streets, including Airport Blvd, and Daniels Street, and includes design elements that are intended to provide safe and accessible routes for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.*

LU-P-40: Development shall be managed to ensure that adequate public facilities and services, as defined in the Public Services and Facilities Element, are planned and provided.

- **Consistent:** *The Master Plan outlines the public services and facilities needed to serve the proposed uses, and the infrastructure that would be installed to facilities expanded services/utilities. The development will be required to pay public service and facility impact fees related to the project.*

LU-P-43: The City shall promote the provision of both public and private open space within urbanized Manteca to provide visual contrast with the built-environment and to provide for the recreational needs of Manteca residents. Private open space shall not be considered for public use, other than as visual open space, and shall not be constrained from other uses as identified in the General Plan, unless as provided for by agreement with the land owner.

- **Consistent:** *The project includes a variety of open space, recreational, and landscaping elements/amenities that are intended to provide visual contrast with the built environment and to meet the recreational needs of Manteca residents.*

The Project is consistent with the key land use issues and development concepts of the Manteca GP which provide for logical growth of the City, emphasize community form, scale, and identify, encourage attractive, sustainable neighborhoods, support public transit and bicycle and pedestrian circulation, encourage housing opportunity, promote employment and economic development, encourage a mix of land uses that balance public services and fiscal sustainability, promote access to open space, and encourage agricultural productivity through a compact, concentric development form.

The Project is located within City limits and will provide for employment-generating uses that will improve the City's jobs:housing balance. The Project is consistent with the General Plan land use policies that encourage an orderly pattern of development that is contiguous with the City boundary, require growth to contribute to a diversified economic base and balance between employment and housing opportunities, and allow recreation uses that are attractive and have high day/evening activity levels adjacent to the highways.

The Manteca GP designates the Project site Public/Quasi-Public, which allows government-owned facilities, public and private schools, institutions, civic uses and public utilities, and quasi-public uses such as hospitals and churches. The Project would be a government-owned facility that provides recreation and visitor-serving uses. As a government-owned facility, the Project does not conflict with the uses allowed under the Manteca GP. Therefore, the Project is substantially consistent with the Manteca GP land use requirements and would have a **less than significant** impact relative to the Manteca GP. It is noted that consistency with Manteca GP policies and programs related to environmental topics other than land use (aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards, hydrology/water quality, noise, public services, transportation, and utilities) are discussed in the relevant sections of this EIR.

#### *MANTECA ZONING CODE*

The Manteca Zoning Code implements the General Plan. The Project site is zoned PQP by the Zoning Code, which allows government-owned facilities, public and private schools, institutions,

## 3.10 LAND USE AND POPULATION

---

civic uses and public utilities, and quasi-public uses such as hospitals and religious institutions. Outdoor commercial recreation and outdoor community recreation uses are allowed in the PQP district. The Project proposes to zone the site with a Master Plan overlay zone. The FEZ Master Plan will accommodate indoor and outdoor recreation uses, including ball fields and courts, a waterpark, and playground, and visitor-serving uses, including a hotel, food and beverage operations, and conference and meeting facilities, as described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description.

A primary purpose of the Zoning Code is to ensure that development that occurs is consistent with the General Plan. The Master Plan overlay zoning is consistent with the General Plan designation of Public/Quasi-Public and provides zoning to allow a detailed Master Plan to be prepared for a comprehensive development such as the proposed FEZ. The Master Plan will establish permitted uses, development densities and intensities, and development standards to ensure that public health, safety, and general welfare are protected, consistent with the purpose of the Zoning Code. All existing City development standards and zoning requirements would remain in effect, except as specifically addressed in the Master Plan. Subsequent development plans for the Project must be consistent with the Master Plan. Compliance with the Master Plan regulatory document would ensure the Project's consistency with the City's Zoning Code. The Project will be consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code and will have a *less than significant* impact relative to potential conflicts with zoning.

### **Impact 3.10-3: The proposed Project would not significantly conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. (less than significant)**

#### *SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN (SJMSCP)*

The City's participation in the SJMSCP allows projects within Manteca's jurisdiction to seek coverage under the SJMSCP for impacts to endangered, threatened, and species of special concern. The SJMSCP provides a process to offset impacts to biological resources, conserve open space, maintain the agricultural economy, and allow development within the County. It was also created to obtain the necessary 32 permits from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game for the next 50 years in exchange for participating projects paying mitigation fees. Fees are based on the amount and quality of land converted from agricultural or open space uses to urban uses. These fees are used to preserve and create habitats to be managed in perpetuity through the establishment of habitat preserves. Ninety-seven species are covered under the SJMSCP, with the intent to provide comprehensive mitigation pursuant to local, state, and federal regulations for impacts on these species from permitted activities under the Plan. Participation in the SJMSCP confers authorization for activities that result (or may result in) incidental take of covered state-listed species, federally listed species, and other covered.

As described in Section 3.3, Biological Resources, prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project proponent will be required to coordinate with SJCOG and will be responsible for the appropriate coverage, permits, compensatory mitigation or fees, and project-specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures as defined within the SJMSCP. The Project does not conflict with the

implementation of the SJMSCP and has appropriate measures to ensure compliance with payment of mitigation fees. Implementation of the Project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to compliance with the SJMSCP.

**Impact 3.10-4: The proposed Project has the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area (less than significant)**

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. A growth-inducing impact is defined by the CEQA Guidelines as:

*The way in which a proposed Project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth...It is not assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.*

Based on the CEQA Guidelines, growth inducement is any growth that exceeds planned growth of an area and results in new development that would not have taken place without implementation of the project. A project can have direct and/or indirect growth inducement potential. Direct growth inducement would result if a project, for example, involved construction of new housing. A project would have indirect growth inducement potential if it established substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, or governmental enterprises) or if it would involve a construction effort with substantial short-term employment opportunities that would indirectly stimulate the need for additional housing and services to support the new employment demand (*Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Board of Supervisors* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 342). Similarly, a project would indirectly induce growth if it would remove an obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint on a required public service. A project providing an increased water supply or wastewater treatment/collection in an area where this service historically limited growth could be considered growth-inducing.

The State CEQA Guidelines further explain that the environmental effects of induced growth are considered indirect impacts of the proposed action. These indirect impacts or secondary effects of growth may result in significant, adverse environmental impacts. Potential secondary effects of growth include increased demand on other community and public services and infrastructure, increased traffic and noise, and adverse environmental impacts such as degradation of air and water quality, degradation or loss of plant and animal habitat, and conversion of agricultural and open space land to developed uses.

Growth inducement may constitute an adverse impact if the growth is not consistent with or accommodated by the land use plans and growth management plans and policies for the area affected. Local land use plans provide for land use development patterns and growth policies that allow for the orderly expansion of urban development supported by adequate urban public services, such as water supply, roadway infrastructure, sewer service, and solid waste service.

**Components of Growth:** The timing, magnitude, and location of land development and population growth in a region are based on various interrelated land use and economic variables. Key variables include regional economic trends, market demand for residential and non-residential uses, land availability and cost, the availability and quality of transportation facilities and public services, proximity to employment centers, the supply and cost of housing, and regulatory policies or conditions. Since the general plan of a community defines the location, type, and intensity of growth, it is the primary means of regulating development and growth in California.

### *GROWTH EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT*

**Direct Population Growth:** The Project does not propose any housing that would result in direct population growth.

**Indirect Population Growth:** As described above, projects that do not directly induce population growth still have the potential to result in indirect population growth through the creation of jobs or the extension of infrastructure into areas that were not previously served. Implementation of the Project would provide job growth to the area. It is anticipated that local employment would be increased to provide administrative, management, recreation, visitor-serving establishments, retail services, and landscape and maintenance to the Project. The proposed Project is expected to require both full-time and part-time employees. It is anticipated that the employment growth would be met both by existing residents and through the attraction of new residents.

The Project would establish a variety of business opportunities that can support the skilled and educated workforce of Manteca and the local area. The Project is consistent with the Manteca GP, which anticipated use of the Project site for Public/Quasi-Public uses, anticipated that job-creating uses would occur on the Project site, and anticipated that public infrastructure and services would be extended to the Project site as envisioned by the General Plan Land Use Map. The Manteca GP designates sites for residential growth to ensure a balance between new residential development and jobs-creating uses. The Housing Element of the Manteca GP identifies that the City has capacity for 4,922 residential units on vacant and underdeveloped sites. The Project would not result in indirect population growth beyond the City's capacity that is planned in the General Plan.


Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to exceed the planned growth (directly or indirectly) in the area beyond what is anticipated in the City of Manteca General Plan. Growth inducement is a **less than significant** impact of the Project.

### **Impact 3.10-5: The proposed Project has the potential to displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing (less than significant)**

There are no existing homes or other types of residential structures on the Project site. Therefore, development of the Project would not directly displace any persons or existing housing. The Project will have a **less than significant impact** related to the displacement of substantial numbers of people or existing housing.



**PROJECT LOCATION**




**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE PROJECT**

Figure 3.10-1: Aerial Photo

Data sources: ArcGIS Online Basemap Imagery with Transportation. Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*



Data sources: City of Manteca; San Joaquin County GIS; Map date: December 14, 2014.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section describes mineral resources located on the project site, as well as the regional setting for mineral resources and environmental impacts associated with mineral resources. The analysis contained in this section is intended to be at a project-level, and covers impacts associated with the conversion of the entire site to an urban use. Information in this section is based on the following: *Special Report 199 Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Stockton-Lodi Production-Consumption Region, San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, California* (California Geological Survey, 2012), *San Joaquin County Planning Handout-GP-V3-IV-B* (San Joaquin County 19923), *San Joaquin County General Plan Background Report – Natural Resources* (San Joaquin County, July 2009), *City of Manteca General Plan 2023* (City of Manteca as amended through 2013), and *Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report* (City of Manteca 2003). There were no NOP comments received during the public review period(s) regarding this topic.

### 3.11.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### STATEWIDE

---

In 2012, the California Geological Survey identified that approximately 4 billion tons of permitted aggregate reserves lie within the 31 aggregate study areas in California. These permitted aggregate reserves have been determined to be acceptable for commercial use, exist within properties owned or leased by aggregate producing companies, and have permits allowing mining of aggregate material. Sand, gravel, and crushed stones are construction materials that are collectively referred to as construction aggregate. These materials provide the bulk and strength to Portland cement concrete (PCC), asphaltic concrete (AC), plaster, and stucco. Other uses include road base, subbase, railroad ballast, and fill. From 1981 to 2010, California consumed an average of about 180 million tons of construction aggregate (all grades) per year. (CGS, 2012)

#### REGIONAL SETTING

---

The primary mineral resources in San Joaquin County are sand, gravel, and natural gas, with limited mining of peat, gold, and silver. In 2012, the California Geological Survey assessed the Stockton-Lodi Production-Consumption (P-C) Region mineral resources, with a focus on aggregate resources. Mineral resources in the region are classified based on whether the aggregate meets the specifications for use in PCC. This aggregate is termed “PCC-grade aggregate.” The material quality specifications for PCC-grade aggregate are more restrictive than the specifications for aggregate for other applications. As a result of the strict specifications, PCC-grade aggregate deposits are more scarce and valuable than other aggregate resources.

#### **Known Mineral Resources**

The California Geological Survey issued Special Report 199 designating areas within the Stockton-Lodi P-C Region based on the significance of mineral resources. The Stockton-Lodi P-C Region contains about 969 million tons PCC-grade aggregate resources and 67 million tons PCC-grade

sand resources. These resources are classified into different mineral resource zone designations, as described below.

To be considered significant for the purpose of mineral land classification, a mineral deposit or group of deposits, must meet criteria adopted by the State Mining and Geology Board. These criteria include marketability and threshold values. The threshold value is approximately \$17.375 million for a construction aggregate deposit. PCC-grade aggregate sells for about \$13 per ton in the Stockton-Lodi P-C Region; therefore, \$17,375,000 equates to about 1.3 million tons of PCC-grade aggregate material.

The following Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) descriptions are for PCC-grade aggregate.

*MRZ-1:* Areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.

*MRZ-2:* Areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists.

*MRZ-3:* Areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.

*MRZ-4:* Areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other MRZ zone.

### **Mineral Extraction Activities**

Approximately 232 million tons of PCC-grade aggregate reserves are permitted for production in the County (CGS, 2012). There are 34 active and inactive aggregate mines within San Joaquin County (San Joaquin County, 2009). Three mines are located in the vicinity of the Project site:

- Mine ID# 91-39-0001 – Oakwood Lake. Mine is closed and was operated by Beck Properties.
- Mine ID# 91-39-0012 – Mossdale Road. Mine is closed and was operated by FTG Construction Materials.
- Mine ID# 91-39-0022 – Mossdale-Brown Sand. Mine is active and is operated by Brown Sand, Inc.

### **PROJECT SITE**

---

The Project site is not located in either of the MRZ-2 (PCC sand) areas designated in Manteca. The MRZ-2 zones (PCC sand) are located to the south and west of the project site along the San Joaquin River. The project site, and much of Manteca has been mapped as an MRZ-3, which suggests that the area contains mineral deposits, but the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data. The justification for the MRZ-3 designation is largely due to the proximity of Manteca (including the project site) to the San Joaquin River.

No known natural gas fields were identified in the vicinity of the project site (San Joaquin County, 19920).

## 3.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

### STATE

---

#### **Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975**

The State Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 2710 et seq.) (SMARA) required that the California State Geologist implement a mineral land classification system to identify and protect mineral resources of regional or statewide significance in areas where urban expansion or other irreversible land uses may occur. This information is intended to be considered in local land use planning activities through the adoption of general plan mineral resource management policies (California Public Resources Code Section 2762). The California State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) classifies such urban and non-urban lands according to a priority list, or when the Board is otherwise petitioned to classify a particular land area.

As mandated by SMARA, aggregate mineral resources within the State are classified by the SMGB through application of the MRZ System. The MRZ is used to map all mineral commodities within identified jurisdictional boundaries, with priority given to areas where future mineral resource extraction may be prevented or restricted by land use compatibility issues, or where mineral resources may be mined during the 50-year period following their classification. The MRZ classifies lands that contain mineral deposits and identifies the presence or absence of substantial sand and gravel deposits and crushed rock source areas (i.e., commodities used as, or in the production of, construction materials).

PRC Section 2762(d) and 2763 requires a lead agency to prepare a statement specifying its reasons for permitting a use that would threaten the potential to extract mineral resources either 1) in an area that has been designated in its general plan as having important minerals to be protected, or 2) if the use is proposed in an area with significant resources pursuant to Section 2761(b)(2) and the lead agency has not yet acted on State's designation. PRC Section 2763 requires that lead agency land use decisions involving areas designated as being of regional significance shall be in accordance with the lead agency's mineral resource management policies and shall also, in balancing mineral values against alternative land uses, consider the importance of these minerals to their market region as a whole and not just their importance to the lead agency's area of jurisdiction.

#### **Division of Mines and Geology**

The California Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) operates within the Department of Conservation. The DMG is responsible for assisting in the utilization of mineral deposits and the identification of geological hazards.

#### **State Geological Survey**

Similar to the DMG, the California Geological Survey is responsible for assisting in the identification and proper utilization of mineral deposits, as well as the identification of fault locations and other geological hazards.

### LOCAL

---

#### **City of Manteca General Plan**

Section 8.11 of the Resource Conservation Element addresses mineral resources as follows:

#### 8.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

The State of California has identified lands in the General Plan Study Area, near the San Joaquin River, as areas of significant mineral resources. In particular, sand deposits in these areas are considered to be of regional significance. However, Brown Sand and Gravel, Incorporated, the only operator within the Study Area (Oakwood Lake Pit), has completed mining operations. Oakwood Lake Resort has been created from reclaimed mined lands.

### 3.11.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on mineral resources if it will:

- 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; and/or
- 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.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

#### **Impact 3.11-1: The project would result in the loss of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region (less than significant)**

The Project site is not mapped as having a known mineral resource of value to the region. Implementation of each individual phase, and collectively as a whole Project, would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource of value to the region. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

#### **Impact 3.11-2: The project would result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan (less than significant)**

The Project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in the City's General Plan. Implementation of each individual phase, and collectively as a whole Project, would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on the Manteca General Plan. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

This section provides a general description of the existing noise sources in the project vicinity, a discussion of the regulatory setting, and identifies potential noise impacts associated with the proposed project. Project impacts are evaluated relative to applicable noise level criteria and to the existing ambient noise environment. Phase 1 is analyzed to a project-level based on the available site and building plans that are included in the applications. The balance of the project site is analyzed more programmatically because the applications do not include building plans for noise analysis. Mitigation measures have been identified for significant noise-related impacts.

### 3.12.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### KEY TERMS

<b>Acoustics</b>	The science of sound.
<b>Ambient Noise</b>	The distinctive acoustical characteristics of a given area consisting of all noise sources audible at that location. In many cases, the term ambient is used to describe an existing or pre-project condition such as the setting in an environmental noise study.
<b>Attenuation</b>	The reduction of noise.
<b>A-Weighting</b>	A frequency-response adjustment of a sound level meter that conditions the output signal to approximate human response.
<b>Decibel or dB</b>	Fundamental unit of sound, defined as ten times the logarithm of the ratio of the sound pressure squared over the reference pressure squared.
<b>CNEL</b>	Community noise equivalent level. Defined as the 24-hour average noise level with noise occurring during evening hours (7 - 10 p.m.) weighted by a factor of three and nighttime hours weighted by a factor of 10 prior to averaging.
<b>Frequency</b>	The measure of the rapidity of alterations of a periodic acoustic signal, expressed in cycles per second or Hertz.
<b>Impulsive</b>	Sound of short duration, usually less than one second, with an abrupt onset and rapid decay.
<b>L<sub>dn</sub></b>	Day/Night Average Sound Level. Similar to CNEL but with no evening weighting.
<b>L<sub>eq</sub></b>	Equivalent or energy-averaged sound level.
<b>L<sub>max</sub></b>	The highest root-mean-square (RMS) sound level measured over a given period of time.
<b>L<sub>(n)</sub></b>	The sound level exceeded a described percentile over a measurement period. For instance, an hourly L <sub>50</sub> is the sound level exceeded 50 percent of the time during the one hour period.
<b>Loudness</b>	A subjective term for the sensation of the magnitude of sound.
<b>Noise</b>	Unwanted sound.
<b>SEL</b>	Sound exposure levels. A rating, in decibels, of a discrete event, such as an aircraft flyover or train passby, that compresses the total sound energy into a one-second event.

### FUNDAMENTALS OF ACOUSTICS

---

Acoustics is the science of sound. Sound may be thought of as mechanical energy of a vibrating object transmitted by pressure waves through a medium to human (or animal) ears. If the pressure variations occur frequently enough (at least 20 times per second), then they can be heard and are called sound. The number of pressure variations per second is called the frequency of sound, and is expressed as cycles per second or Hertz (Hz).

Noise is a subjective reaction to different types of sounds. Noise is typically defined as (airborne) sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected or undesired, and may therefore be classified as a more specific group of sounds. Perceptions of sound and noise are highly subjective from person to person.

Measuring sound directly in terms of pressure would require a very large and awkward range of numbers. To avoid this, the decibel scale was devised. The decibel scale uses the hearing threshold (20 micropascals), as a point of reference, defined as 0 dB. Other sound pressures are then compared to this reference pressure, and the logarithm is taken to keep the numbers in a practical range. The decibel scale allows a million-fold increase in pressure to be expressed as 120 dB, and changes in levels (dB) correspond closely to human perception of relative loudness.

The perceived loudness of sounds is dependent upon many factors, including sound pressure level and frequency content. However, within the usual range of environmental noise levels, perception of loudness is relatively predictable, and can be approximated by A-weighted sound levels. There is a strong correlation between A-weighted sound levels (expressed as dBA) and the way the human ear perceives sound. For this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels, but are expressed as dB, unless otherwise noted.

The decibel scale is logarithmic, not linear. In other words, two sound levels 10 dB apart differ in acoustic energy by a factor of 10. When the standard logarithmic decibel is A-weighted, an increase of 10 dBA is generally perceived as a doubling in loudness. For example, a 70 dBA sound is half as loud as an 80 dBA sound, and twice as loud as a 60 dBA sound.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the ambient noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given environment. A common statistical tool to measure the ambient noise level is the average, or equivalent, sound level ( $L_{eq}$ ), which corresponds to a steady-state A weighted sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given time period (usually one hour). The  $L_{eq}$  is the foundation of the composite noise descriptor,  $L_{dn}$ , and shows very good correlation with community response to noise.

The day/night average level ( $L_{dn}$ ) is based upon the average noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10 decibel weighing applied to noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) hours. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were twice as loud as daytime exposures. Because  $L_{dn}$  represents a 24-

hour average, it tends to disguise short-term variations in the noise environment. CNEL is similar to  $L_{dn}$ , but includes a +5 dB penalty for evening noise. Table 3.12-1 lists several examples of the noise levels associated with common situations.

**TABLE 3.12-1: TYPICAL NOISE LEVELS**

<i>COMMON OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES</i>	<i>NOISE LEVEL (DBA)</i>	<i>COMMON INDOOR ACTIVITIES</i>
	--110--	Rock Band
Jet Fly-over at 300 m (1,000 ft)	--100--	
Gas Lawn Mower at 1 m (3 ft)	--90--	
Diesel Truck at 15 m (50 ft), at 80 km/hr (50 mph)	--80--	Food Blender at 1 m (3 ft) Garbage Disposal at 1 m (3 ft)
Noisy Urban Area, Daytime Gas Lawn Mower, 30 m (100 ft)	--70--	Vacuum Cleaner at 3 m (10 ft)
Commercial Area Heavy Traffic at 90 m (300 ft)	--60--	Normal Speech at 1 m (3 ft)
Quiet Urban Daytime	--50--	Large Business Office Dishwasher in Next Room
Quiet Urban Nighttime	--40--	Theater, Large Conference Room (Background)
Quiet Suburban Nighttime	--30--	Library
Quiet Rural Nighttime	--20--	Bedroom at Night, Concert Hall (Background)
	--10--	Broadcast/Recording Studio
Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing	--0--	Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing

*SOURCE: CALTRANS, TECHNICAL NOISE SUPPLEMENT, TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS PROTOCOL. NOVEMBER 2009.*

## EFFECTS OF NOISE ON PEOPLE

The effects of noise on people can be placed in three categories:

- Subjective effects of annoyance, nuisance, and dissatisfaction;
- Interference with activities such as speech, sleep, and learning; and
- Physiological effects such as hearing loss or sudden startling.

Environmental noise typically produces effects in the first two categories. Workers in industrial plants can experience noise in the last category. There is no completely satisfactory way to measure the subjective effects of noise or the corresponding reactions of annoyance and dissatisfaction. A wide variation in individual thresholds of annoyance exists and different tolerances to noise tend to develop based on an individual’s past experiences with noise.

Thus, an important way of predicting a human reaction to a new noise environment is the way it compares to the existing environment to which one has adapted: the so-called ambient noise level. In general, the more a new noise exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise will be judged by those hearing it. With regard to increases in A-weighted noise level, the following relationships occur:

- Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a 1 dBA change cannot be perceived;
- Outside of the laboratory, a 3 dBA change is considered a just-perceivable difference;

- A change in level of at least 5 dBA is required before any noticeable change in human response would be expected; and
- A 10 dBA change is subjectively heard as approximately a doubling in loudness, and can cause an adverse response.

Stationary point sources of noise – including stationary mobile sources such as idling vehicles – attenuate (lessen) at a rate of approximately 6 dB per doubling of distance from the source, depending on environmental conditions (i.e. atmospheric conditions and either vegetative or manufactured noise barriers, etc.). Widely distributed noises, such as a large industrial facility spread over many acres, or a street with moving vehicles, would typically attenuate at a lower rate.

### EXISTING NOISE LEVELS

---

#### Traffic Noise Levels

The FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD 77-108) was used to develop  $L_{dn}$  (24-hour average) noise contours for the primary project-area roadways. The model is based upon the CALVENO noise emission factors for automobiles, medium trucks, and heavy trucks, with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The FHWA Model predicts hourly  $L_{eq}$  values for free-flowing traffic conditions, and is generally considered to be accurate within 1.5 dB. To predict  $L_{dn}$  values, it is necessary to determine the hourly distribution of traffic for a typical 24-hour period.

Existing traffic volumes were obtained from the traffic study prepared for the project (Fehr & Peers, June 2014). Day/night traffic distributions were based upon continuous hourly noise measurement data collected and file data for similar roadways. Using these data sources and the FHWA traffic noise prediction methodology, traffic noise levels were calculated for existing conditions. Locations of continuous noise monitoring sites are shown on Figure 3.12-1. Table 3.12-2 shows the results of this analysis. Appendix A provides the complete inputs and results for the FHWA traffic noise modeling.

Traffic noise levels are predicted at the sensitive receptors located at the closest typical setback distance along each project-area roadway segments. In some locations sensitive receptors may be located at distances which vary from the assumed calculation distance and may experience shielding from intervening barriers or sound walls. However, the traffic noise analysis is believed to be representative of the majority of sensitive receptors located closest to the project-area roadway segments analyzed in this report.

The actual distances to noise level contours may vary from the distances predicted by the FHWA model due to roadway curvature, grade, shielding from local topography or structures, elevated roadways, or elevated receivers. The distances reported in Table 3.12-2 are generally considered to be conservative estimates of noise exposure along the project-area roadways.

**TABLE 3.12-2: PREDICTED EXISTING TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS**

ROADWAY	SEGMENT	NOISE LEVEL AT CLOSEST RECEPTORS ( $L_{DN}$ ), dB	DISTANCES TO TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS, $L_{DN}$ (FEET)		
			70 dB	65 dB	60 dB
Airport Way	North of Yosemite	63.8	29	62	134
Airport Way	Yosemite to Wawona	64.5	32	69	149
Airport Way	Wawona to Daniels	64.4	32	68	147
Airport Way	Daniels to Atherton	64.1	40	87	187
Airport Way	South of Atherton	64.6	33	70	152
McKinley Avenue	North of Yosemite	55.1	20	44	94
McKinley Avenue	South of Yosemite	60.4	12	25	53
Yosemite Avenue	West of McKinley	59.2	19	41	89
Yosemite Avenue	McKinley to Airport	62.2	23	49	105
Yosemite Avenue	East of Airport	65.5	38	82	176
Wawona Street	East of Airport	57.9	8	17	36
Daniels Street	East of Airport	65.7	31	66	143
Atherton Drive	West of Airport	52.2	5	10	23
Atherton Drive	East of Airport	49.0	3	6	14

NOTES: DISTANCES TO TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS ARE MEASURED IN FEET FROM THE CENTERLINES OF THE ROADWAYS. EXISTING NOISE LEVELS ARE BASED ON PREDICTIONS, NOT FULL MEASUREMENTS.

SOURCE: FHWA-RD-77-108 WITH INPUTS FROM FEHR & PEERS., CALTRANS AND J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

**Railroad Noise Levels**

Railroad activity in the project vicinity occurs on the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) line which borders the northwestern boundary of the project site.

In order to quantify noise exposure from existing train operations, a continuous (24-hour) noise level measurement survey was conducted adjacent the railroad line. The purpose of the noise level measurements was to determine the typical Sound Exposure Level (SEL) for railroad line operations, while accounting for the effects of travel speed, warning horns, and other factors which may affect noise generation. In addition, the noise level measurement equipment was programmed to identify individual train events, so that the typical number of train operations could be determined.

Locations of continuous noise monitoring sites are shown on Figure 3.12-1. Table 3.12-3 shows a summary of the continuous noise measurement results.

**TABLE 3.12-3 : RAILROAD NOISE MEASUREMENT RESULTS**

MEASUREMENT LOCATION	RAILROAD TRACK	GRADE CROSSING/ WARNING HORN	TRAIN EVENTS PER 24-HR PERIOD	DISTANCE TO CL	SEL
1	UPRR	Yes	10	50'	107 dB

SOURCE: J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC - 2014

## 3.12 NOISE

Noise measurement equipment consisted of Larson Davis Laboratories (LDL) Model 820 precision integrating sound level meters equipped with LDL ½" microphones. The measurement systems were calibrated using an LDL Model CAL200 acoustical calibrator before and after testing. The measurement equipment meets all of the pertinent requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Type 1 (precision) sound level meters.

To determine the distances to the day/night average ( $L_{dn}$ ) railroad contours, it is necessary to calculate the  $L_{dn}$  for typical train operations. This was done using the SEL values and above-described number and an even day/night distribution of daily freight train operations. The  $L_{dn}$  may be calculated as follows:

$$L_{dn} = SEL + 10 \log N_{eq} - 49.4 \text{ dB, where:}$$

SEL is the mean Sound Exposure Level of the event,  $N_{eq}$  is the sum of the number of daytime events (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) per day, plus 10 times the number of nighttime events (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) per day, and 49.4 is ten times the logarithm of the number of seconds per day.

Based upon the above-described noise level data, number of operations and methods of calculation, the  $L_{dn}$  value for railroad line operations have been calculated, and the distances to the  $L_{dn}$  noise level contours are shown in Table 3.12-4.

**TABLE 3.12-4: APPROXIMATE DISTANCES TO THE RAILROAD NOISE CONTOURS**

EXTERIOR RAILROAD NOISE LEVEL AT MEASUREMENT SITE, LDN	DISTANCE TO LDN CONTOUR		
	60 dB	65 dB	70 dB
UPRR Line			
74 dB @ 50 feet – With Warning Horns	409 feet	190 feet	88 feet

SOURCE: J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014

### COMMUNITY NOISE SURVEY

A community noise survey was conducted to document existing ambient noise levels in the project area. Continuous 24-hour noise monitoring was conducted at four sites to record day-night statistical noise level trends. The data collected included the hourly average ( $L_{eq}$ ), median ( $L_{50}$ ), and the maximum level ( $L_{max}$ ) during the measurement period. Noise monitoring sites and the measured noise levels at each site are summarized in Table 3.12-5. Figure 3.12-1 shows the locations of the noise monitoring sites. The completed 24-hr noise monitoring results are contained in Appendix B.

Community noise monitoring equipment included Larson Davis Laboratories (LDL) Model 820 precision integrating sound level meters equipped with LDL ½" microphones. The measurement systems were calibrated using a LDL Model CAL200 acoustical calibrator before and after testing. The measurement equipment meets all of the pertinent requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Type 1 (precision) sound level meters.

**TABLE 3.12-5: EXISTING AMBIENT NOISE MONITORING RESULTS**

SITE	LOCATION	DATE	$L_{DN}$ (dBA)	MEASURED HOURLY NOISE LEVELS, LOW-HIGH (AVERAGE), dBA					
				DAYTIME (7:00 AM - 10:00 PM)			NIGHTTIME (10:00 PM - 7:00 AM)		
				$L_{EQ}$	$L_{50}$	$L_{MAX}$	$L_{EQ}$	$L_{50}$	$L_{MAX}$
LT-1	South center on Project Site – 120 feet from centerline of SR 120	Friday 2/21/14	77	70-73 (71)	68-73 (70)	84-94 (88)	66-73 (70)	60-72 (66)	80-90 (84)
		Saturday 2/22/14	75	69-73 (71)	68-70 (69)	85-95 (89)	65-71 (68)	60-68 (64)	79-91 (85)
LT-2	Northwest on project site – 50' to UPRR Railroad centerline	Friday 2/21/14	73	45-75 (68)	43-57 (48)	61-108 (82)	47-74 (66)	46-56 (51)	59-105 (76)
		Saturday 2/22/14	72	46-74 (63)	43-54 (47)	59-105 (74)	46-75 (66)	45-53 (48)	60-106 (70)
LT-3	West center on project site. Near existing single-family residential	Friday 2/21/14	63	53-63 (57)	52-61 (54)	64-85 (73)	52-61 (57)	51-60 (55)	62-80 (69)
		Saturday 2/22/14	63	53-59 (55)	51-58 (54)	64-76 (69)	50-62 (57)	49-59 (53)	58-86 (69)
LT-4	North center on property – south of waste water treatment plant	Friday 2/21/14	60	49-62 (54)	48-55 (50)	60-83 (70)	50-56 (53)	49-53 (51)	55-79 (67)
		Saturday 2/22/14	60	48-56 (53)	47-53 (50)	59-79 (67)	48-60 (54)	48-51 (49)	55-84 (65)

SOURCE: J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. - 2014

The results of the community noise survey shown in Table 3.12-5 indicate that existing transportation noise sources were the major contributor of ambient noise in the project vicinity. Specifically, traffic noise from SR 120 and railroad noise on the UPRR were observed to be the primary noise sources in the project area.

### 3.12.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### FEDERAL

There are no federal regulations related to noise that apply to the proposed project.

#### STATE

##### California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Appendix G, indicate that a significant noise impact may occur if a project exposes persons to noise or vibration levels in excess of local general plans or noise ordinance standards, or cause a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels. CEQA standards are discussed more below under the Thresholds of Significance criteria section.

**California State Building Codes**

The State Building Code, Title 24, Part 2 of the State of California Code of Regulations establishes uniform minimum noise insulation performance standards to protect persons within new buildings which house people, including hotels, motels, dormitories, apartment houses and dwellings other than single-family dwellings. Title 24 mandates that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB L<sub>dn</sub> or CNEL in any habitable room.

Title 24 also mandates that for structures containing noise-sensitive uses to be located where the L<sub>dn</sub> or CNEL exceeds 60 dB, an acoustical analysis must be prepared to identify mechanisms for limiting exterior noise to the prescribed allowable interior levels. If the interior allowable noise levels are met by requiring that windows be kept closed, the design for the structure must also specify a ventilation or air conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment

**CITY OF MANTECA**

---

**The City of Manteca General Plan**

The City of Manteca General Plan Noise Element contains goals, policies, and implementation measures for assessing noise impacts within the City. Listed below are the noise goals, policies, and implementation measures that are applicable to the proposed project (City of Manteca General Plan, 2003):

***Goals***

- N-1. Protect the residents of Manteca from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise.
  
- N-3. Ensure that the downtown core noise levels remain acceptable and compatible with commercial and higher density residential land uses.
  
- N-4. Protect public health and welfare by eliminating existing noise problems where feasible, by establishing standards for acceptable indoor and outdoor noise, and by preventing significant increases in noise levels.
  
- N-5. Incorporate noise considerations into land use planning decisions, and guide the location and design of transportation facilities to minimize the effects of noise on adjacent land uses.

***Policies***

- N-P-2: New development of residential or other noise-sensitive land uses will not be permitted in noise-impacted areas unless effective mitigation measures are incorporated into the project design to satisfy the performance standards in Table 9-1.
  
- N-P-3: The City may permit the development of new noise-sensitive uses only where the noise level due to fixed (non-transportation) noise sources satisfies the noise level standards of Table 9-2. Noise mitigation may be required to meet Table 9-2 performance standards.

N-P-5: In accord with the Table 9-2 standards, the City shall regulate construction-related noise impacts on adjacent uses.

**Implementation Measures**

N-I-1. New development in residential areas with an actual or projected exterior noise level of greater than 60 dB Ldn will be conditioned to use mitigation measures to reduce exterior noise levels to less than or equal to 60 dB Ldn.

N-I-3. In making a determination of impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a substantial increase will occur if ambient noise levels are increased by 10 dB or more. An increase from 5-10 dB may be substantial. Factors to be considered in determining the significance of increases from 5-10 dB include:

- the resulting noise levels
- the duration and frequency of the noise
- the number of people affected
- the land use designation of the affected receptor sites
- public reactions or controversy as demonstrated at workshops or hearings, or by correspondence
- prior CEQA determinations by other agencies specific to the project

N-I-4. Control noise at the source through use of insulation, berms, building design and orientation, buffer space, staggered operating hours and other techniques. Use noise barriers to attenuate noise to acceptable levels.

MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NOISE EXPOSURE MOBILE NOISE SOURCES			
Land Use <sup>4</sup>	Outdoor Activity Areas <sup>1</sup>	Interior Spaces	
		Ldn/CNEL, dB	Leq, dB <sup>3</sup>
Residential	60 <sup>2</sup>	45	
Transient Lodging	60 <sup>2</sup>	45	
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	60 <sup>2</sup>	45	
Theaters, Auditoriums, Music Halls			35
Churches, Music Halls	60 <sup>2</sup>		40
Office Buildings	65		45
Schools, Libraries, Museums			45
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70		

<sup>1</sup>Outdoor activity areas for residential development are considered to be backyard patios or decks of single family dwellings, and the common areas where people generally congregate for multi-family developments. Outdoor activity areas for non-residential developments are considered to be those common areas where people generally congregate, including pedestrian plazas, seating areas, and outside lunch facilities. Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

<sup>2</sup>In areas where it is not possible to reduce exterior noise levels to 60 dB L<sub>dn</sub> or below using a practical application of the best noise-reduction technology, an exterior noise level of up to 65 L<sub>dn</sub> will be allowed.

<sup>3</sup>Determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

<sup>4</sup>Where a proposed use is not specifically listed on the table, the use shall comply with the noise exposure standards for the nearest similar use as determined by the City.

**Table 9-1 of the City of Manteca General Plan Noise Element**

**PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR STATIONARY NOISE SOURCES OR PROJECTS AFFECTED BY STATIONARY NOISE SOURCES<sup>1,2</sup>**

Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime	Nighttime
	7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	10 p.m. to 7 a.m.
Hourly Leq, dB	50	45
Maximum Level, dB	70	65

<sup>1</sup>Each of the noise levels specified above should be lowered by five (5) dB for simple noise tones, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or recurring impulsive noises. Such noises are generally considered by residents to be particularly annoying and are a primary source of noise complaints.

<sup>2</sup>No standards have been included for interior noise levels. Standard construction practices should, with the exterior noise levels identified, result in acceptable interior noise levels.

**Table 9-2 of the City of Manteca General Plan Noise Element**

### City of Manteca Municipal Code Noise Ordinance

Section 9.52.030 of the City of Manteca Municipal Code prohibits excessive or annoying noise or vibration to residential and commercial properties in the City. The following general rules are outline in the ordinance:

**9.52.030 PROHIBITED NOISES—GENERAL STANDARD**

No person shall make, or cause to suffer, or permit to be made upon any public property, public right-of-way or private property, any unnecessary and unreasonable noises, sounds or vibrations which are physically annoying to reasonable persons of ordinary sensitivity or which are so harsh or so prolonged or unnatural or unusual in their use, time or place as to cause or contribute to the unnecessary and unreasonable discomfort of any persons within the neighborhood from which said noises emanate or which interfere with the peace and comfort of residents or their guests, or the operators or customers in places of business in the vicinity, or which may detrimentally or adversely affect such residences or places of business. (Ord. 1374 § 1(part), 2007)

**17.58.050 D. EXEMPT ACTIVITIES**

8. Construction activities when conducted as part of an approved Building Permit, except as prohibited in Subsection **17.58.050(E)(1)** (Prohibited Activities) below.

**17.58.050 E. PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES**

1. Construction Noise. Operating or causing the operation of tools or equipment on private property used in alteration, construction, demolition, drilling, or repair work daily between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., so that the sound creates a noise disturbance across a residential property line, except for emergency work of public service utilities.

### VIBRATION STANDARDS

Vibration is like noise in that it involves a source, a transmission path, and a receiver. While vibration is related to noise, it differs in that in that noise is generally considered to be pressure

waves transmitted through air, whereas vibration usually consists of the excitation of a structure or surface. As with noise, vibration consists of an amplitude and frequency. A person’s perception to the vibration will depend on their individual sensitivity to vibration, as well as the amplitude and frequency of the source and the response of the system which is vibrating.

Vibration can be measured in terms of acceleration, velocity, or displacement. A common practice is to monitor vibration measures in terms of peak particle velocities in inches per second. Standards pertaining to perception as well as damage to structures have been developed for vibration levels defined in terms of peak particle velocities.

The City of Manteca does not have specific policies pertaining to vibration levels. However, vibration levels associated with construction activities and railroad operations are addressed as potential noise impacts associated with project implementation.

Human and structural response to different vibration levels is influenced by a number of factors, including ground type, distance between source and receptor, duration, and the number of perceived vibration events. Table 3.12-6 indicates that the threshold for damage to structures ranges from 0.2 to 0.6 peak particle velocity in inches per second (in/sec p.p.v). The general threshold at which human annoyance could occur is noted as 0.1 in/sec p.p.v. The threshold of damage to buildings is approximately 0.2 in/sec p.p.v.

**TABLE 3.12-6: EFFECTS OF VIBRATION ON PEOPLE AND BUILDINGS**

PEAK PARTICLE VELOCITY		HUMAN REACTION	EFFECT ON BUILDINGS
MM/SEC.	IN./SEC.		
0.15-0.30	0.006-0.019	Threshold of perception; possibility of intrusion	Vibrations unlikely to cause damage of any type
2.0	0.08	Vibrations readily perceptible	Recommended upper level of the vibration to which ruins and ancient monuments should be subjected
2.5	0.10	Level at which continuous vibrations begin to annoy people	Virtually no risk of “architectural” damage to normal buildings
5.0	0.20	Vibrations annoying to people in buildings (this agrees with the levels established for people standing on bridges and subjected to relative short periods of vibrations)	Threshold at which there is a risk of “architectural” damage to normal dwelling - houses with plastered walls and ceilings. Special types of finish such as lining of walls, flexible ceiling treatment, etc., would minimize “architectural” damage
10-15	0.4-0.6	Vibrations considered unpleasant by people subjected to continuous vibrations and unacceptable to some people walking on bridges	Vibrations at a greater level than normally expected from traffic, but would cause “architectural” damage and possibly minor structural damage.

SOURCE: CALTRANS. TRANSPORTATION RELATED EARTHBOEN VIBRATIONS. TAV-02-01-R9601 FEBRUARY 20, 2002.

### 3.12.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project will have a significant impact related to noise if it will result in:

- 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;
- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without project;
- 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, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; or
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip. Therefore, airport and airport noise is not discussed further in this analysis.

#### **Determination of a Significant Increase in Noise Levels**

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines define a significant impact of a project if it “increases substantially the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas”.

The City of Manteca General Plan Noise Element Implementation Measure N-I-3 provides specific guidance for assessing increases in ambient noise, as follows:

*In making a determination of impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a substantial increase will occur if ambient noise levels are increased by 10 dB or more. An increase from 5-10 dB may be substantial. Factors to be considered in determining the significance of increases from 5-10 dB include:*

- *the resulting noise levels*
- *the duration and frequency of the noise*
- *the number of people affected*
- *the land use designation of the affected receptor sites*
- *public reactions or controversy as demonstrated at workshops or hearings, or by correspondence*
- *prior CEQA determinations by other agencies specific to the project*

---

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

**Impact 3.12-1: The proposed project has the potential to expose people to, or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or otherwise cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (less than significant with mitigation)**

**Traffic Noise Modeling:** To describe future noise levels due to traffic, the Federal Highway Administration Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108) was used. Direct inputs to the model included traffic volumes provided by Fehr & Peers. The FHWA model is based upon the Calveno reference noise factors for automobiles, medium trucks and heavy trucks, with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. The FHWA model was developed to predict hourly  $L_{eq}$  values for free-flowing traffic conditions. To predict  $L_{dn}$ /CNEL values, it is necessary to determine the day/night distribution of traffic and adjust the traffic volume input data to yield an equivalent hourly traffic volume.

Development of the project would result in new hotel and outdoor recreational uses. These uses are considered noise sensitive. Table 9-1 of the City of Manteca General Plan Noise Element establishes acceptable noise levels of 60 dB  $L_{dn}$  for outdoor activity areas of transient lodging uses along with an interior noise level standard of 45 dB  $L_{dn}$ . The City applies an exterior noise level standard of 70 dB  $L_{dn}$  at playground and neighborhood park uses.

**Exterior Traffic Noise Level Impacts:** Table 3.12-7 shows the noise levels associated with traffic on the local roadway network under the existing and existing plus project traffic conditions. Table 3.12-8 shows the noise levels associated with traffic on the local roadway network under the cumulative and cumulative plus project traffic conditions. As indicated by Table 3.12-7 and Table 3.12-8, the related noise level increases under development of the proposed project are predicted to range between 0.1 to 2.3 dB. The Table 3.12-7 and Table 3.12-8 data indicate that some noise sensitive receptors located along the project-area roadways are currently exposed to exterior traffic noise levels exceeding the City of Manteca 60 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard for residential uses. These receptors will continue to experience elevated exterior noise levels with implementation of the proposed project.

The project's contribution to existing traffic noise increases is predicted to be 2.3 dB, or less. This is less than the City's substantial increase criteria of 5-10 dB. Therefore, the increase of 2.3 dB  $L_{dn}$  is considered less than significant relative to the City's substantial increase threshold.

The proposed project would not cause increased noise levels exceeding the City of Manteca 60 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard at existing noise-sensitive residential receptors. This would be a **less-than-significant** impact relative to this topic.

## 3.12 NOISE

**TABLE 3.12-7: EXISTING TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS VS. EXISTING PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS**

ROADWAY	SEGMENT	NOISE LEVELS ( $L_{DN}$ , dB)			DISTANCE TO EXISTING + PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS, FEET <sup>1</sup>		
		EXISTING	EXISTING + PROJECT	CHANGE (dB)	70 dB $L_{DN}$	65 dB $L_{DN}$	60 dB $L_{DN}$
Airport Way	North of Yosemite	63.8	63.9	0.1	29	63	136
Airport Way	Yosemite to Wawona	64.5	64.7	0.2	33	72	154
Airport Way	Wawona to Daniels	64.4	64.5	0.2	32	70	151
Airport Way	Daniels to Atherton	64.1	64.6	0.5	43	93	201
Airport Way	South of Atherton	64.6	64.3	-0.3	31	67	145
McKinley Ave	North of Yosemite	55.1	55.3	0.2	21	45	97
McKinley Ave	South of Yosemite	60.4	61.0	0.6	13	27	59
Yosemite Ave	West of McKinley	59.2	59.3	0.0	19	42	90
Yosemite Ave	McKinley to Airport	62.2	62.2	0.1	23	49	105
Yosemite Ave	East of Airport	65.5	65.7	0.1	39	83	179
Wawona St	East of Airport	57.9	58.0	0.1	8	17	37
Daniels Street	East of Airport	65.7	65.8	0.2	32	68	146
Atherton Drive	West of Airport	52.2	51.7	-0.5	4	10	21
Atherton Drive	East of Airport	49.0	49.0	0.0	3	6	14

<sup>1</sup> DISTANCES TO TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS ARE MEASURED IN FEET FROM THE CENTERLINES OF THE ROADWAYS. ACTUAL DISTANCES MAY VARY DUE TO SHIELDING FROM EXISTING NOISE BARRIERS OR INTERVENING STRUCTURES. TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS MAY VARY DEPENDING ON ACTUAL SETBACK DISTANCES AND LOCALIZED SHIELDING.

SOURCE: FHWA-RD-77-108 WITH INPUTS FROM FEHR & PEERS AND J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

**TABLE 3.12-8: CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS VS. CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS**

ROADWAY	SEGMENT	NOISE LEVELS ( $L_{DN}$ , dB)			DISTANCE TO 2030 + PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS, FEET <sup>1</sup>		
		2030	2030 + PROJECT	CHANGE (dB)	70 dB $L_{DN}$	65 dB $L_{DN}$	60 dB $L_{DN}$
Airport Way	North of Yosemite	67.0	67.0	0.0	47	102	219
Airport Way	Yosemite to Wawona	65.8	66.5	0.7	44	94	202
Airport Way	Wawona to Daniels	66.5	66.6	0.1	45	96	208
Airport Way	Daniels to Atherton	66.2	66.9	0.7	62	134	289
Airport Way	South of Atherton	68.6	68.7	0.1	62	133	286
McKinley Ave	North of Yosemite	60.7	60.7	0.0	48	104	224
McKinley Ave	South of Yosemite	70.0	72.3	2.3	71	153	329
Yosemite Ave	West of McKinley	63.1	63.1	0.0	35	74	160
Yosemite Ave	McKinley to Airport	67.0	67.4	0.4	50	108	232
Yosemite Ave	East of Airport	66.7	66.8	0.1	46	99	214
Wawona St	East of Airport	59.5	59.6	0.1	10	22	47
Daniels Street	East of Airport	69.3	69.3	0.0	54	117	251
Atherton Drive	West of Airport	54.4	54.4	0.0	7	15	32
Atherton Drive	East of Airport	54.8	54.8	0.0	7	16	34
Milo Candini	Yosemite to Wawona	N/A	56.8	N/A	10	21	46

<sup>1</sup> DISTANCES TO TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS ARE MEASURED IN FEET FROM THE CENTERLINES OF THE ROADWAYS. ACTUAL DISTANCES MAY VARY DUE TO SHIELDING FROM EXISTING NOISE BARRIERS OR INTERVENING STRUCTURES. TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS MAY VARY DEPENDING ON ACTUAL SETBACK DISTANCES AND LOCALIZED SHIELDING.

SOURCE: FHWA-RD-77-108 WITH INPUTS FROM FEHR & PEERS AND J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

**Union Pacific Railroad Line (UPRR) Noise Levels:** The UPRR line was measured to generate an exterior noise level of 74 dBA  $L_{dn}$  at a distance of 50 feet. Based upon this measurement, railroad noise levels at the project site were predicted, as shown in Table 3.12-9. Railroad noise level are not predicted to exceed the City of Manteca 70 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard at proposed outdoor recreation areas, as shown in Table 3.12-9.

**TABLE 3.12-9: CUMULATIVE + PROJECT TRANSPORTATION NOISE LEVELS AT PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL USES**

ROADWAY	RECEPTOR DESCRIPTION	APPROXIMATE SETBACK, FEET <sup>1</sup>	ADT	PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS, dB LDN			
				NO WALL	6' WALL	7' WALL	8' WALL
SR 120	Hotel Pool Area <sup>2</sup>	500	130,200	60 dB	--	--	--
SR 120	PA-6	750	130,200	68 dB	--	--	--
N/A	PA-10/11	150	Rail	67 dB	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Setback distances are measured in feet from the centerlines of the roadways to the center of the outdoor recreation area.

<sup>2</sup> Includes a partial view correction to account for shielding from proposed building facades.

-- Meets the City of Manteca exterior noise standard without mitigation.

Source: FHWA-RD-77-108 with inputs from Fehr & Peers, and j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. 2014.

The Table 3.12-9 data indicate that predicted traffic noise levels would comply with the City’s 60 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard at the proposed outdoor pool area of the proposed hotel use. Additionally, exterior traffic and railroad noise levels would comply with the City’s 70 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard for playground and neighborhood park uses.

**Interior Noise Impacts:** Modern construction typically provides a 25 dB exterior-to-interior noise level reduction with windows closed. Therefore, sensitive receptors exposed to exterior noise of 70 dB  $L_{dn}$ , or less, will typically comply with the City of Manteca 45 dB  $L_{dn}$  interior noise level standard. Additional noise reduction measures, such as acoustically rated windows are generally required for exterior noise levels exceeding 70 dB  $L_{dn}$ . It should be noted that exterior noise levels are typically 2-3 dB higher at second floor locations. Additionally, noise barriers do not reduce exterior noise levels at second floor locations.

The proposed hotel use located in Phase 1 of the FEZ is predicted to be exposed to unmitigated first floor exterior transportation noise levels of approximately 73 dB  $L_{dn}$ . Therefore, upper floors are predicted to be exposed to exterior noise levels of up to 76 dB  $L_{dn}$ . Based upon a 25 dB exterior-to-interior noise level reduction, interior noise levels are predicted to range between 48 to 51 dB  $L_{dn}$ . These noise levels would exceed the City of Manteca 45 dB  $L_{dn}$  interior noise level standard for hotel uses. In order to achieve compliance with the 45 dB  $L_{dn}$  interior noise level standard, interior noise control measures would be required on the hotel facility within Phase 1. This would include the use of sound transmission class (STC) 38 rated window assemblies in facades located within 550 feet of the centerline of SR 120.

The following mitigation measures will minimize noise impacts resulting from transportation noise impacts on the Phase 1 of the proposed project. Implementation of this mitigation measure would

ensure consistency with the City's noise standards and would reduce this potentially significant impact to a **less than significant** level.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.12-1:** *All hotel room windows located within 550 feet of the centerline of SR 120 shall have a minimum sound transmission class (STC) rating of 38. As an alternative to this requirement, the project proponent may submit a detailed interior noise analysis outlining alternative noise control measures that would ensure compliance with the City of Manteca 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard. This analysis should specify required sound ratings for glazing as well as any other modifications to be the building envelope used to meet the City's interior noise level standard. This analysis shall be prepared by a qualified noise control engineer.*

**Stationary Noise Impacts:** The nearest existing sensitive receptors include single-family residences west of the areas PA-6, PA-9, PA-10, and PA-11. Additionally, single-family residential uses are located east of area PA-1, along Airport Way. Activities occurring at the site of the proposed hotel facility are not located near any existing sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to increase stationary noise at existing sensitive receptors. However, build out of the project site could cause increased stationary noise at sensitive receptors around the project site. These future uses may include the following:

- Baseball/Softball Fields (2)
- Multi-purpose/Soccer Fields (5-10) in varying sizes.
- Shared public parking in PA-15 and PA-14
- Man-made passive lake/retention basin, approximately six (6) acres. Lakeside boardwalk promenade with semi-pervious pavers.
- Small Outdoor Amphitheater
- Outdoor entertainment / performance plaza
- Destination Playground
- Family Party Pavilions
- Beach Volleyball Courts (2)
- Customer/visitor parking and shared parking
- Concessions to support recreation, sporting uses and events and all visitor serving uses
- Retail shops
- Restaurants, cafes, bistro's, coffee shops
- Sports bar/ Micro-brewery

Table 3.12-10 provides an estimate of noise levels associated the above-listed types of use. The estimated noise level data for a small outdoor amphitheater or entertainment/performance plaza would be representative of the most intensive type uses that could be conditionally permitted due to the likely use of amplified sound. Noise contours for these uses could potentially exceed the City's daytime 50 dBA  $L_{eq}$  and nighttime 45 dBA  $L_{eq}$  noise level standards up to 2,812-8,891 feet

from the use. If acoustic shielding is provided through the project design, these distances could be reduced to 1,581-5,000 feet, or less depending on the site design and hours of operation.

**TABLE 3.12-10: ESTIMATED NOISE LEVELS FOR FUTURE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT USES**

USE	TYPICAL NOISE LEVEL AT, 50 FEET $L_{eq}^1$	DISTANCE TO 50 dBA $L_{eq}$ NOISE CONTOUR		DISTANCE TO 45 dBA $L_{eq}$ NOISE CONTOUR	
		DIRECT LINE OF SITE	WITH SHIELDING FROM 6' TALL SOUND WALL OR SIMILAR SHIELDING	DIRECT LINE OF SITE	WITH SHIELDING FROM 6' TALL SOUND WALL OR SIMILAR SHIELDING
Athletic fields	66 dBA	315'	177'	561	315
Busy Parking Lot, 250 spaces	59 dBA	147'	83'	262	147
Small outdoor amphitheater	90 dBA	5,000	2,812	8,891	5,000
Outdoor entertainment, performance plaza	85 dBA	2,812'	1,581'	5,000	2,812
Destination Playground, 100 kids	65 dBA	281'	158'	500	281
Family Party Pavilions	60 dBA	158'	89'	281	158
Loading Dock (retail, restaurant, etc.)	70 dBA	473'	266'	842	473
Truck Circulation (retail, restaurant, etc.)	55 dBA	89'	50'	158	89
Vendor Deliveries (retail, restaurant, etc.)	59 dBA	133'	75'	237	133

<sup>1</sup> ACTUAL NOISE LEVELS MAY VARY DEPENDING ON SITE DESIGN AND LOCATION OF NOISE SOURCES.

SOURCE: J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

Less intensive uses include athletic fields, parking lots, playgrounds, party pavilions, and retail/restaurant uses may only generate noise levels exceeding the City's 50 dBA  $L_{eq}$  daytime noise level standard at distances of 89-473 feet. If noise shielding is provided these distances would be reduced to 50-266 feet. The following mitigation measures will minimize noise impacts resulting from on-site noise sources. Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure consistency with the City's noise standards and would reduce this potentially significant impact to a **less than significant** level.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Mitigation Measure 3.12-2:** *Prior to the development of each individual phase, or a portion of each individual phase of development, proposed uses which include extensive noise generating uses shall be reviewed by the City of Manteca to ensure that exterior noise levels would not exceed the applicable City of Manteca noise standards. The Table 3.12-10 data shall be used as a screening tool to determine which uses may exceed the City's standards. The City shall prohibit the approval of a use that would cause an exceedance of the noise standards at a sensitive receptor unless sufficient noise control measures are implemented in the project design. The specific development proposals within the project site shall be reviewed by the City of Manteca when the detailed information is available for the individual development/construction approvals, which may occur during Architectural Design Review and/or Building Permit.*

**Impact 3.12-2: The proposed project has the potential to have a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (less than significant)**

The site improvements and building construction would include the use of heavy equipment and impact tools that can generate noise. Table 3.12-11 provides a list of the types of equipment which may be associated with construction activities and the associated noise levels.

**TABLE 3.12-11: CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE**

TYPE OF EQUIPMENT	PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS, $L_{MAX}$ DB				DISTANCES TO NOISE CONTOURS (FEET)	
	NOISE LEVEL AT 50'	NOISE LEVEL AT 100'	NOISE LEVEL AT 200'	NOISE LEVEL AT 400'	70 DB $L_{MAX}$ CONTOUR	65 DB $L_{MAX}$ CONTOUR
Backhoe	78	72	66	60	126	223
Compactor	83	77	71	65	223	397
Compressor (air)	78	72	66	60	126	223
Concrete Saw	90	84	78	72	500	889
Dozer	82	76	70	64	199	354
Dump Truck	76	70	64	58	100	177
Excavator	81	75	69	63	177	315
Generator	81	75	69	63	177	315
Jackhammer	89	83	77	71	446	792
Pneumatic Tools	85	79	73	67	281	500

SOURCE: ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION NOISE MODEL USER'S GUIDE. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION. FHWA-HEP-05-054. JANUARY 2006. J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

Activities involved in project construction would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 85 to 90 dB at a distance of 50 feet. The nearest residential receptors would be located 100 feet or more from construction activities occurring at the southwest boundary of the project site (PA-6). At this distance, construction related activities are predicted to generate maximum noise levels ranging between 72-84 dB  $L_{max}$ . Based upon the daytime maximum noise levels of 64-85 dB  $L_{max}$ , maximum noise levels due to project construction are predicted to be within the range of existing maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors.

Construction could result in periods of elevated ambient noise levels and the potential for annoyance. However, predicted maximum noise levels associated with project construction are predicted to be less than existing average maximum ( $L_{max}$ ) noise levels, as measured at the nearest sensitive receptors. The City of Manteca General Plan establishes allowable hours of operation and noise limits for construction activities as follows:

*17.58.050 D Exempt Activities*

8. Construction activities when conducted as part of an approved Building Permit, except as prohibited in Subsection 17.58.050(E)(1) (Prohibited Activities) below.

*17.58.050 E. Prohibited Activities*

1. Construction Noise. Operating or causing the operation of tools or equipment on private property used in alteration, construction, demolition, drilling, or repair work daily between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., so that the sound creates a noise disturbance across a residential property line, except for emergency work of public service utilities.

Maximum ( $L_{max}$ ) construction related noise levels are predicted to be less than existing maximum noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors. Additionally, all construction activities will be subject to the requirements of the City of Manteca Noise Ordinance with respect to limits on construction noise. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

**Impact 3.12-3: The proposed project has the potential to expose people to, or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (less than significant)**

The primary vibration-generating activities associated with the proposed project would occur during construction when activities such as grading, utilities placement, and parking lot construction occur. Sensitive receptors which could be impacted by construction related vibrations, especially vibratory compactors/rollers, are located approximately 100 feet or further from the project area. At this distance construction vibrations are not predicted to exceed acceptable levels. Additionally, construction activities would be temporary in nature and would likely occur during normal daytime working hours.

Construction vibration impacts include human annoyance and building structural damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of perception. Building damage can take the form of cosmetic or structural. Table 3.12-12 shows the typical vibration levels produced by construction equipment.

**TABLE 3.12-12: VIBRATION LEVELS FOR VARYING CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT**


TYPE OF EQUIPMENT	PEAK PARTICLE VELOCITY @ 25 FEET (INCHES/SECOND)	PEAK PARTICLE VELOCITY @ 100 FEET (INCHES/SECOND)
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.011
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.010
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.000
Auger/drill Rigs	0.089	0.011
Jackhammer	0.035	0.004
Vibratory Hammer	0.070	0.009
Vibratory Compactor/roller	0.210	0.026

SOURCE: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, TRANSIT NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES, MAY 2006

The Table 3.12-12 data indicate that construction vibration levels anticipated for the project are less than the 0.2 in/sec p.p.v. threshold of damage to buildings and less than the 0.1 in/sec threshold of annoyance criteria at distances of 100 feet. Therefore, construction vibrations are not predicted to cause damage to existing buildings or cause annoyance to sensitive receptors. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact.


**Impact 3.12-4: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports (no impact)**

There are no documented public airports or public use airports within close proximity to the Plan Area. There are no documented private airstrips within close proximity to the Plan Area. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **no impact** with regards to this environmental issue.



**MANTECA FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE**

Figure 3-12.1: Noise Measurement Sites



**Legend**

- Project Boundary
- Noise Measurement Site

Data sources: J.C. Breman & Associates; ArcGIS Online BING aerial image map service. Map date: March 11, 2015.

*This page left intentionally blank.*

This section describes and evaluates potential impacts associated with the provision of police protection, fire protection and emergency services, parks and recreation, schools, and other public facilities for the proposed project. The information in this section is primarily derived from the *City of Manteca General Plan* (Manteca 2003), *City of Manteca General Plan Environmental Impact Report* (Manteca 2003), *Draft Manteca Draft Municipal Services Review and Sphere of Influence Plan* (Manteca 2014). No comments regarding public services and recreation were received during the public review period(s) or scoping meeting for the Notice of Preparation.

### 3.13.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

#### CITY OF MANTECA SERVICES

---

The City of Manteca receives funds for the provision of public services through development fees, property taxes, and connection and usage fees. As land is developed within the City and annexed into the City of Manteca, these fees apply. The City of Manteca reviews these fee structures on an annual basis to ensure that they provide adequate financing to cover the provision of city services. The City's Community Development, Public Works, and Finance Departments are responsible for continual oversight to ensure that the fee structures are adequate. The City reviews the referenced fees and user charges on an annual basis to determine the correct level of adjustment required to reverse any deficits and assure funding for needed infrastructure going forward. The City intends to include discussion of these fees and charges as part of the annual budget hearings. The FY 2013-2014 budget for the Manteca Police Department is \$15,251,818.

##### **City of Manteca Police Department**

Police protection services in the City of Manteca are provided by the Manteca Police Department (MPD). The MPD operates out of its headquarters located at 1001 W. Center Street. Currently the MPD has 63 sworn officers.

The MPD classifies calls for service as priority 1, priority 2 or priority 3. Priority 1 calls are calls where a threat is posed to life or a crime of violence. Priority 2 calls are calls for service where there is an urgency or suspicious behavior. Priority 3 calls are for service where no emergency or serious problem is involved. The average response times by priority call for 2012 and 2013 are listed below.

- Priority 1 calls: 2012, 4 minutes and 16 seconds. 2013, 4 minutes and 46 seconds.
- Priority 2 calls: 2012, 18 minutes and 39 seconds. 2013, 17 minutes and 54 seconds.
- Priority 3 calls: 2012, 37 minutes and 17 seconds. 2013, 37 minutes and 49 seconds

##### *ORGANIZATION*

The MPD is organized into two divisions: Operations and Services. Additionally, the MPD operates a Public Affairs Unit. For budgeting purposes the MPD is organized into the following programs: administration, patrol, investigations, support services, dispatch, code enforcement, jail services, and animal services.

## 3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

### **Operations Division**

The Operations Division is the largest division of the Department. It includes all uniformed officers and their support teams. The units included in the Operations Division are patrol, traffic, community service officers, SWAT, crisis response team, mounted patrol, canine, and bomb squad.

### **Services Division**

The Services Division includes all the teams and units that support the line police function of the MPD. These teams include Dispatch, Records, Property and Evidence, Crime Analysis, and Animal Services, as well as Detectives, School Resource Officers, Gang Unit, and Manteca's Street Crimes Unit (SCU), which is the department's proactive narcotic and street crime suppression unit.

The MPD also has several very active volunteer groups. The Police Explorers, Citizen's Police Academy graduates, Police Reserves, and the SHARPs allow members of the community of all ages and experience to give back to the community through volunteering.

### **Public Affairs Unit**

The MPD's Public Affairs Officer (PAO) works directly with the Chief of Police on issues that affect the MPD and community. In addition to being a community liaison, the PAO works with the public in providing current information regarding issues effecting Manteca. This is done by working with local news media outlets, issuing information bulletins and conducting neighborhood meetings, and by using the local government channel for a program called StreetBeat. In addition to assisting the Chief of Police, the PAO also coordinates several crime prevention programs to include the Citizen Police Academy, Drug Awareness Education, and various workplace-training programs such as Workplace Violence Prevention. The PAO also coordinates with other city offices special projects and does site plan reviews for new commercial and residential projects using a process called CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design). Table 3.13-1 shows the recent crime statistics for the City of Manteca between 2010 and 2012.

**TABLE 3.13-1: MANTECA POLICE DEPARTMENT CRIME STATISTICS (2010-2012)**

<i>CATEGORY/CRIME</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2012</i>
Total Violent Crimes	241	206	265
Homicide	1	4	0
Rape	20	7	11
Robbery	71	53	83
Assault	159	142	171
Total Property Crimes	1883	2367	2681
Burglary	344	511	454
Motor Vehicle Theft	235	266	383
Larceny	1304	1590	1844
Arson	9	19	19

SOURCE: FBI CRIME STATISTICS; [HTTP://WWW.FBI.GOV/ABOUT-US/CJIS/UCR/CRIME-IN/THE-U.S./TABLES/TABLE-8/10TBL08CA.XLS](http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s./tables/table-8/10tbl08ca.xls)

### City of Manteca Fire Department

The Manteca Fire Department is responsible for the primary provision of fire service and emergency medical response for the City of Manteca and its residents. The Manteca Fire Department serves approximately 71,164 residents throughout approximately 17.2 square miles within the City limits. The Manteca Fire Department operates out of four (4) facilities that are strategically located in the City of Manteca. The Manteca Fire Department is headquartered in Station 242 located at 1154 S. Union Road. This building serves as the Fire Department headquarters and the Fire Prevention Bureau. Fire training and emergency medical services are managed out of Station 241. Apparatus includes three engines, three reserve engines, one ladder truck, one medium rescue unit, one USAR rescue trailer, eight staff vehicles, two pick-up trucks, and a public education trailer. The FY 2013-2014 budget for the Manteca Fire Department is \$8,007,790 (Administration \$750,825, Operations \$6,987,970, Prevention \$268,995).

The Manteca Fire Department maintains a goal for the initial company of three (3) firefighters to arrive on scene for fire and emergency medical service (EMS) incidents within five (5) minutes 90% of the time (Response Effectiveness). In 2013 the department averaged a 4:35 response time City-wide and was on scene within five minutes 71% of the time. On September 11, 2013, Fire Station No. 4 opened in northwest Manteca. The data so far this year (2014) shows that the response time to this area has dropped by 42%. Based on the half-year data, it is expected that the addition of Fire Station No. 4 will improve both the average response time and the percent of response effectiveness.

The construction of Fire Station No. 5, which is planned in southwest Manteca, will have a similar impact on response times and response effectiveness. The City has funded the design of this station in fiscal year 2014/15 with the intent of constructing and staffing this station by 2017. Funding for this station is dependent on additional annexations and development in the area. The construction and staffing of Fire Station No. 5 will allow the City the ability to achieve the full alarm standard outlined by NFPA 1710 for the first time in the City's History; this will directly affect the ISO rating, enhance service to the citizens of Manteca, and improve the department's ability to obtain grants.

#### *ISO RATING*

The Insurance Services Office (ISO) Public Protection Classification Program currently rates the Fire Department as **THREE** on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being the highest possible protection rating and 10 being the lowest. The ISO rating measures individual fire protection agencies against a Fire Suppression Rating Schedule, which includes such criteria as facilities and support for handling and dispatching fire alarms, first-alarm response and initial attack, and adequacy of local water supply for fire-suppression purposes. The recent construction and staffing of Fire Station No. 4 as well as the imminent construction and staffing of Fire Station No. 5 will have a positive impact on the City's ISO rating. The ISO ratings are used to establish fire insurance premiums. The City plans to apply for ISO re-classification when Fire Station No. 5 is complete. In addition, upon completion

the Fire Department will apply for Accreditation through the Commission of Fire Accreditation International (CFAI).

### **City of Manteca Parks and Recreation Department**

Manteca is home to more than 50 public park spaces totaling more than 400 acres. Parks and Recreation amenities include several baseball and softball diamonds, sports fields, picnic areas, barbecues, playgrounds and tot lots, a 3+ mile Class 1 bike and pedestrian path, lighted tennis courts, a BMX bicycle track, a skate park, an 18-hole municipal golf course, and a public swimming pool (with tot pool).

Existing rental facilities include:

- Northgate: Full Picnic Shelter; Half Picnic Shelter
- Lincoln Picnic Shelter
- Woodward: Full Picnic Shelter; Half Picnic Shelter
- Library Park Gazebo
- Lincoln Pool
- Sports Fields

On a regional scale, the City is located in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta), which contains several recreational areas and facilities, primarily for water-based recreation. Regional County parks near the City include the 9.85-acre Dos Reis Regional Park and the 3.7-acre Mossdale Crossing Regional Park, both located along the San Joaquin River. Mossdale Crossing Park is located near the project site on the west side of Interstate 5. Each of these parks includes boat launch ramps, picnic/barbeque areas, and children's play areas. Dos Reis Regional Park also has camping facilities. Also in the vicinity is the Haven Acres Marina, a private marina located on the San Joaquin River north of Dos Reis Regional Park. This facility provides river access to the San Joaquin River and includes parking areas, a boat ramp, and 10 boat berths.

TABLE 3.13-2: COMMUNITY/SPECIALTY PARK FACILITIES INVENTORY

COMMUNITY / SPECIALTY PARKS & FACILITIES											
Map Key	Name	Address	Acres	Picnic Tables	Barbecues	Play Equipment	Tot Lot	Basketball	Baseball Backstop	Restrooms	Other
1	Big League Dreams Sport Park	1077 Milo Candini Dr	37.91	•		•				•	6 lighted ballfields, indoor soccer field
2	BMX Track	941 Spreckels Av	6.70								1,200-foot-long ABA BMX track
3	Center St Tennis Courts	311 W Center St	.46	•							2 Tennis courts (no lights)
4	Civic Center	1001 W Center St	5.87	•							Parks & Recreation offices, classrooms
5	Library Park	320 W Center St	1.25	•		•					Gazebo, interactive water feature, bocce ball court, murals
6	Lincoln Park & Pool	245 S Powers Av	3.71	•	•	•	•		•		Swimming pool, lighted ballfield
7	Manteca Park Golf Course	305 N Union Rd	101.00								18-hole course, driving range, snack bar, banquet facilities, pro shop
8	Morezone Ballfield	1323 W Center St	3.30	•					•		Lighted ballfield
9	Northgate Park	1750 Hoyt Ln	15.11	•	•	•	•		•		Sports fields, softball complex (3 lighted fields), horseshoe pit, sand volleyball
10	Senior Center	295 Cherry Ln		•							Auditorium w/stage, kitchen, craft room
11	Skate Park	Center St and Elm Av	.32								Small & large bowls, quarter pipes, etc.
12	Spreckels Recreation Park	941 Spreckels Av	3.27								Sports field turf area
13	Tidewater Bikeway	Lathrop Rd to Moffat Bl	34.00								3.4 mi. Class 1 bike & pedestrian path
14	Union Road Tennis Park	307 N Union Rd	7.73	•							6 lighted tennis courts
15	Union Road Park	245 N Union Rd	1.40								
16	Wilson Park	224 W Center St	.37	•							
17	Woodward Park	710 E Woodward Av	50.62	•	•	•	•	•		•	Sports fields

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT WEBSITE,

HTTP://WWW.CI.MANTECA.CA.US/PARKS/FACILITIES/DEFAULT.HTM

## 3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

**TABLE 3.13-3: NEIGHBORHOOD PARK FACILITIES INVENTORY**

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS											
Map Key	Name	Address	Acres	Picnic Tables	Barbecues	Play Equipment	Tot Lot	Basketball	Baseball Backstop	Restrooms	Other
18	Antigua Park	1055 Collins St	5.08	•	•	•	•	•			
19	Baccilieri Park	154 Stockton St	1.26	•					•		
20	Bella Vista Park	1580 Bella Terra Dr	9.24	•	•	•	•				
21	B. & C. Giles Memorial Park	545 W. Alameda St	4.00	•	•	•					At the Boys and Girls Club
22	Button Estates Park	1457 Discovery Creek Dr	3.70						•		
23	Chadwick Square Park	1953 London Av	9.00	•		•	•				
24	Colony Park	1232 Trailwood Av	5.03	•	•	•	•	•			
25	Cotta Park	505 Mission Ridge Dr	3.70								
26	Crestwood Park	1901 Crestwood Av	3.85	•		•		•			
27	Curran Grove Park	196 Berndt Av	4.50	•	•	•	•		•		
28	Diamond Oaks Park	1179 Pestana Av	6.46	•	•	•	•	•	•		
29	Doxey Park	1355 Northgate Dr	8.40	•	•	•		•			
30	Dutra Estates Park	2701 Ancestry St	5.27	•	•	•		•			
31	Dutra Northeast Park	1282 Laurel Park Cr	1.76								
32	Dutra Southeast Park	1850 Sparrowhawk St	6.90	•	•	•	•	•			
33	Franciscan Park	1041 Elm Av	4.02	•	•	•					
34	Gonsalves/Cambridge Greenbelt	407 Fishback Rd	3.40								
35	Graystone Park	810 Agate Av	5.19	•		•	•	•	•		
36	Hildebrand Park	431 Pine St	.58	•	•	•	•	•			
37	Mayor's Park	1440 Kelley Dr	4.03	•	•	•		•			
38	Mini Park	246 Elm St	.17	•							
39	Moffat Basin Park	800 Moffat Blvd	1.60								
40	Paseo Circle Park	1759 Buena Vista Dr	1.03	•							
41	Primavera Park	1253 Primavera Av	6.91	•	•	•	•				
42	Quail Ridge Park	1020 Mission Ridge Dr	3.07				•	•			
43	Roberts Estates Park	1740 Rail St	5.07	•	•	•	•				
44	Rodoni Park	1006 Lucio St	2.75	•		•	•				
45	Sequoia Park	868 Wawona St	3.97	•		•		•			
46	Shasta Park	955 E Edison St	10.96	•	•	•	•	•			
47	Southside Park	409 Oregon St	3.32	•	•	•	•	•			
48	Springport Park	746 Pestana Av	6.45			•			•		
49	Springtime Park	1268 Springtime Av	4.04	•		•					
50	St. Francis Park	1273 Devonshire Av	4.76	•	•	•		•			
51	Stadium Plaza Park	2470 Daniels St	4.77								Fountain
52	Terra Bella Park	1630 Luna Bella Ln	3.39	•	•	•	•				
53	Tesoro Park	1399 Tesoro Dr	9.51	•	•	•	•				
54	Union Ranch East Park	925 Raccoon Valley Dr	7.5	•	•	•	•	•			
55	Union West Park	1291 Parkview St	3.64	•	•	•		•	•		
56	Villa Ticino Park	1970 Geneva Wy	5.60				•				
57	Walnut Place Park	360 Victory Av	2.04								
58	William Martin Park	1605 Maywood Av	1.56	•	•	•		•			
59	Yosemite Park	600 El Portal Av	5.00	•	•	•		•	•		

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT WEBSITE,  
[HTTP://WWW.CI.MANTECA.CA.US/PARKS/FACILITIES/DEFAULT.HTM](http://www.ci.manteca.ca.us/parks/facilities/default.htm)

The City currently has over 400 acres of developed parkland. Based on the Department of Finance estimated 2014 population of 72,880, the City more than meets its General Plan parkland goal of five acres per 1,000 residents.

## OTHER AGENCY SERVICES

### Manteca Unified School District

The Project is located within the service boundaries of the Manteca Unified School District (MUSD). MUSD provides school services for grades K through 12 within the communities of Manteca, Lathrop, Stockton, and French Camp. The District is approximately 113 square miles and serves more than 23,000 students. MUSD operates 20 elementary schools, five high schools, three alternative schools, and one adult school (MUSD, 2013). Within the City of Manteca, there are two K-2nd schools, two 3rd – 8th schools, twelve additional elementary schools, and five high schools. According to the MUSD School Accountability Report Card (SARC), the schools in the City had a total enrollment of approximately 14,220 students, of which 9,232 were enrolled in elementary school (grades 1 – 8) and 4,988 were enrolled in high school (grades 9 – 12).

**TABLE 3.13-4: CITY OF MANTECA SCHOOL INVENTORY**

SCHOOL
George McParland Elementary School Annex (K – 2 <sup>nd</sup> grades)
Stella Brockman Elementary School Annex (K – 2 <sup>nd</sup> grades)
George McParland Elementary School (3 <sup>rd</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grades)
Stella Brockman Elementary School Annex (3 <sup>rd</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> grades)
Brock Elliott Elementary School
Golden West Elementary School
Joshua Cowell Elementary School
Lincoln Elementary School
Manteca Day School
Neil Hafley Elementary School
New Haven Elementary School
Nile Garden Elementary School
Sequoia Elementary School
Shasta Elementary School
Veritas Elementary School
Walter Woodward Elementary School
Calla High School
East Union High School
Manteca Community Day School
Manteca High School
Sierra High School

SOURCE: MANTECA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, 2011/2012 SARC

### **Library Services**

The Manteca Branch Library, a branch library of the Stockton - San Joaquin County Library system, is located at 320 West Center Street. The library offers a circulating collection of books, magazines, CDs, and DVDs in both English and Spanish.

### 3.13.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### STATE

---

### **Police Protection**

There are no federal or state regulations related to police protection services applicable to the proposed project.

### **Fire Protection and Emergency Response**

#### *CALIFORNIA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION*

In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 8 Sections 1270 "Fire Prevention" and 6773 "Fire Protection and Fire Equipment" the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) has established minimum standards for fire suppression and emergency medical services. The standards include, but are not limited to, guidelines on the handling of highly combustible materials, fire hose sizing requirements, restrictions on the use of compressed air, access roads, and the testing, maintenance, and use of all firefighting and emergency medical equipment.

The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster.

#### *EMERGENCY RESPONSE/EVACUATION PLANS*

The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster.

#### *FIRE PROTECTION*

The California Fire Code contains regulations relating to construction and maintenance of buildings and the use of premises. Topics addressed in the Code include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions to protect and assist first responders, industrial

processes, and many other general and specialized fire safety requirements for new existing buildings and premises.

#### *UNIFORM FIRE CODE*

The Uniform Fire Code with the State of California Amendments contains regulations relating to construction, maintenance, and use of buildings. Topics addressed in the California Fire Code include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions intended to protect and assist fire responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire-safety requirements for new and existing buildings and the surrounding premises. The Fire Code contains specialized technical regulations related to fire and life safety.

#### *CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE*

State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code. This includes regulations for building standards (as also set forth in the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices such as extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building and childcare facility standards, and fire suppression training.

#### *NFPA 1710*

The NFPA 1710 Standards are applicable to urban areas and where staffing is comprised of career Firefighters. According to these guidelines, a career fire department needs to respond within six minutes, 90 percent of the time with a response time measured from the 911 call to the time of arrival of the first responder.

The standards are divided as follows:

- Dispatch time of one (1) minute or less for at least 90 percent of the alarms
- Turnout time of one (1) minute or less for EMS calls (80 seconds for fire and special operations response)
- Fire response travel time of four (4) minutes or less for the arrival of the first arriving engine company at a fire incident and eight (8) minutes or less travel time for the deployment of an initial full alarm assignment at a fire incident
- Eight (8) minutes or less travel time for the arrival of an advanced life support (ALS) (4 minutes or less if provided by the fire department)

### **Parks/Recreation**

#### *QUIMBY ACT*

The Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) states that “the legislative body of a city or county may, by ordinance, require the dedication of land or impose a requirement of the payment of fees in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for park or recreational purposes as a condition to the approval of a tentative or parcel map.” Requirements of the Quimby Act apply only to the acquisition of new parkland and do not apply to the physical development of new park facilities or associated operations and maintenance costs. The Quimby Act seeks to preserve open space needed to develop parkland and recreational facilities; however, the actual development of parks and other recreational facilities is subject to discretionary approval and is evaluated on a

case-by-case basis with new residential development. The City collects fees imposed by the park and recreation districts impact fees. The impact fees are collected at the time of building permit and include both capital impacts and land acquisition.

### **Schools**

#### *CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS*

The California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Education Code, governs all aspects of education within the State.

#### *CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION*

The California Department of Education (CDE) School Facilities Planning Division (SFPD) prepared a School Site Selection and Approval Guide that provides criteria for locating appropriate school sites in the State of California. School site and size recommendations were changed by the CDE in 2000 to reflect various changes in educational conditions, such as lowering of class sizes and use of advanced technology. The expanded use of school buildings and grounds for community and agency joint use and concern for the safety of the students and staff members also influenced the modification of the CDE recommendations.

Specific recommendations for school size are provided in the School Site Analysis and Development Guide. This document suggests a ratio of 1:2 between buildings and land. CDE is aware that in a number of cases, primarily in urban settings, smaller sites cannot accommodate this ratio. In such cases, the SFPD may approve an amount of acreage less than the recommended gross site size and building-to-ground ratio.

Certain health and safety requirements for school site selection are governed by state regulations and the policies of the SFPD relating to:

- Proximity to airports, high-voltage power transmission lines, railroads, and major roadways;
- Presence of toxic and hazardous substances;
- Hazardous facilities and hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile;
- Proximity to high-pressure natural gas lines, propane storage facilities, gasoline lines, pressurized sewer lines, or high-pressure water pipelines;
- Noise;
- Results of geological studies or soil analyses;
- Traffic and school bus safety issues.

#### *THE KINDERGARTEN-UNIVERSITY PUBLIC EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 2002 (PROP 47)*

This act was approved by California voters in November 2002 and provides for a bond issue of \$13.05 billion to fund necessary education facilities to relieve overcrowding and to repair older schools. Funds will be targeted at areas of greatest need and must be spent according to strict accountability measures. Funds will also be used to upgrade and build new classrooms in the

California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California in order to provide adequate higher education facilities to accommodate growing student enrollment.

*LEROY F. GREENE SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT OF 1998 (SB 50)*

The “Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998,” also known as Senate Bill No. 50 or SB 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998), governs a school district’s authority to levy school impact fees. This comprehensive legislation, together with the \$9.2 billion education bond act approved by the voters in November 1998 known as “Proposition 1A”, reformed methods of school construction financing in California. SB 50 instituted a new school facility program by which school districts can apply for state construction and modernization funds. It imposed limitations on the power of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities impacts as a condition of approving new development and provided the authority for school districts to levy fees at three different levels:

- **Level I** fees are the current statutory fees allowed under Education Code 17620. This code section provides the basic authority for school districts to levy a fee against residential and commercial construction for the purpose of funding school construction or reconstruction of facilities. These fees vary by district for residential construction and commercial construction and are increased biannually.
- **Level II** fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5, allowing school districts to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. These conditions include having a substantial percentage of students on multi-track year-round scheduling, having an assumed debt equal to 15–30 percent of the district’s bonding capacity (percentage is based on revenue sources for repayment), having at least 20 percent of the district’s teaching stations housed in relocatable classrooms, and having placed a local bond on the ballot in the past four years which received at least 50 percent plus one of the votes cast. A Facility Needs Assessment must demonstrate the need for new school facilities for unhoused pupils is attributable to projected enrollment growth from the construction of new residential units over the next five years.
- **Level III** fees are outlined in Government Code Section 655995.7. If State funding becomes unavailable, this code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee on residential construction. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. However, if a district eventually receives State funding, this excess fee may be reimbursed to the developers or subtracted from the amount of state funding.

## LOCAL

### **City of Manteca Municipal Code**

The City of Manteca Municipal Code, Fee Schedule VI *Development Fee* includes development impact fees to fund public facilities, including the San Joaquin County Facilities Fee to fund police services. (City of Manteca Municipal Code)

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

#### ***Policies: Police Protection***

PF-P-39. The City shall endeavor through adequate staffing and patrol arrangements to maintain the minimum feasible police response times for police calls.

PF-P-40. The City shall provide police services to serve the existing and projected population.

PF-P-41. The City will establish the criteria for determining the circumstances under which police service will be enhanced.

#### ***Policies: Fire Protection***

PF-P-42. The City shall endeavor to maintain an overall fire insurance (ISO) rating of 4 or better.

PF-P-43. The City shall endeavor through adequate staffing and station locations to maintain the minimum feasible response time for fire and emergency calls.

PF-P-44. The City shall provide fire services to serve the existing and projected population.

PF-P-45. The City will establish the criteria for determining the circumstances under which fire service will be enhanced.

#### ***Policies: Parks and Recreation***

PF-P-46. The City shall expand the community and neighborhood park system with the goal of providing neighborhood park facilities within reasonable walking distance of all city residential areas.

PF-P-47. The City shall use joint development of park and drainage detention basins in the development of neighborhood parks.

PF-P-48. The City shall cooperate with the Manteca Unified School District in opportunities for joint-use of school and park and recreational facilities.

PF-P-49. City park acquisition and development efforts shall be based on a goal of 5 acres of developed neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents within the city limits. The distribution of land between neighborhood and community parks shall be determined within the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

PF-P-50. Neighborhood parks shall conform to the following general guidelines (specific details and standards to be determined within the Parks and Recreation Master Plan):

- The typical minimum size shall be set to support active and passive recreation activities.
- The typical service area for a neighborhood park is approximately ¼ mile walking distance.
- Neighborhood parks shall include a turf area above the basin flood line of sufficient area to be used for playgrounds, sports, picnic areas, and other recreational facilities.

PF-P-51. The City shall aggressively pursue State and County funding to supplement City revenues to the extent such funding is available.

PF-P-52. The City shall endeavor to identify, acquire, and develop one or more community parks as defined in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

PF-P-53. All new residential development will be required to pay a park acquisition and improvement fee, based on providing 5 acres per 1,000 residents, to fund system-wide improvements.

PF-P-54. The City shall require the provision of private open space and recreational facilities as part of new residential developments.

PF-P-55. The City shall not discourage the expansion of private commercial recreational facilities.

PF-P-56. The City shall develop a convenient system of pedestrian sidewalks and pathways linking City parks, major open space areas, and the downtown core.

PF-P-57. The City shall adopt a Bicycle Route Master Plan and develop a bicycle route system linking areas, schools, public facilities, the downtown core, and neighborhoods.

***Policies: Education***

PF-P-33. The City shall cooperate with the Manteca Unified School District and others in locating and reserving appropriate sites for new neighborhood walking distance schools. Adequate facilities shall be planned to accommodate new residential development and endeavor to create neighborhood schools.

PF-P-34. The City shall cooperate with the Manteca Unified School District in their collection of school facility development fees from new development.

PF-P-35. Financing of new school facilities will be planned concurrent with new development.

PF-P-36. The City and Manteca Unified School District will work together to develop criteria for the designation of school sites and consider opportunities for reducing the cost of land for school facilities. The City will encourage the school district to comply with City standards in the design and landscaping of school facilities.

PF-P-37. The City will consider opportunities for joint-use of facilities with the school district. When feasible, a joint-use agreement will be pursued to maximize public use of facilities, minimize duplication of services provided, and facilitate shared financial and operational responsibilities.

PF-P-38. Schools must be located away from hazards of sensitive resource conservation areas, except where the proximity of resources may be of educational value and the protection of resources is reasonably assured.

### 3.13.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on public services if it would result in:

- Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered government facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:
  - Police Protection
  - Fire Protection
  - Parks and Recreation
  - Schools
  - Other public facilities
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- Would 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.

#### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

##### **Impact 3.13-1: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of police department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (less than significant)**

The City's General Plan includes policies and implementation measures that would allow for the Manteca Police Department to continue providing adequate staffing levels. Below is a list of relevant policies:

- The City shall endeavor through adequate staffing and patrol arrangements to maintain the minimum feasible police response times for police calls. Currently the City has 63 sworn officers. With a population of 71,164, that equates to a staffing level of .85 officers per 1000 residents.
- The City shall provide police services to serve the existing and projected population. The Police Department will continuously monitor response times and report annually on the results of the monitoring.

The addition of the proposed Project (all phases) will place some additional burden on the Police Department. While the proposed project (all phases) does not anticipate a direct increase in population (i.e. there are no additional houses), it is anticipated that police service will be required

to serve the people that will utilize the facilities. The development of Phase 1 will increase the number of visitors and presumably increase the daytime population due to the hotel, water park, conference center, etc. The current method of calculating staffing needs in Manteca is based on a ratio of officers to residents, which does not apply to the proposed project because there is no change in population. Instead, we have assumed an 80 percent occupancy, which includes the people utilizing the entirety of Phase 1 (hotel, waterpark, and conference center). The occupancy would equate to 400 people per day. The additional demand for police officers would be equivalent to 0.34 officers ( $400 \text{ people} / 1000 \text{ people} = 0.4$ ;  $0.4 \times 0.85 = 0.34$ ). The development of later Phases will involve a variety of uses including, commercial, retail, and recreational facilities. These types of uses will have fluctuations in patrol force staffing needs. For instance, the proposed recreational facilities may have tournament ball games on certain weekends and not during others, which would place an increased demand on police service during the tournament but not during the entire week or month. Regardless, the ability to provide police service for the proposed project (all phases) is directly related to the financial resources allocated to the Police Department.

The City of Manteca's expenses, including those for police service, are covered through the revenues that they receive from development fees and property taxes. As land is developed within the City and annexed into the City of Manteca from the SOI, these fees and charges apply. The City of Manteca manages their finances on a continual basis, which is reported on an annual basis through the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and the City Budget. The City's management and reporting of their finances are in accordance with the legal requirements for such. An outside audit is performed to ensure that the legal requirements are met. The Manteca Police department will monitor/assess their patrol force staffing needs on a regular basis based on call volumes, time needed to respond to calls, and number of staff available.

The General Plan includes polices and implementation measures that require new development to pay its fair share to offset capital costs for public facilities and services. Moreover, Goal PF-3 in the General Plan's Public Facilities Element states that improvements and services required to serve development will not place an economic burden on existing residents of the City. Development will pay a fair share of all costs of required public infrastructure and services. The City reviews their fees and user charges on an annual basis to determine the correct level of adjustment required to pay for adequate services and to reverse any deficits and assure funding for needed infrastructure going forward.

The FY 2013-2014 budget for the Police Department is \$15,251,818, which is sufficient to cover the current staffing levels. The need for additional personnel in the future will be addressed by the Chief of Police, the City Manager, and the City Council as response times are reassessed annually. The City's budgets for current and future expenses, debts, and revenues and their financial statements show that they are fiscally sound. The City will continue to manage and report their financial condition on an annual basis, which will include adjustments as necessary.

Impact fees from each phase of the proposed project will be collected based upon projected impacts from each phase of development. The adequacy of impact fees will be reviewed on an

annual basis to ensure that the fee is commensurate with the service. Payment of the applicable impact fees for each phase of development by the project proponent, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes, sales taxes, and other revenues generated by each phase of development would fund capital and labor costs associated with police protection services. The City's latest Municipal Service Review (2014) indicates that the City has the ability to serve the anticipated growth within the Sphere of Influence and that new development is not expected to have a significant effect on governmental structure of the City of Manteca or its ability to provide services, including police service. The Municipal Service Review (2014) indicates that the City has demonstrated the ability to work with service providers to ensure that adequate services are provided in a cost effective manner. Efforts to ensure effective government structure for the provision of police protection demonstrate the City's foresight to plan for future service needs as City boundaries expand due to annexations and population increases. Assuming the City continues to evaluate existing government structure and seek opportunities for improvement, no significant barriers are expected in regards to government structure during the 10 and 20-Year Planning Horizons. The proposed project is located within the 10-year Planning Horizon within the Municipal Service Review, and is already annexed into the City. Based on the City's existing governmental structure, financial stability, planned revenue, and police service performance, the impact of the proposed project on the need for additional police services and facilities is **less-than-significant**.

### **Impact 3.13-2: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of fire department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (less than significant)**

The City of Manteca General Plan 2023 includes policies and implementation measures that would allow for the Department to continue providing adequate facilities and staffing levels. Below is a list of relevant policies:

- The City shall endeavor to maintain an overall fire insurance (ISO) rating of 4 or better (Policy PF-P-42).
- The City shall endeavor through adequate staffing and station locations to maintain the minimum feasible response time for fire and emergency calls (PF-P-43).
- The City shall provide fire services to serve the existing and projected population (PF-P-44).
- The City will establish the criteria for determining the circumstances under which fire service will be enhanced (PF-P-45).
- The Fire Department shall continuously monitor response times and report annually on the results of the monitoring (PF-I-24).
- The General Plan also outlines land use policies to take full advantage of the use of existing public services and minimize the need for additional ones.
- The City shall encourage a pattern of development that promotes the efficient and timely development of public services and facilities (LU-P-4).

- The City shall continue the practice of annexation with detachment from the fire district in an effort to achieve compliance with NFPA 1710 for the citizens of Manteca.

The addition of the proposed project (all phases) will place some additional burden on the Fire Department. While the proposed project (all phases) does not anticipate a direct increase in population (i.e. there are no additional houses), it is anticipated that fire service will be required to serve the people that will utilize the facilities. The development of Phase 1 will increase the number of visitors and presumably increase the daytime population due to the hotel, water park, conference center, etc. The current method of calculating staffing needs in Manteca is based on a goal for the initial company of three (3) firefighters to arrive on scene for fire and emergency medical service (EMS) incidents within five (5) minutes 90% of the time (Response Effectiveness). In 2013 the department averaged a 4:35 response time City-wide and was on scene within (5) minutes 71% of the time. On September 11, 2013, Fire Station No. 4 opened in northwest Manteca. The data that has been compiled so far (2014) shows that the response time to the surrounding area has dropped by 42%. Based on the half-year data, it is anticipated that the addition of Fire Station No. 4 will improve both the average response time and the percent of response effectiveness, which will benefit the development of Phase 1. Additionally, the construction of Fire Station No. 5, which is planned in southwest Manteca, will have a similar impact on response times and response effectiveness for Phase 1 of the proposed Project. The City has funded the design of this station in fiscal year 2014/15 with the intent of constructing and staffing this station by 2017. Funding for this station is dependent on additional annexations and development in the area, which is currently in the planning stages. The construction and staffing of Fire Station No. 5 will allow the City the ability to achieve the full alarm standard outlined by NFPA 1710 for the first time in the City's History; this will directly affect the ISO rating, enhance service to the citizens of Manteca and improve the department's ability to obtain grants. Phase 1 is not anticipated to cause a significant burden to fire service.

The development of later Phases will involve a variety of uses including, commercial, retail, and recreational facilities. These types of uses will have fluctuations in service needs. For instance, the proposed recreational facilities may have tournament ball games on certain weekends and not during others, which would place an increased demand on fire service during the tournament but not during the entire week or month. Regardless, the ability to provide fire service for the proposed project is directly related to the financial resources allocated to the Fire Department. The City of Manteca expenses, including those for fire service, are covered through the revenues that they receive from development fees, and property taxes. As land is developed within the City and annexed into the City of Manteca from the SOI, these fees and charges apply. The City of Manteca manages their finances on a continual basis, which is reported on an annual basis through the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and the City Budget. The City's management and reporting of their finances are in accordance with the legal requirements for such. An outside audit is performed to ensure that the legal requirements are met. The Manteca Fire Department will monitor/assess their response time needs on a regular basis based on call volumes, time needed to respond to calls, and number of staff and facilities available.

### 3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

---

The General Plan includes polices and implementation measures that require new development to pay its fair share to offset capital costs for public facilities and services. Moreover, Goal PF-3 in the General Plan's Public Facilities Element states that improvements and services required to serve development will not place an economic burden on existing residents of the City. Development will pay a fair share of all costs of required public infrastructure and services. The City reviews their fees and user charges on an annual basis to determine the correct level of adjustment required to pay for adequate services and to reverse any deficits and assure funding for needed infrastructure going forward.

The FY 2013-2014 budget for the Manteca Fire Department was \$8,007,790 (Administration \$750,825, Operations \$6,987,970, Prevention \$268,995). The City's budgets for current and future expenses, debts, and revenues and their financial statements show that they are fiscally sound. The City will continue to manage and report their financial condition on an annual basis, which will include adjustments as necessary.

Impact fees from each phase of new development will be collected based upon projected impacts from each phase of development. The adequacy of impact fees will be reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that the fee is commensurate with the service. Payment of the applicable impact fees for each phase of development by the project proponent, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes, sales taxes, and other revenues generated by each phase of development would fund capital and labor costs associated with fire protection services. The City's latest Municipal Service Review (2014) indicates that the City has the ability to serve the anticipated growth within the Sphere of Influence and that new development is not expected to have a significant effect on governmental structure of the City of Manteca or its ability to provide services, including fire service. The Municipal Service Review (2014) indicates that the City has demonstrated the ability to work with service providers to ensure that adequate services are provided in a cost effective manner. Efforts to ensure effective government structure for the provision of fire protection demonstrate the City's foresight to plan for future service needs as City boundaries expand due to annexations and population increases. Assuming the City continues to evaluate existing government structure and seek opportunities for improvement, no significant barriers are expected in regards to government structure during the 10 and 20-Year Planning Horizons. The proposed project is located within the 10-year Planning Horizon within the Municipal Service Review, and is already annexed into the City. Based on the City's existing governmental structure, financial stability, planned revenue, and fire service performance, the impact of the proposed project on the need for additional fire services and facilities is **less-than-significant**.

**Impact 3.13-3: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of school facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (less than significant)**

The proposed project is located within the service boundaries of the Manteca Unified School District (MUSD). MUSD provides school services for grades K through 12 within the communities of Manteca, Lathrop, Stockton, and French Camp. Within the City of Manteca, there are two K-2<sup>nd</sup> grade schools, two 3<sup>rd</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> grade schools, 12 elementary schools, and five high schools, including alternative and community high schools. According to the MUSD School Accountability Report Card (SARC), the schools in the City had a total enrollment of approximately 14,220 students, of which 9,232 were enrolled in elementary school (grades 1 – 8) and 4,988 were enrolled in high school (grades 9 – 12).

The proposed project does not include any residential units or any other type of use that would directly increase the student population in the area; however, the project may indirectly increase the number of persons in the area as a result of employment potential. It is not possible to determine at this time whether employment opportunities would be utilized by the existing population with existing students in the schools or if employees would be recruited from outside the region, bringing new students to Manteca. Regardless, the MUSD collects impact fees from each new development under the provisions of SB 50. A project's impacts on school facilities are fully mitigated via the payment of the requisite school impact fees established pursuant to Government Code Section 65995. Payment of the applicable impact fees by the project proponent, and ongoing revenues that would come from taxes, would fund capital and labor costs associated with school services.

The MUSD performs a needs analysis and adopts an annual budget allocating resources for new school facilities as they are warranted. The proposed project does not trigger the need for a new school directly, or indirectly, nor has the MUSD planned to construct a new school in the proposed project vicinity. If the MUSD proposes a new school in the future elsewhere in the City to accommodate new demand in Manteca, including any indirect demand created from new employment related to the proposed project, then the new school will require environmental review when it is proposed. The environmental review will determine if there will be an adverse physical impact associated with its construction. A new school is not proposed at this time. The proposed project would not result in the need for new school facilities, thus it will have a **less-than-significant** impact relative to this topic.

**Impact 3.13-4: The proposed project has the potential to have effects on other public facilities (less than significant)**

The proposed project may bring employees to the area which may require the use of other public services such as libraries, etc. The City collects impact fees from new development based upon projected impacts from each development, including impacts on other public services. The City also reviews the adequacy of impact fees on an annual basis to ensure that the fee is

commensurate with services provided. Payment of the applicable impact fees by the project proponent, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes, sales taxes, and other revenues generated by the proposed project, would fund capital and labor costs associated with these other public services.

The proposed project does not trigger the need for new facilities associated with other public services. Consequently, new facilities for other public services are not proposed at this time. The proposed project would not result in the need for new facilities for other public services, thus it will have a **less-than-significant** impact relative to this topic.

**Impact 3.13-5: The proposed project has the potential to require the construction of park and recreational facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (less than significant)**

The proposed project includes additional recreational facilities to serve the community and surrounding area. While the project may indirectly increase the number of persons in the area as a result of employment potential and visitor-serving uses, the proposed project does not include any residential units or any other type of use that would directly increase the residential population in the area.

The proposed project would not have the potential to require construction of additional park and recreational facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts. As such, the proposed project is anticipated to result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

**Impact 3.13-6: Would 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 (less than significant)**

The project may indirectly increase the number of persons in the area as a result of employment potential and visitor-serving uses; however, the proposed project does not include any residential units or any other type of use that would directly increase the residential population in the area. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in any significant increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities from people associated with the employment potential and visitor-serving uses. The proposed project does, however, include extensive new recreational facilities for the community, which would more than offset any new demand for parks or recreational facilities that could result from the employment potential and visitor-serving uses. Since the proposed project would not significantly increase the use of an existing park, or other recreational facility, it is not anticipated that any substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. As such, the proposed project would have a **less-than-significant** impact relative to this topic.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

This section of the EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed project on the surrounding transportation system including roadways, bicycle/pedestrian facilities, rail, and transit facilities/services. As described previously, Phase 1 of the project is analyzed at a project-specific level, while project buildout is analyzed at a programmatic level. This chapter identifies the significant impacts of both Phase 1 and project buildout and recommends mitigation measures to lessen their significance. An evaluation of vehicular access to Phase 1 of the project is also provided. All technical calculations can be found in the appendix.

### 3.14.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### PROJECT LOCATION

---

The 210.7-acre project site is located in San Joaquin County, north of State Route (SR) 120 and west of Airport Way. Access to Phase 1 would be provided by Daniels Street, which currently extends westerly from Airport Way. As part of Phase 1, Daniels Street would be extended further west to connect to McKinley Avenue. Project buildout would include new roadway connections to Airport Way and Yosemite Avenue. Figure 3.14-1 displays the project location.

#### STUDY AREA ROADWAYS AND INTERSECTIONS

---

The following describes the key roadways in the study area.

**State Route (SR) 120** is an east-west four-lane freeway within the study area that connects Interstate 5 and State Route 99 through south Manteca. It features interchanges at Yosemite Avenue, Airport Way, Union Road, and Main Street. It is grade-separated above McKinley Avenue. SR 120 has a posted speed limit of 65 miles per hour (mph).

**Airport Way** is a north-south roadway that extends from downtown Stockton into Manteca, and continues south beyond SR 120 into unincorporated San Joaquin County. Between Woodward Avenue and SR 120, Airport Way is two-lanes with a posted speed limit of 40 mph. It widens to four lanes north of the SR 120 westbound ramp-terminal intersection to Daniels Street. North of Daniels Street, Airport Way narrows to two lanes.

**McKinley Avenue** is a north-south two-lane rural road that extends north from Woodward Avenue under SR 120 to Lathrop Road. South of Yosemite Avenue, McKinley Avenue has a posted speed limit of 50 mph and permits passing in certain sections. An interchange with SR 120 is planned at McKinley Avenue.

**Daniels Street** is an east-west street that begins at Union Road and extends westerly beyond Airport Way. It currently terminates approximately 1,200 feet west of Milo Candini Drive. West of Airport Way, it is a four-lane median divided road with a post speed limit of 30 mph. It provides access to the Manteca Big League Dreams Athletic Complex and the Stadium Shopping Center.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

**Milo Candini Drive** is a two-lane street that extends northerly from Daniels Street for ¼ mile to provide access to off-street parking for the Manteca Big League Dreams Athletic Complex. It has a posted speed limit of 25 mph.

### EXISTING PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES

---

Figure 3.14-2 displays existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the project vicinity. As shown, sidewalks exist along the entirety of Daniels Street west of Airport Way. Crosswalks are present at all legs of the signalized Daniels Street/Milo Candini Drive and Daniels Street/Airport Way intersections. Sidewalks are present on Airport Way for a short distance north of Daniels Street, and not present at the SR 120/Airport Way interchange.

Bicycle facilities in the project vicinity consist of a Class II lane (on-street with appropriate signage and striping) on Milo Candini Drive.

### TRANSIT SERVICE

---

Public transit in the study area includes both bus and rail passenger components. Bus service is provided by Manteca Transit while rail passenger service is provided by Altamont Commuter Express (ACE).

Figure 3.14-2 shows that a bus stop is provided on Daniels Street west of Milo Candini Drive. This stop services Manteca Transit bus routes 1, 2, and 3. Route 1 runs in a generally east-west direction along Airport Way and Yosemite Boulevard, through downtown, to east of SR 99. Routes 2 and 3 operate in a counter-directional loop system that connects the northern and southern areas of the City. Service runs from about 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM on one-hour headways during weekdays. Adult fares run \$1 per ride.

The ACE regional passenger rail service operates a commuter rail service between Stockton and San Jose. The Lathrop-Manteca ACE Rail Station is located at the northeast corner of the McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue intersection, approximately two miles from the project site. Manteca bus service does not currently stop at this ACE station.

### RAIL

---

The study area includes a Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) track that extends southerly from Stockton between Airport Way and McKinley Avenue. The track (i.e, Oakland Subdivision line) features at-grade crossings with Yosemite Avenue and McKinley Avenue. Table 3.14-1 provides an inventory of train crossings, equipment, and the accident history at each crossing based on USDOT data (<http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/OfficeofSafety/PublicSite/Crossing/XingLocResults.aspx?state=06&county=115&railroad=&reportinglevel=ALL&radionm=County&street=&xingtype=%25&xingstat us=%25&xingpos=%25>).

Both at-grade crossings have advanced warning signs, railroad crossing pavement markings, stop lines, crossing gates, flashing lights, and warning bells. According to US Department of

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Transportation Crossing Inventory, an average of 13 trains per day use this line. The last reported collision at the Yosemite Avenue crossing occurred in 1993. The McKinley Avenue crossing has not had any reported collisions.

Crossing #	Location	Train Activity		Equipment Present	Vehicular Conditions		Accident History
		Number of Daily Trains <sup>1</sup>	Average Speed Range		Number of Lanes	Estimated ADT <sup>2</sup>	
833918C	Yosemite Avenue	13	30 to 50 mph	advanced warning signs, stop lines, RR Xing symbols, gates, bells	2	7,000	No reported accidents since 1993. Four (4) reported accidents between 1979 and 1993.
833917V	McKinley Avenue	13	30 to 50 mph	advanced warning signs, stop lines, RR Xing symbols, gates, bells	2	1,700	None reported

Notes:  
<sup>1</sup> 8 of the 13 trains are ACE commuter rail trains.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimated ADT calculated assuming the AM and PM peak hour volumes are 16% of daily. Values rounded to the nearest 100 vehicles.

Source: Federal Railroad Administration Office of Safety Analysis and Fehr & Peers, 2014.

#### 3.14.2 ANALYSIS METHODS

The operational performance of the roadway network is commonly described with the term Level of Service or LOS. LOS is a qualitative description of operating conditions, ranging from LOS A (free-flow traffic conditions with little or no delay) to LOS F (oversaturated conditions where traffic flows exceed design capacity, resulting in long queues and delays). The LOS analysis methods outlined in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2000 and 2010) were used in this study.

Table 3.14-2 summarizes the relationship between the control delay and LOS for signalized and unsignalized intersections. The delay ranges for unsignalized intersections are lower than for signalized intersections as drivers expect less delay at unsignalized intersections.

Level of Service	Description (for signalized intersections)	Ave Control Delay Per Vehicle (Sec)	
		Signalized Intersections	Unsignalized Intersections
A	Operations with very low delay occurring with favorable traffic signal progression and/or short cycle lengths.	≤ 10.0	≤ 10.0
B	Operations with low delay occurring with good progression and/or short cycle lengths.	> 10.0 to 20.0	> 10.0 to 15.0
C	Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures begin to appear.	> 20.0 to 35.0	> 15.0 to 25.0
D	Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high V/C ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.	> 35.0 to 55.0	> 25.0 to 35.0

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

<b>Table 3.14-2: Intersection LOS Criteria</b>			
E	Operations with high delay values indicating poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.	> 55.0 to 80.0	> 35.0 to 50.0
F	Operations with delays unacceptable to most drivers occurring due to over-saturation, poor progression, or very long cycle lengths.	> 80.0	> 50.0
Source: <i>Highway Capacity Manual</i> , Transportation Research Board, 2010.			

The HCM procedures were applied using the Synchro 7 traffic analysis software and the SimTraffic microsimulation software. A SimTraffic micro-simulation model was developed for study facilities in the vicinity of the SR 120/Airport Way interchange including both the ramp terminal intersections and adjacent surface street intersections at Daniels Street and Atherton Drive. The use of SimTraffic at these locations is appropriate given the spacing of intersections, and levels of traffic in the corridor. Per standard practice, 20 runs were conducted, statistical outliers were omitted, and the results were then averaged to yield reported conditions.

The study intersections not located in the vicinity of the SR 120/Airport Way interchange were analyzed using the Synchro (version 7) software program, which is consistent with HCM procedures. While Version 8 was recently released to apply the 2010 HCM update, the program has been found to have some glitches, which prohibit certain lane configurations from being analyzed. Furthermore, the 2000 and 2010 HCM intersection analysis methodologies did not change dramatically. Fehr & Peers has used version 7 of Synchro in dozens of EIR analyses throughout California.

The Synchro and SimTraffic analysis relies on peak hour factors and heavy vehicle percentages that were measured in the field. Other model inputs include lane configurations, traffic volumes, and traffic controls (including signal phasing/timing). For side-street stop-controlled intersections, delay is calculated for each stop-controlled movement and for the uncontrolled left turns, if any, from the main street. The delay and LOS for the intersection as a whole and for the worst movement are reported for side-street stop intersections.

Per Caltrans District 10 standards, freeway segment operations are evaluated using methodologies from the Transportation Research Board’s 2010 *Highway Capacity Manual* using the HCS 2010 software program. The LOS for a freeway segment is based on the vehicle density (passenger cars/lane/mile) as shown in Table 3.14-3.

The performance LOS for merge and diverge sections is computed in one of two ways. If both the ramp and the adjacent freeway mainline segment are under capacity, then LOS is based on the density of the ramp junction. If either the ramp or the adjacent freeway mainline segment have reached (or exceed) capacity, then the merge/diverge segment is considered to operate at LOS F regardless of the computed ramp junction density. The LOS for ramp junctions is based on the vehicle density (passenger cars/lane/mile) as shown in Table 3.14-3.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

<b>Table 3.14-3: Freeway Level of Service Definitions</b>		
Level of Service <sup>1</sup>	Mainline (Density) <sup>1</sup>	Ramp Junctions (Density) <sup>1</sup>
A	≤ 11	≤ 10
B	> 11 to 18	> 10 to 20
C	> 18 to 26	> 20 to 28
D	> 26 to 35	> 28 to 35
E	> 35 to 45	> 35
F	> 45 or Demand exceeds capacity <sup>2</sup>	Demand exceeds capacity <sup>2</sup>

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Density expressed in passenger car equivalents per hour per mile per lane.  
<sup>2</sup> Occurs when freeway demand exceeds upstream (diverge) or downstream (merge) freeway segment capacity, or if off-ramp demand exceeds off-ramp capacity.

Source: HCM (Transportation Research Board, 2010) Exhibits 11-5 and 13-2

### ANALYSIS SCENARIOS

The transportation system was analyzed for the following scenarios:

**Existing Conditions** – establishes the existing setting, which is used to measure the significance of project impacts.

**Existing Plus Phase 1 Conditions** – adds traffic from Phase 1 of the proposed project to existing conditions.

**Cumulative No Project Conditions** – represents cumulative travel conditions based on output from the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) Travel Demand Model assuming no development on the project site.

**Cumulative Plus Phase 1 Conditions** – adds traffic from Phase 1 of the proposed project to the cumulative no project condition.

**Cumulative Plus Project Buildout Conditions** – includes a programmatic assessment of expected travel conditions that would result at project buildout.

These scenarios provide for a transportation impact analysis that supports a project-level environmental review of Phase 1 of the proposed project. Due to the uncertainty of the timing, precise uses, and activities associated with many of the future phases of the project, project buildout is evaluated at a programmatic level. This chapter describes expected travel conditions under this scenario, identifies significant impacts associated with this condition, and recommends mitigation measures, which may include additional environmental review for project buildout conditions.

### DATA COLLECTION

Study facilities were selected based on the project’s expected travel characteristics (i.e., location and amount of project trips) as well as facilities susceptible to being impacted by the project.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

### *INTERSECTIONS*

Eight existing intersections were selected for study as well as three future intersections. Traffic counts were conducted in February 2014 at the following study intersections:

1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive
2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps
3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps
4. Airport Way/Daniels Street
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street
6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue
8. Daniels Street/Milo Candini Drive

All intersection turning movement counts were collected during the midweek AM peak period (6:30 – 9 AM) and PM peak period (3:30 – 6:00 PM). Counts included heavy vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Weather conditions were dry and schools were in session at the time of all counts. Figure 3.14-3 displays the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections. This figure also displays the existing traffic controls and lane configurations at each intersection.

### *SR 120 FREEWAY*

Mainline vehicle counts collected for the *Final Traffic Operations Report for the State Route 120/McKinley Avenue Interchange PA&ED* (Fehr & Peers, April 2013) were used to analyze the SR 120 corridor for this project. A fully operational Caltrans PeMS traffic monitoring station is located on SR 120 at the Union Road overcrossing. Traffic data from this count station was obtained for every Tuesday and Thursday for the months of March, April, May, September, October, and November 2011 (excluding holidays). Caltrans Traffic Operations staff stated that the busiest day of traffic volume observations should be used for the analysis. Mainline volumes at other locations along SR 120 were calculated by balancing ramp volumes.

The following SR 120 study segments were analyzed. The distance between the Airport Way and Union Road interchanges meet Caltrans minimum spacing standards. However, the section between successive on- and off-ramps is not of sufficient length to qualify as a basic section. Therefore, the EB off-ramp at Union Road and WB on-ramp at Union Road were analyzed instead of the mainline.

1. SR 120 EB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way
2. SR 120 WB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way
3. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Airport Way
4. SR 120 EB on-ramp at Airport Way
5. SR 120 WB off-ramp at Airport Way
6. SR 120 WB on-ramp at Airport Way
7. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Union Road

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

### 8. SR 120 WB on-ramp at Union Road

#### EXISTING INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

Existing operations were analyzed for the weekday AM and PM peak hours at the study intersections. Table 3.14-4 displays the intersection analysis results.

The data in this table indicates that the study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the minor street (eastbound left-turn) stop-controlled movement at the Airport Way/Atherton Drive intersection, which operates at LOS F during the AM peak hour. This occurs as a result of 207 vehicles attempting to find gaps and turn left onto northbound Airport Way.

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
			Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS
1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	16 (57)	C (F)	6 (25)	A (C)
2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	15	B	29	C
3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	13	B	20	B
4. Airport Way/Daniels Street	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	22	C	34	C
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	3 (20)	A (C)	2 (30)	A (D)
6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	28	C	42	D
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue	City of Lathrop	All-Way Stop	9	A	14	B
8. Daniels Street/Milo Candini Drive	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	12	B	11	B

Notes:  
 1. For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for all approaches. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay and LOS for the most-delayed individual movement is shown in parentheses next to the average intersection delay and LOS. All results are rounded to the nearest second.  
 Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

#### EXISTING PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

Three of the eight study intersections are currently controlled by stop signs. To assess the potential need for their signalization, applicable signal warrants from the *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD)*, Caltrans, 2014 were consulted. The CA MUTCD includes eight potentially applicable signal warrants. Generally, meeting one of the signal warrants could justify signalization of an intersection. However, a detailed evaluation of all applicable warrants should be conducted and additional factors (e.g., congestion, approach conditions, driver confusion) should be considered before the decision to install a signal is made. The peak hour volume warrant (Warrant 3) was evaluated using the available data.

The results of the traffic signal warrant analysis are shown in Table 3.14-5. Detailed signal warrant assessments are provided in the appendix. As shown, the peak hour volume warrant for consideration of a traffic signal is currently satisfied during the PM peak hour at the McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue intersection.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

<b>Table 3.14-5: Peak Hour Signal Warrant Analysis – Existing Conditions</b>			
Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour Warrant Met? <sup>1</sup>
1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	NO
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	NO
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue	City of Lathrop	All-Way Stop	YES

Note: 1. Evaluated based on peak hour volume warrant contained in *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (CA MUTCD), Caltrans, 2014.  
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

### EXISTING FREEWAY OPERATIONS

Table 3.14-6 displays AM and PM peak hour operations of the study freeway segments.

<b>Table 3.14-6: Freeway Operations – Existing Conditions</b>						
Intersection	Type	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		
		Density	LOS	Density	LOS	
1. SR 120 EB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way	Basic Section	18	C	37	E	
2. SR 120 WB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way	Basic Section	29	D	25	C	
3. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	23	C	39	E	
4. SR 120 EB on-ramp at Airport Way	Merge	21	C	31	D	
5. SR 120 WB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	33	D	32	D	
6. SR 120 WB on-ramp at Airport Way	Merge	29	D	25	C	
7. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Union Road	Diverge	23	C	36	E	
8. SR 120 WB on-ramp at Union Road	Merge	28	C	27	C	

Notes: 1. Evaluated using the HCS2010 software, which applies the methods from the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, 2010).  
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

According to this table, the eastbound direction of SR 120 currently operates at LOS E during the PM peak hour between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way. Operations are also at LOS E during the PM peak hour at the eastbound off-ramps at Airport Way and Union Road. All other study freeway facilities currently operate at LOS D or better.

### 3.14.3 PROJECT TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a multi-use family entertainment venue consisting of a variety of indoor and outdoor recreational amenities, retail, restaurants, and hotels. It would be developed in several phases, depending on market conditions and the availability of financing. The projected timeframe for the construction is up to 15 years.

Phase 1 is the currently proposed hotel facility. All subsequent phases are presented to illustrate a potential phasing scheme; however, these subsequent phases have not yet been proposed via applications for site review and entitlements. Therefore, detailed project travel characteristics are

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

presented in this section for Phase 1 only. General travel characteristics that may be expected with project buildout are described in the cumulative conditions section.

### Phase 1 Project Description

For analysis purposes, Phase 1 was assumed to consist of the following trip generating land uses:

- 500-room hotel including an indoor waterpark, a 30,000 square foot convention/meeting/exhibition facility, and approximately 1,063 parking spaces.

In addition, Phase 1 would extend Daniels Street from its current terminus westerly approximately 2,800 feet to a new intersection at McKinley Avenue. This roadway improvement would provide a second point of access to the project. It would also enable secondary access to be provided into the Big League Dreams and Stadium Shopping Center uses along Daniels Street. By making this connection, some background traffic (e.g., residents south of SR 120) that currently use the Airport Way corridor will divert to the new connection.

According to the project site plan (MCR Engineering Architectural Design Consultants), access to Phase 1 would be provided by the following four driveways on Daniels Street, which are labeled numerically for ease of reference:

- Driveway 1 – is an existing full-access driveway that provides access to the adjacent Costco.
- Driveway 2 – is a planned, full-access driveway that would be approximately 340 feet west of Driveway 1. It would be directly opposite a planned fourth leg that would accommodate various future phases north of Daniels Street. A dedicated 175-foot westbound left-turn lane would be provided on Daniels Street to accommodate the inbound left-turn movement.
- Driveway 3 – is a planned, inbound-only driveway that would be situated approximately 400 feet west of Driveway 2. The site plan does not show a median break at this location, meaning that the only ingress opportunities would be for eastbound right-turns.
- Driveway 4 – is a planned, right-turn only driveway that would be situated approximately 420 feet west of Driveway 3. The site plan does not show a median break at this location, meaning that movements at this driveway would be restricted to right-turns only.

### TRIP GENERATION

---

The description and expected operating characteristics of the Great Wolf Lodge closely match the description of the “Resort Hotel” land use category contained in *Trip Generation* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012). The “Resort Hotel” provides a wide array of on-site amenities and recreation opportunities, but generally does not include convention or meeting space. This description leads to the following important conclusions regarding the project’s trip generation:

- The ITE Resort Hotel trip rates account for the project’s indoor waterpark (which is reserved for hotel guests) and on-site meeting rooms, retail, and restaurant uses (which cater primarily to hotel guests).
- Since Resort Hotel trip rates do not account for conference center space and events, its trip generation is quantified using anticipated attendance levels, data from Great Wolf Resorts Inc., and travel behavior characteristics.

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Conference center activities during the weekday peak hours typically consist of business/professional events, marketing events, fundraisers, and related activities. Past studies have shown that special events such as weddings, concerts, and sporting events have average vehicle occupancies of 2.0 to 3.0 persons per vehicle. However, given the types of attendees expected at weekday conference center events, this analysis applies an average vehicle occupancy (AVO) of 1.5 persons per vehicle. To the extent conference attendees arrive from airports (via shuttle) or from more remote destinations such as Sacramento or the Bay Area, the AVO could increase. Therefore, the use of a 1.5 AVO is a reasonably conservative, yet realistic estimate. This study uses the following calculations to estimate the conference center trip generation:

- For analysis purposes, the conference center is assumed to accommodate a business/professional activity that attracts about 580 attendees. This attendance level is considered a reasonably conservative condition, which may occur five times per month on average. Based on data provided by Great Wolf Resorts Inc. at their other resorts, approximately 50 percent of conference center attendees are expected to either stay at the hotel the night before (25 percent) or night of the conference activity (25 percent). For those that do not stay overnight, they are assumed to arrive during the AM peak hour.
- Some conference attendees who do not stay overnight at the hotel after the event may choose to remain on-site for drinks/hors d’oeuvres, stay for dinner, or participate in later meetings. Although this is fairly typical for a conference, the analysis conservatively assumes that only 10 percent of non-overnight conference attendees depart the facility after the PM peak hour, meaning that 90 percent depart during the PM peak hour.
- As is typical for conferences, employees for conference center activities arrive prior to guests, and depart after guests leave (i.e., outside of the study peak hours).
- 5 percent of conference attendees are dropped off and picked up by non-attendees.

Table 3.14-7 displays the Phase 1 project’s expected AM and PM peak hour trip generation. The project is expected to generate approximately 490 AM peak hour trips and 520 PM peak hour trips. The vast majority of AM peak hour trips are inbound, while PM peak hour trips are outbound.

Land Use	ITE Land Use Code	Units	Trip Rates <sup>1,2</sup>		AM Peak Hour Trips			PM Peak Hour Trips		
			AM	PM	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Great Wolf Lodge	330	500 rooms	0.37	0.49	133	52	185	105	140	245
Conference Center	N / A	20 KSF (580 attendees)	N / A	N / A	290	15	305	13	261	274
<b>Total</b>					<b>423</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>519</b>

Notes:  
<sup>1</sup>Trip rates for Great Wolf Lodge based on fitted curve equation assuming 100% occupied rooms as published in *Trip Generation 9<sup>th</sup> Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012).  
<sup>2</sup>Refer to prior page for methodology used to estimate conference center trip generation. Calculations are as follows: AM Peak Hour IN = (580\*75%)/1.5 = 290 trips; AM Peak Hour OUT = (580\*75%\*.05)/1.5 = 15 trips; PM Peak Hour IN = (580\*90%\*75%\*.05)/1.5 = 13 trips; PM Peak Hour OUT = (580\*90%\*75%)/1.5 = 261 trips  
 KSF = thousand square feet; N / A = Not Applicable.  
 Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014.

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

The daily trip generation of the Phase 1 project was also estimated. The results, which are shown in Table 3.14-8, necessarily rely upon a series of reasonable estimates and assumptions regarding attendance levels, employment levels, vehicle occupancy, deliveries, and arrival/departure patterns. Using these methods, the trip generation was estimated to be 3,856 daily trips.

Land Use	ITE Land Use Code	Units	Quantity/Type	Trip Rate	Trips
Great Wolf Lodge	N / A	500 rooms	Guests & Hotel Employees & Deliveries	5.4 <sup>1</sup>	2,700
		Waterpark	Employees <sup>2</sup>	N / A	112
Conference Center	N / A	30 KSF (580 attendees)	Attendees <sup>3</sup>	N / A	938
			Employees <sup>4</sup>	N / A	96
			Deliveries <sup>5</sup>	N / A	10
<b>Total</b>					<b>3,856</b>
<p>Notes:</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Since the Resort Hotel land use category in <i>Trip Generation</i> does not have daily rates, the daily rate was estimated by applying the ratio of AM/PM rates to daily for the All Suites Hotel category to the proposed use.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> Waterpark assumed to have 50 on-site employees during a typical weekday. Daily trips estimated based on 20% pick-up/drop-off, and a 1.1 AVO.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Based on 50% of attendees either staying overnight at hotel the night prior to or that evening. Assumes 20% of all attendees make a mid-day round trip to an off-site destination.</p> <p><sup>4</sup> Conference Center assumed to have 50 on-site employees during a typical weekday event. Daily trips estimated based on 20% pick-up/drop-off, and a 1.1 AVO. Daily trips estimated based on 5% pick-up/drop-off, and a 1.1 AVO.</p> <p><sup>5</sup> Assumes five vehicle deliveries per day to conference center.</p> <p>Source: Fehr &amp; Peers, 2014.</p>					

The trip generation estimates in Tables 3.14-7 and 3.14-8 should be viewed in the context of the frequency in which conference center activities would occur during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. According to data provided by Great Wolf Resorts, Inc.:

- On average, there are about 60 days per year in which the conference center space use is near its maximum.
- On average, about 75 percent of conference events begin around 8 am and end near 5 pm.

Based on the above, the resort is expected to have near capacity conference center activities that overlap with the AM and PM peak hours about 10 to 15 percent of days during a typical year. Since this scenario is being analyzed in this study, it represents a worst-case assessment of the potential impacts of the Phase 1 proposed project.

#### TRIP DISTRIBUTION/ASSIGNMENT

The distribution of project trips was derived from the Phase 1 project’s expected land uses/activities, existing travel patterns on the Airport Way corridor, and the location of complementary land uses (i.e., residences and shopping).

The Great Wolf Lodge is expected to have synergistic (i.e., internal trip-making) effects with the nearby complementary recreational and retail land uses such as Big League Dreams and Stadium Retail Center (located on Daniels Street), and Bass Pro Shops (located south of SR 120 at the Union

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

Road interchange). In contrast, the distribution of trips by attendees to the conference center would likely be based on the general distribution of population in the region, though some internalization of trips to the adjacent retail center may be expected. Accordingly, separate distribution percentages are expected for each land use type.

Figure 3.14-4 displays the expected Phase 1 project trip distribution for the Great Wolf Lodge and the Conference Center.

Project trips were assigned to study facilities in accordance with the trip generation and trip distribution described previously. The project trips were added to existing traffic volumes to yield “existing plus project” conditions, which are shown on Figure 3.14-5. It should be noted that the connection of Daniels Street to McKinley Avenue would result in a minor redistribution (less than 100 vehicles during the peak hour) of some trips that are currently traveling between residential areas south of SR 120 and the retail/recreational uses along Daniels Street. These trips can avoid traffic signals, queuing, and slowing along Airport Way by instead using McKinley Avenue.

### 3.14.4 REGULATORY SETTING

Existing transportation polices, laws, and regulations that would apply to the proposed project are summarized below. This information provides a context for the impact discussion related to the project’s consistency with applicable regulatory conditions and development of significance criteria for evaluating project impacts.

#### FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATIONS

---

Caltrans is responsible for planning, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining all state-owned roadways in California. Federal Highway standards are implemented in California by Caltrans. Any improvements or modifications to the state highway system within the City of Manteca need to be approved by Caltrans. The City of Manteca does not have the ability to unilaterally make improvements to the state highway system.

The *State Route 120 Transportation Concept Report – TCR* (Caltrans, 2005) identifies a concept LOS of “D” for the segment of SR 120 from I-5 to SR-99. The TCR identifies the need for widening of this facility to six lanes with an ultimate facility being eight lanes to meet projected travel demands. The TCR identifies interchange upgrades at Yosemite Avenue, McKinley Avenue, Airport Way, Union Road, and Main Street.

#### LOCAL REGULATIONS

---

##### **City of Manteca General Plan**

###### ***Circulation Element Policies***

C-P-1 The City shall strive to attain the highest possible traffic levels of service (LOS) consistent with the financial resources available and the limits of technical feasibility. The impact of new development and land use proposals on LOS should be considered in the review process.

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

C-P-2 Manteca's target for transportation LOS is to provide Citywide average LOS of C or better, and a minimum of LOS D at any individual location. This "C average, D minimum" shall be accomplished by attempting to provide LOS C at all locations, but accepting LOS D under the following circumstances:

- a. Where constructing facilities with enough capacity to provide LOS C is found to be unreasonably expensive. This applies to facilities, for example, on which it would cost significantly more per dwelling unit equivalent (DUE) to provide LOS C than to provide LOS D.
- b. Where it is difficult or impossible to maintain LOS C because surrounding facilities in other jurisdictions operate at LOS D or worse.
- c. Where free-flowing roadways or interchange ramps would discourage use of alternate travel modes.
- d. Where maintaining LOS C will be a disincentive to use of existing alternative modes or to the implementation of new transportation modes that would reduce vehicle travel.

C-P-3 Streets shall be dedicated, widened, extended, and constructed according to the Street cross-section diagrams established in the City Improvement Standards. Dedication and improvement of full rights-of-way as shown in the Street Standards shall not be required in existing developed areas where the City determines that such improvements are either infeasible or undesirable.

C-P-5 Development that would necessitate roadway improvements prior to the development of lands abutting those roadway improvements shall be required to make such improvements, or participate in such improvements, as a condition of approval.

C-P-6 New development will pay a fair share of the costs of street and other traffic and transportation improvements based on traffic generation and impacts on levels of service in conformance with the standard and policies established in the Public Facilities Implementation Plan.

C-P-18 In accord with PFIP, the City shall assess development fees for traffic signals and highway interchanges sufficient to fund system wide improvements. The development schedule for these traffic improvements shall be periodically reviewed, and revised as necessary.

C-P-33 The City shall establish a safe and convenient network of identified bicycle routes connecting residential areas with recreation, shopping, and employment areas within the City.

C-P-35 Route sidewalks so that they connect to major public parking areas, transit stops, and intersections within the bikeway system.

C-P-36 Provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at commercial, business/professional, and light industrial uses.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

### City of Lathrop General Plan

The City of Lathrop General Plan (partial amendment in November 2004) contains various transportation-related goals and policies that are relevant to the proposed project because of the proximity of the project site to Lathrop, and because of the roadway connectivity. The City General Plan includes proposed improvements to existing expressways and arterial streets in Lathrop east of I-5. These improvements would allow east-west traffic to access I-5 by traveling around the existing developed area of Lathrop. This would reduce traffic impacts on the Lathrop Road and Louise Avenue interchanges and on freeway sections between Roth Road on the north and the I-5/SR 120 merge on the south. The following improvements within the study area were identified:

- Improve Airport Way to six lanes from Roth Road to SR 120.
- Improve Yosemite Avenue to six lanes from SR 120 to the Manteca City limits.

The City's General Plan identifies LOS C operations on City streets and LOS D operations at interchange ramps.

### San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Plan

In June 2014, the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) adopted the *2014 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)*. This document outlines countywide transportation expenditures based on funding from sources like the federal government, the State of California, and locally collected funds. The RTP contains several proposed improvements that would benefit the regional roadway network within the study area. The improvements, which are listed in Table 3.14-9, are in the Tier 1 category, meaning they have programmed funding sources.

Project	Included in Tier I List in 2014 RTP/SCS?	Included in Measure K?	Included in RTIF?
SR 120 Widening – 4 to 6 lanes from I-5 to SR 99	Yes	Yes	Yes
New SR 120/McKinley interchange	Yes	Yes	Yes
Upgrade SR 120/Union Road interchange	Yes	Yes	No
Airport Way Widening – 2 to 4 lanes from SR 120 to Lathrop Road	Yes	Yes	Yes
Raymus Expressway – 2 to 6 lane expressway from SR 120 to SR 99	Yes	No	Yes
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014			

### San Joaquin County Congestion Management Plan

SJCOG operates a Regional Congestion Management Program (RCMP), which monitors cumulative transportation impacts of growth on the regional roadway system, identifies deficient roadways, and develops plans to mitigate the deficiencies. The RCMP considers LOS E or F operations to be deficient and includes segments of SR 120 and Airport Way (north of SR 120) as CMP facilities.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

### **San Joaquin County Regional Traffic Impact Fee (RTIF)**

SJCOG has implemented a regional traffic impact fee that is assessed on new developments throughout San Joaquin County. The RTIF capital project list provides funding for various freeway and local road widening (project list found at: <http://www.sanjoaquincountytimf.com>). The RTIF capital project began in 2005, and has generated nearly \$30 million in funding for project delivery. For fiscal year 2012 (per: <http://www.sjocog.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/01102013-166>), the fee schedule for new residential development is approximately \$2,987 for single-family units and \$1,792 for multi-family units. RTIF funds are expended on regionally significant capital improvements. Table 3.14-9 lists those projects included in this fee program within the study area.

### **Measure K**

Measure K is the half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation projects in San Joaquin County. Measure K was passed in November 1990, and began collecting funds for a system of improved highways and local streets, new passenger rail service, regional and inter-regional bus routes, park-and-ride lots, new bicycle facilities, and railroad crossings. On November 7, 2006, San Joaquin County voters decided to extend Measure K for an additional 30 years. The renewal of Measure K is estimated to generate \$2.552 billion for the transportation programs identified in the Measure K Expenditure Plan. Table 3.14-9 lists those projects included in this fee program within the study area.

### **City of Manteca Public Facilities Implementation Plan**

The City of Manteca is in the midst of updating the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP). The PFIP is a fee program which collects fees from new development to finance capacity expansion of public facilities (i.e., water, sewer collection, drainage, and transportation) necessary to accommodate the new demands. The City's draft PFIP includes a variety of roadway widenings or extensions such as Airport Way, Atherton Drive, McKinley Avenue, and other roadways within the City. It also includes various intersection improvements.

## 3.14.5 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

This section describes the thresholds or criteria that determine whether the project causes a significant impact on the roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, rail and/or transit systems. These thresholds are based on policies from the General Plans of Manteca and Lathrop, Caltrans policies, and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (2013). For the purposes of this Draft EIR, the project would cause a significant impact if it would:

### Signalized Intersections

- a) Worsen operations maintained by Manteca or Caltrans from LOS D or better to LOS E or worse.
- b) Increase the average delay by three (3) seconds or more at a signalized intersection in Manteca currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS E or worse.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

- c) Add traffic to a signalized intersection on a Caltrans facility that is currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS E or worse.
- d) Worsen the LOS at an intersection in Lathrop from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse;
- e) Increase the average delay at an intersection in Lathrop currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS D or worse by five (5) seconds or more;

### All-Way Stop Intersections

- a) Worsen operations at an intersection in Manteca from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, and cause the peak hour volume signal warrant to be met.
- b) Increase the average delay by three (3) seconds or more at an intersection in Manteca currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS E or worse and cause the peak hour volume signal warrant to be met.
- c) Add traffic to an unsignalized intersection on a Caltrans facility that is currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS E or worse and cause the peak hour volume signal warrant to be met.
- d) Worsen the LOS at an intersection in Lathrop from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse;
- e) Increase the average delay at an intersection in Lathrop currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS D or worse by five (5) seconds or more;

### Side-Street Stop Intersections

- a) Worsen operations (for the highest delayed side-street movement) at an intersection in Manteca from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, and cause the peak hour volume signal warrant to be met.
- b) Increase the average delay for the highest delayed side-street movement at an intersection in Manteca currently operating (or projected to operate) unacceptably by three seconds or more and cause one of the peak hour signal warrants to be met.
- c) Add traffic to a side-street stop intersection on a Caltrans facility that is currently operating (or projected to operate) at LOS E or worse and cause the peak hour volume signal warrant to be met.

### Freeway Facilities

- a) Worsen operations from LOS D or better to LOS E or F.
- b) Add 100 vehicles per day or more to a freeway segment that is currently operating (or projected to operate) unacceptably.
- c) Increase traffic by one percent or more at a freeway ramp that is currently operating (or projected to operate) unacceptably.
- d) Cause vehicular queues on a freeway off-ramp to spill back to the freeway mainline.

### Transit System

- a) Disrupt or interfere with existing or planned public transit services or facilities.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

- b) Create an inconsistency with policies concerning transit systems set forth in a General Plan or other adopted policy document.

### Bicycle/Pedestrian System

- a) Disrupt or interfere with existing or planned bicycle/pedestrian facilities.
- b) Result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe pedestrian/bicycle or pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.
- c) Result in unsafe conditions for bicycles, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/vehicle conflicts.
- d) Create an inconsistency with policies related to bicycle or pedestrian systems set forth in a General Plan or other adopted policy document.

### At-Grade Railroad Crossings

- a) Cause motorists to incur delays corresponding to LOS E or F conditions due to preemptions caused by train crossings.
- b) Add traffic to an at-grade railroad crossing that has a demonstrated record of having an above-average rate of accidents.

## 3.14.6 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### EXISTING PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

An Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) analysis was performed to identify potential impacts under existing conditions. This scenario focuses on the project-specific effects of Phase 1 of the project.

Existing plus project (Phase 1) operations were analyzed for the weekday AM and PM peak hours at the study intersections. Table 3.14-10 displays the intersection analysis results. The data in this table indicates that the addition of project trips would degrade operations at the SR 120 EB Ramps/Airport Way intersection by one service level during each peak hour. However, operations would remain at an acceptable LOS D or better. All study intersections would also continue to operate acceptably under this scenario.

Traffic signal warrant analyses were prepared for the existing plus project (Phase 1) scenario. The results are shown in Table 3.14-11. Detailed signal warrant assessments are provided in the appendix. As noted previously, the peak hour volume traffic signal warrant is currently satisfied at the McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue intersection. The project would not cause either of the two other unsignalized intersections to satisfy the signal warrant.

Table 3.14-12 displays AM and PM peak hour operations of the study freeway segments. The project would add traffic to segments of SR 120, which currently operate at LOS E. The project would not cause any off-ramp queues to exceed the available storage. Thus, queues would not spill back onto the SR 120 mainline.

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

**Table 3.14-10: Intersection Operations – Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions**

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing		Existing Plus Project (Phase 1)	
				Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS
1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	16 (57)	C (F)	19 (79)	C (F)
			PM	6 (25)	A (C)	4 (18)	A (C)
2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	15	B	21	C
			PM	29	C	36	D
3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	13	B	20	B
			PM	20	B	19	B
4. Airport Way/Daniels Street	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	22	C	27	C
			PM	34	C	33	C
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	3 (20)	A (C)	3 (23)	A (C)
			PM	2 (30)	A (D)	2 (34)	A (D)
6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	28	C	30	C
			PM	42	D	43	D
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue	City of Lathrop	All-Way Stop	AM	9	A	10	A
			PM	14	B	15	B
8. Daniels Street/Milo Candini Drive	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	12	B	17	B
			PM	11	B	17	B

Notes: 1. For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for all approaches. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay and LOS for the most-delayed individual movement is shown in parentheses next to the average intersection delay and LOS. All results are rounded to the nearest second.  
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

**Table 3.14-11: Peak Hour Signal Warrant Analysis – Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions**

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour Warrant Met? <sup>1</sup>
1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	NO
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	NO
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue	City of Lathrop	All-Way Stop	YES

Note: 1. Evaluated based on peak hour vol. warrant contained in *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, Caltrans, 2014.  
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

**Table 3.14-12: Freeway Operations – Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions**

Segment	Type	Existing Conditions				Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions			
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
1. SR 120 EB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way	Basic Section	18	C	37	E	19	C	37	E
2. SR 120 WB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way	Basic Section	29	D	25	C	29	D	26	D
3. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	23	C	39	E	24	C	40	E
4. SR 120 EB on-ramp at Airport Way	Merge	21	C	31	D	21	C	33	D
5. SR 120 WB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	33	D	32	D	34	D	33	D
6. SR 120 WB on-ramp at Airport Way	Merge	29	D	25	C	29	D	26	C
7. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Union Road	Diverge	23	C	36	E	24	C	38	E
8. SR 120 WB on-ramp at Union Road	Merge	28	C	27	C	29	D	27	C

Notes: 1. Evaluated using the HCS2010 software, which applies the methods from the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010).  
2. Bold and underlined text indicates unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a significant impact.  
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

### **Impact 3.14-1: The proposed project (Phase 1) would not cause significant impacts at intersections (Less than Significant).**

The project (Phase 1) would not cause any significant impacts to intersections maintained by the City of Manteca, Lathrop, or Caltrans. Although the project would cause additional delays on the side-street stop-controlled approaches (which currently operate at LOS F) at the Airport Way/Atherton Drive intersection, this increase is not considered significant because the resultant volumes would not meet the peak hour signal warrant. Similarly, the project would not cause any intersections maintained by Caltrans to worsen from acceptable to unacceptable levels based on their established significance thresholds. Accordingly, Phase 1 project impacts to study intersections are considered **less than significant**.

#### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*No mitigation required.*

### **Impact 3.14-2: The proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities (Significant and Unavoidable in the Short-Term, Less Than Significant in the Long-Term).**

The addition of project (Phase 1) traffic would exacerbate unacceptable (i.e. LOS E) PM peak hour operations on the following freeway facilities. Project traffic would cause in excess of a 100 vehicle-per-day increase on the impacted SR 120 mainline, and in excess of a 1 percent increase in off-ramp volumes at these locations. This is a potentially significant impact.

- Eastbound SR 120 mainline between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way
- Eastbound SR 120 diverge at Airport Way
- Eastbound SR 120 diverge at Union Road

A new interchange on SR 120 at McKinley Avenue is undergoing design. It is included as Tier 1 (funded) project in the the adopted SJCOG 2014 RTP/SCS with an open to traffic date of 2021. Similarly, improvements are planned at the SR 120/Union Road interchange, which according to the 2014 RTP/SCS should be in place by the end of 2015. These improvements include new auxiliary lanes (weave sections) on portions of SR 120, acceleration/deceleration lanes, and two-lane off-ramps to better accommodate travel in the corridor. The effectiveness of the planned improvements was analyzed under existing plus project conditions. The results are shown in Table 3.14-13, which indicate that all study segments would be restored to an acceptable LOS D or better with the exception of the eastbound off-ramp at Airport Way, which would continue operating at LOS E. Operations at this off-ramp are improved to better than 'no project' conditions based on the amount of off-ramp traffic diverted to McKinley Avenue. This impact is considered **significant and unavoidable** in the short-term until the planned improvements are completed, and **less than significant** once the improvements are in place..

#### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*No mitigation required other than the payment of fees.*

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

**Table 3.14-13: Freeway Operations – Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions With Planned Interchange Improvements**

Segment	Type	Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions		Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions With Planned Interchange Improvements	
		PM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
		SR 120 EB between Yosemite Avenue and Airport Way	Basic Section	37	E	37	E
SR 120 EB off-ramp at McKinley Ave.	Diverge	Does Not Exist		Does Not Exist		29	D
SR 120 EB loop on-ramp at McKinley Ave.	Merge	Does Not Exist		Does Not Exist		34	D
SR 120 EB diagonal on-ramp at McKinley Ave.	Merge	Does Not Exist		Does Not Exist		34	D
SR 120 EB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	39	E	40	E	39	E
SR 120 EB off-ramp at Union Rd.	Diverge	36	E	38	E	Does Not Exist	
SR 120 EB between Airport Way and Union Rd.	Weave	Does Not Exist		Does Not Exist		-	D

Notes:

- Evaluated using the HCS2010 software, which applies the methods from the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010).
- Bold and underlined text indicates unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a significant impact.

Segments shown as “Do Not Exist” are no longer present with the planned interchange improvements in place due to changes in how freeway facility types are categorized (i.e., ramp spacing, auxiliary lanes, etc.)

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

### **Impact 3.14-3: The proposed project (Phase 1) would adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities (Less than Significant with Mitigation).**

The project (Phase 1) would provide sidewalks along the extension of Daniels Street. The project would not disrupt or interfere with existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. However, the *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003) indicates that a Class II bicycle lane is planned along Daniels Street from Airport Way to McKinley Avenue. Since the project description does not describe any planned on-street bicycle facilities, the project could create an inconsistency with policies related to bicycle systems. Therefore, this impact is considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.14-1 would provide consistency with the *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003). Consequently, this impact would be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

#### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

**Mitigation Measure 3.14-1:** *The project proponent shall provide Class II bicycle lanes in each direction of Daniels Street westerly from its existing terminus to McKinley Avenue.*

### **Impact 3.14-4: The proposed project (Phase 1) would not adversely affect transit services or facilities (Less than Significant).**

The project (Phase 1) could potentially increase transit ridership on Manteca Transit bus routes 1, 2, and 3, which includes a stop on Daniels Street near the project site. The project would not

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

disrupt or interfere with existing or planned public transit services or facilities. It would not create an inconsistency with policies concerning transit systems set forth in a General Plan or in the *City of Manteca Short Range Transit Plan* (2009). Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*No mitigation required.*

### **Impact 3.14-5: The proposed project (Phase 1) could cause potentially significant impacts to at-grade rail crossings (Less than Significant).**

Yosemite Avenue and McKinley Avenue each feature at-grade crossings of a UP railroad track. The project (Phase 1) would add about 200 and 100 vehicles per day, respectively, to these two at-grade crossings. Each crossing has advanced warning signs, railroad crossing pavement markings, stop lines, crossing gates, flashing lights, and warning bells. The project would not cause an increase in delay during train crossings that would correspond to LOS D or worse conditions. Furthermore, the project would not add traffic to an at-grade crossing with a known safety problem. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*No mitigation required.*

## CUMULATIVE (2030) CONDITIONS TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

A Cumulative Conditions analysis was performed to identify potential impacts of Phase 1 of the project under Year 2030 conditions. Roadway assumptions and associated traffic forecasts along with the intersection and freeway segment operations analysis results are presented in this section.

### **Traffic Forecasts**

The future cumulative roadway network includes certain roadway improvements, consistent with the SJCOG RTP/SCS project list, which support the level of development anticipated to be in place in 2030. Major improvements within the study area included under Cumulative Conditions are summarized below:

- SR 120 – widened to six lanes from I-5 to SR 99.
- SR 120/McKinley Avenue interchange – partial cloverleaf design with lane configurations based on those in the *Final Traffic Report for the State Route 120/McKinley Avenue Interchange Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA/ED)* (Fehr & Peers, 2013) including an auxiliary (weave) lane on WB SR 120 from Airport Way to McKinley Avenue.
- Airport Way Widening – widened to four lanes between Yosemite Avenue and Woodward Avenue (with exception of SR 120 overcrossing which remains two lanes).
- Yosemite Avenue Widening – widened to four lanes from SR 120 to east of Airport Way.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

In addition to the above, a number of other improvements are assumed including the extensions of Atherton Drive and Daniels Street, and widening of Union Road. Improvements were not assumed at the SR 120/Airport Way interchange because it is not included in the 2014 RTP/SCS. Planned roadway improvements in the study area are shown on Figure 3.14-6.

Selected intersection improvements were assumed to occur by 2030 based on planned roadway widenings and specific intersection improvements identified in the City's draft PFIP.

The SJCOG model was modified to reflect the following reasonable and foreseeable land uses in the study area:

- Lathrop Gateway Business Park – situated north of SR 120 between Yosemite Avenue and McKinley Avenue, which could yield a maximum of 5.43 million square feet of non-residential according to that project's EIR.
- Machado Estates – 575 dwelling units located south of Woodward Avenue and west of Airport Way.
- Terra Ranch – 409 dwelling units located directly west of Machado Estates.
- Oakwood shores – a partially developed residential project (475 dwelling units at build-out) located south of the project site on Oakwood Lane that has two access locations on Woodward Avenue west of McKinley Avenue.
- Manteca Trails – 1,651 dwelling units located south of Woodward Avenue and west of McKinley Avenue.
- South Lathrop Specific Plan – 3.9 million square feet of industrial located directly south of the SR 120/Yosemite Avenue interchange.

Cumulative traffic forecasts were developed using the SJCOG travel demand model. The process of developing forecasts followed a series of commonly-used quantitative steps in which the amount of growth projected by the model is added to the existing counts in order to estimate future year traffic volumes. Traffic forecasts for the Cumulative (2030) Year analysis were developed for the following project scenarios:

- The **Cumulative No Project** scenario includes the 2030 planned roadways and developments, but assumes no development within the project site. This scenario also does not assume the extension of Daniels Street westerly from its current terminus to McKinley Ave.
- The **Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1)** scenario adds traffic from Phase 1 of the project to the surrounding roadway system. This scenario assumes the extension of Daniels Street westerly from its current terminus to McKinley Avenue.

Traffic forecasts for the Cumulative No Project scenario were developed using the SJCOG travel demand model. A forecasting procedure known as the "difference method" was utilized to develop year 2030 forecasts from the SJCOG future year model. This method accounts for potential differences between the base year model and existing traffic counts that could otherwise transfer to the future year traffic forecast. This forecasting procedure is calculated as follows:

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

$$\text{Year 2030 Forecast} = \text{Existing Volume} + (\text{Year 2030 SJCOG TDM} - \text{Base Year SJCOG TDM})$$

Figures 3.14-7a and 7b display the Cumulative No Project traffic forecasts. Figure 3.14-8 shows the cumulative distribution of Phase 1 project trips, which would be slightly different than existing conditions due to additional development near the project site as well as the construction of the SR 120/McKinley Avenue interchange, which would become the project's primary access for travel to/from the west on SR 120. Figures 3.14-9a and 9b display the Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1) traffic forecasts.

### **Intersection Operations**

The study intersections, including the two future SR 120/McKinley interchange ramp-terminal intersections, were analyzed under Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Phase 1 conditions. As shown in Table 3.14-14, many of the study intersections are projected to operate at unacceptable service levels regardless of whether the project is developed. This is due to expected traffic growth and a lack of any planned improvements at these locations. Although operations at the Airport Way/Atherton Drive intersection are anticipated to be at LOS F without or with the project, the project impact is not considered cumulatively significant because side-street delay would not worsen when the project is implemented.

The two unsignalized study intersections were re-evaluated under cumulative conditions to determine if they would satisfy the Peak Hour warrant for consideration of a traffic signal. Both intersections would satisfy the warrant during one or both peak hours under Cumulative No Project and Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions.

### **Freeway Analysis**

Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1) freeway operations were evaluated for the AM and PM peak hours. The results are shown in Table 3.14-15. This table shows only those freeway facilities that would be used by project trips. As shown, all ramp merge/diverge movements would operate at LOS D or better. These results assume the planned widening of SR 120 to six lanes. They also include the planned two-lane off-ramp (and deceleration lane) on eastbound SR 120 at McKinley Avenue.

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Table 3.14-14: Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions							
Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1)	
				Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS
1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	<b>83 (2570)</b>	F (F)	<b>109 (378)</b>	F (F)
			PM	<b>49 (1193)</b>	E (F)	<b>46 (1178)</b>	E (F)
2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	<b>101</b>	F	<b>112</b>	F
			PM	<b>87</b>	F	<b>58</b>	E
3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	42	D	54	D
			PM	<b>105</b>	F	<b>76</b>	E
4. Airport Way/Daniels Street	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	27	C	31	C
			PM	<b>189</b>	F	<b>219</b>	F
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	<b>4 (48)</b>	A (E)	<b>4 (60)</b>	A (F)
			PM	<b>9 (161)</b>	A (F)	<b>11 (216)</b>	B (F)
6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	39	D	41	D
			PM	<b>75</b>	E	<b>79</b>	E
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue	City of Lathrop	Traffic Signal	AM	36	D	37	D
			PM	46	D	47	D
8. Daniels Street/Milo Candini Drive	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	23	C	23	C
			PM	14	B	20	B
9. McKinley Ave/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	15	B	24	C
			PM	17	B	20	B
10. McKinley Ave/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	14	B	18	B
			PM	12	B	17	B
11. McKinley Ave/Daniels St Extension	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	Intersection does not exist under this scenario		11	B
			PM			21	C

Notes:

- For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for all approaches. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay and LOS for the most-delayed individual movement is shown in parentheses next to the average intersection delay and LOS. All results are rounded to the nearest second.
- Bold** indicates unacceptable LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

**Table 3.14-15: Freeway Operations – Cumulative Conditions**

Segment	Type	Cumulative No Project Conditions				Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions			
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
1. SR 120 EB off-ramp at McKinley Ave	Diverge	14	B	27	C	15	B	28	C
2. SR 120 WB on-ramp at McKinley Ave	Merge	33	D	26	C	33	D	27	C
3. SR 120 EB on-ramp at Airport Way	Merge	25	C	31	D	25	C	32	D
4. SR 120 WB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	30	D	33	D	31	D	33	D
5. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Union Road	Diverge	16	D	21	C	16	B	31	C
6. SR 120 WB slip on-ramp at Union Road	Merge	25	C	27	C	27	C	27	C

Notes:

1. Evaluated using the HCS2010 software, which applies the methods from the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010).
2. Bold and underlined text indicates unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a significant impact.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

#### **Project Buildout Travel Characteristics**

Future phases of the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone may include a variety of new sports, recreation, entertainment, and shopping facilities within the project site. These additional facilities are not currently planned, and the proposed project does not include site plan review or other entitlements that would allow for their implementation. The following conceptual land uses have been prepared for the various numbered, Planning Areas (PA) within the project site:

- PA-1 (northeast corner of Project Site): Potential land uses could include three international soccer fields, two U-12 soccer fields, and one U-8 soccer field. Alternatively, the international soccer fields could be divided into two U-12 youth soccer fields, yielding a total of eight U-12 play fields, and one U-8 size field.
- PA-1a & PA-1b (directly west of the existing Big League Dreams complex): Two new baseball fields.
- PA-2 (northcentral portion of Project Site): Two U-12 and two U-13 sized youth soccer fields.
- PA-3, PA-4, and PA-5 (north of the Daniels Street extension and west of the existing Big League Dreams Complex): 360,000 square feet of food and beverage, restaurant, and general retail space.
- PA-6 and PA-6a (southwest portion of Project Site): serves as expansion for the family entertainment offerings, and potential location of the Yosemite/South Sierra Nevada Visitors Center, relocated Manteca Convention and Visitors Bureau, and bus terminal / temporary bus parking for tours connecting to Yosemite and the Sierras.
- PA-7 (west portion of Project Site, north of Daniels Street): intended to be developed as an Adventure Zone with active and passive recreational facilities.
- PA-8 (central portion of Project Site): incorporates an Indoor All-Season Sports & Exhibition Center.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

- PA-9 and PA-10 (west portion of Project Site, north of Daniels Street and east of McKinley Avenue): is slated for future FEZ expansion.
- PA-11 (northwest portion of Project Site): is intended to be developed as a sport field with spectator seating.
- PA-12 (northcentral portion of Project Site): is envisioned to serve as an outdoor sports zone.
- PA-13, PA-14, and PA-15 (northern portion of Project Site): comprises the PG&E right-of-way, which will be used for shared parking for the FEZ property.

To support buildout of the FEZ, the following roadway improvements would be completed.

- Extend Daniels Street as a four-lane roadway from its current terminus to McKinley Avenue.
- Extend Wawona Street westerly as a two-lane roadway from Airport Way to Milo Candini Drive.
- Extend Milo Candini Drive northeasterly from the FEZ property to Yosemite Avenue.

A detailed technical analysis of project buildout was not conducted due to the speculative nature of the land use proposals. At this time, the specific amount of retail versus restaurant is not known. The degree to which retail and restaurant uses will be configured to complement the sporting activities is not known. The types of sporting activities (i.e., soccer practices versus matches, and spectator sizes for the international fields) are not known. The size and types of land uses on PA-6 through PA-12 are not known. Therefore, any analysis that attempts to analyze (and mitigate for) project-specific or cumulative transportation impacts associated with project buildout would be speculative. Instead, a programmatic assessment of travel conditions under cumulative conditions was conducted. This evaluation consisted of estimating the average daily traffic (ADT) volume on roadways bordering and within the project site assuming no development and with project buildout.

Figure 3.14-10 displays the Cumulative No Project ADT forecasts using the same forecasting procedure described earlier in this section. The 'no project' forecasts assume no additional development west of Airport Way, north of SR 120, east of McKinley Avenue, and south of Yosemite Avenue.

The following four-step process was then used to estimate the Cumulative Plus Project ADT forecasts. The "project buildout" forecasts are also shown on Figure 3.14-10.

- Step 1: Add proposed roadway improvements to travel demand model.
- Step 2: Develop four new traffic analysis zones (TAZs) to represent project buildout. Inputs to each TAZ are as follows:
  - TAZ 1 (PA-1 and PA-2): Input retail employees such that zone generates 910 daily trips, which is ITE's estimate of the trip generation of 13 soccer fields.
  - TAZ 2 (FEZ commercial uses): Enter three retail employees per thousand square feet.

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

- TAZ 3 (Hotel Facility): Use multi-family residential, office, and retail employees to match expected trip generation (model doesn't have a hotel land use category).
- TAZ 4 (PA-6 through PA-12): Enter two retail employees per thousand square feet of building space (based on the square footage yields in the NOP).
- Step 3: Review reasonableness of model forecasts in terms of trip generation, internalization, and external directionality of trips.
- Step 4: Develop ADT forecasts using the procedure described earlier in this section.

According to Figure 3.14-10, project buildout (along with planned roadway improvements) would cause increases in traffic on segments of Airport Way and McKinley Avenue. The following key conclusions are drawn from this figure:

- The SR 120/McKinley Avenue interchange has been 'sized' to accommodate buildout of the Manteca and Lathrop General Plans (including development of the FEZ property). Accordingly, project buildout would not adversely affect its design or operations.
- Project buildout would cause the ADT on Airport Way between Daniels Street and SR 120 to increase from 32,100 to 36,000, a 12 percent increase. This could potentially cause impacts to the SR 120/Airport Way interchange, which is not currently planned to be upgraded.
- According to Figure 3.14-10, project buildout would result in Daniels Street between Airport Way and McKinley Avenue carrying no more than 12,500 ADT, which is well within the capacity of a four-lane road. It is noted that the Wawona Street extension to Milo Candini Drive would carry 11,200 ADT. This volume is due, partially, to the assumption that a significant amount of parking would be provided along the power line corridor, which is directly accessible via this road. The Airport Way/Wawona Street intersection would require signalization and additional lanes to accommodate this traffic.
- An extension of Milo Candini to Yosemite Ave (separate City improvement project) is projected to accommodate a modest traffic volume (2,100 ADT). Accordingly, it may be included in one of the later phases of the FEZ or constructed as a separate project.

### **Impact 3.14-6: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would cause significant impacts at intersections (Significant and Unavoidable).**

The project (Phase 1) would cause the following intersections to worsen to a significant degree according to the results in Table 3.14-14 and the established significance criteria:

- Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps (LOS F operations worsened during the AM peak hour)
- Airport Way/Daniels Street (LOS F operations worsened during the PM peak hour)
- Airport Way/Wawona Street (LOS E or F operations worsened during the AM and PM peak hours)
- Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue (LOS E operations worsened during the PM peak hour)

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Phase 1 project impacts to these study intersections are considered a potentially significant impact. Table 3.14-16 displays traffic operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with the proposed mitigation measures in place. As shown, all impacted study intersections would operate acceptably with the proposed mitigation measures in place.

Some of these measures are considered infeasible for reasons described below. The improvements at the SR 120/Airport Way interchange are within Caltrans' right-of-way and beyond the control of the City of Manteca to implement. The improvements at the Airport Way/Daniels Street and Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue intersections would likely require additional right-of-way from adjacent properties. For these reasons, these intersection impacts are considered to be **significant and unavoidable**.

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1)		Cumulative Plus Project w/ Mitigation <sup>3</sup>	
				Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS
Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	<b>101</b>	F	<b>112</b>	F	14	B
			PM	<b>87</b>	F	<b>58</b>	E	12	B
Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	42	D	54	D	14	B
			PM	<b>105</b>	F	<b>76</b>	E	12	B
Airport Way/Daniels Street	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	27	C	31	C	32	C
			PM	<b>189</b>	F	<b>219</b>	F	51	D
Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	4 ( <b>48</b> )	A (E)	4 ( <b>60</b> )	A (F)	7	A
			PM	9 ( <b>161</b> )	A (F)	11 ( <b>216</b> )	B (F)	7	A
Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	39	D	41	D	30	C
			PM	<b>75</b>	E	<b>79</b>	E	37	D

Notes:

- For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for all approaches. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay and LOS for the most-delayed individual movement is shown in parentheses next to the average intersection delay and LOS. All results are rounded to the nearest second.
- Bold** indicates unacceptable LOS.
- Refer to previous page for description of proposed mitigations.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure 3.14-2:** The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost for each individual phase, or portion of individual phase of the development, toward the following improvements at the SR 120/Airport Way interchange:

- Relocate the westbound ramp-terminal intersection approximately 180 feet south of its current location, which will increase the spacing to the Airport Way/Daniels Street intersection.
- Construct a loop on-ramp.
- Widen the overcrossing to include two northbound and three southbound lanes.

### 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

- *Widen SR 120 eastbound and westbound off-ramps to include two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes approaching Airport Way.*

*The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.14-3:** *The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost for each individual phase, or portion of individual phase of the development, of adding the following improvements to the Airport Way/Daniels Street intersection. Alternatively, the City could decide to include this improvement in its draft PFIP, with the City being responsible to construct the improvement when warranted:*

- *Reconfigure the southbound approach to add a third through lane.*
- *Restripe the eastbound Daniels Street approach to include one left-turn, one shared left/through lane, and two right-turn lanes with right-turn overlap phasing.*

*The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.14-4:** *The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost of installing a traffic signal at the Airport Way/Wawona Street intersection. Alternatively, the City could decide to include this improvement in its draft PFIP, with the City being responsible to construct the improvement when warranted.*

*The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.*

**Mitigation Measure 3.14-5:** *The project proponent shall pay its fair share cost of adding the following improvements to the Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue intersection. Alternatively, the City could decide to include this improvement in its draft PFIP, with the City being responsible to construct the improvement when warranted:*

- *Widen the eastbound and westbound Yosemite Avenue approaches to include dual left-turn lanes.*

*The fair share cost shall be determined through traffic studies prepared for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase of the development. The fair share cost shall be paid at the time improvement plans are approved for the individual phase, or portion of the individual phase.*

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

### **Impact 3.14-7: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities (Significant and Unavoidable).**

The addition of project (Phase 1) traffic would maintain acceptable (i.e. LOS D or better) operations on study freeway facilities. However, project traffic would exacerbate vehicle queuing on the Airport Way WB off-ramp that spills back onto the SR 120 mainline. This occurs as a result of insufficient capacity at the interchange ramp terminal intersections. This is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.14-2 recommends that the applicant contribute fair share funding toward the reconstruction of the SR 120/Airport Way interchange. The capacity improvements would reduce queuing on the westbound off-ramp. However, this improvement would require approval from Caltrans. It would also require the remaining funding (beyond the project's fair share contribution) to be identified. Although implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the significance of the impact, the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** because there is no assurance that Manteca can implement these improvements.

#### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*Implement Mitigation Measure 3.14-2.*

### **Impact 3.14-8: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities (Less than Significant).**

The project (Phase 1) would provide sidewalks along the extension of Daniels Street. The project would not disrupt or interfere with existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. However, the *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003) indicates that a Class II bicycle lane is planned along Daniels Street from Airport Way to McKinley Avenue. Since the project description does not describe any on-street planned bicycle facilities, the project could create an inconsistency with policies related to bicycle systems. The City's Bikeway Master Plan also describes other bicycle facilities that would traverse the project site. However, none of these facilities would pass through or adjacent to the Phase 1 project boundary. Therefore, this impact is considered a potentially significant impact. This measure would provide consistency with the *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003). Consequently, this impact would be reduced to a **less than significant** level with mitigation.

#### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*Implement Mitigation Measure 3.14-3.*

### **Impact 3.14-9: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would not adversely affect transit services or facilities (Less than Significant).**

The project (Phase 1) could potentially increase transit ridership on Manteca Transit bus routes 1, 2, and 3, which includes a stop on Daniels Street near the project site. The project would not disrupt or interfere with existing or planned public transit services or facilities. It would not create

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

an inconsistency with policies concerning transit systems set forth in a General Plan or in the *City of Manteca Short Range Transit Plan* (2009). Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant**.

### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*No mitigation required.*

### **Impact 3.14-10: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) could cause potentially significant impacts to at-grade rail crossings (Less than Significant).**

Yosemite Avenue and McKinley Avenue each feature at-grade crossings of a UP railroad track. The project (Phase 1) would add about 200 and 100 vehicles per day, respectively, to these two at-grade crossings. Each crossing has advanced warning signs, railroad crossing pavement markings, stop lines, crossing gates, flashing lights, and warning bells. The project would not cause an increase in delay during train crossings that would correspond to LOS D or worse conditions. Furthermore, the project would not add traffic to an at-grade crossing with a known safety problem. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

*No mitigation required.*

### **Impact 3.14-11: Under cumulative conditions, proposed project buildout could cause significant impacts at intersections and freeway facilities (Significant and Unavoidable).**

Project buildout would generate more external vehicle trips than the Phase 1 project. Accordingly, cumulative project impacts may be greater and require greater levels of mitigation than what is required for Phase 1. Due to the uncertainty of the specific land use types, attendance levels, on-site activities, and other factors, a detailed analysis of project buildout conditions is not possible at this time. Nevertheless, based on the preliminary traffic assessment presented earlier in this chapter, project buildout impacts are considered a potentially significant impact. Due to the likelihood that identified additional improvements may require additional right-of-way and/or approvals from other agencies, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable**.

### *MITIGATION MEASURES*

**Mitigation Measure 3.14-6:** *Each subsequent individual phase or portion of a subsequent individual phase of development shall be subject to additional traffic studies to analyze potentially significant transportation system impacts and identify mitigation measures that lessen their significance, including fair share costs.*

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

### EVALUATION OF ACCESS TO PHASE 1

---

This section discusses proposed vehicular access to Phase 1 from Daniels Street. Each of the four project driveways was evaluated in consideration of their spacing, permitted turning movements, and appropriate form of access control (e.g., traffic signals, stop signs, etc.).

Figure 3.14-11 displays the access and circulation recommendations for Phase 1. This figure indicates that primary entrance (at Driveway 2) is recommended for signalization once the fourth (north leg) is constructed. Traffic volumes would not warrant signalization with it as a three-way, full-access intersection. As shown on Figure 3.14-11, various recommendations are offered at the other project driveways to improve ingress/egress, including providing westbound left-turn ingress at Driveway 3. This is important because the majority of project trips are anticipated to enter from the east, which would result in a heavy westbound left-turn movement at Driveway 2. Provision of left-turn ingress at Driveway 3 would provide relief to that movement. The project site plan shows several one-way, on-site roadways. To discourage wrong-way travel, on-site signage and pavement markings are recommended. To enable motorists to efficiently reach their destination, wayfinding signage is recommended. These recommendations are not considered mitigation for significant impacts. Rather, they may be considered as conditions of approval to be imposed on Phase 1.




Figure 3.14-1  
Study Area

N:\2014Projects\3206\_FEZ EIR\Graphics\Draft\GIS\MXD\Fig01\_StudyArea.mxd

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*





Figure 3.14-2  
Existing Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Facilities

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*



1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	4. Airport Way/Daniels St
<p><b>1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive</b></p> <p>Atherton Drive</p> <p>100 (221) 150 (361) 48 (96)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>99 (69) 0 (0) 6 (2)</p> <p>207 (130) 1 (1) 5 (6)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>3 (5) 326 (228) 4 (8)</p>	<p><b>2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps</b></p> <p>SR 120 EB Ramps</p> <p>238 (497) 96 (269)</p> <p>185 (496) 2 (0) 60 (181)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>458 (321) 174 (106)</p>	<p><b>3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps</b></p> <p>SR 120 WB Ramps</p> <p>292 (281) 258 (684)</p> <p>191 (336) 0 (0) 76 (182)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>135 (66) 508 (751)</p>	<p><b>4. Airport Way/Daniels St</b></p> <p>Daniels St</p> <p>67 (259) 256 (345) 18 (19)</p> <p>21 (18) 35 (105) 181 (126)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>40 (311) 21 (103) 113 (394)</p> <p>145 (501) 392 (399) 162 (187)</p>
5. Airport Way/Wawona St.	6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	7. McKinley Ave/Yosemite Ave	8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street
<p><b>5. Airport Way/Wawona St.</b></p> <p>Wawona St.</p> <p>310 (644) 52 (52)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>46 (33) 42 (22)</p> <p>382 (655) 91 (60)</p>	<p><b>6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue</b></p> <p>Yosemite Avenue</p> <p>49 (52) 230 (331) 237 (171)</p> <p>198 (171) 150 (193) 69 (220)</p> <p>16 (97) 151 (303) 44 (125)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>56 (44) 215 (361) 142 (244)</p>	<p><b>7. McKinley Ave/Yosemite Ave</b></p> <p>Yosemite Ave</p> <p>15 (13) 11 (42) 97 (130)</p> <p>67 (160) 131 (153) 9 (27)</p> <p>14 (24) 111 (213) 12 (52)</p> <p>McKinley Ave</p> <p>32 (14) 29 (15) 9 (15)</p>	<p><b>8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street</b></p> <p>Daniels Street</p> <p>0 (3) 1 (3) 3 (23)</p> <p>11 (385) 87 (66) 22 (77)</p> <p>Milo Candini Drive</p> <p>0 (3) 78 (439) 0 (1)</p> <p>1 (1) 0 (4) 6 (75)</p>

Study Intersection  
 Turn Lane  
 AM (PM) Peak Hour Traffic Volume

Traffic Signal  
 Stop Sign

Note: Traffic Counts Collected in February 2014

Not to Scale

Figure 3.14-3  
Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations - Existing Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*




## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

N:\2014\Projects\3206\_FEZ EIR\Graphics\Drawn\GIS\MXD\Fig05\_PHTV\_EFP.mxd



1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	4. Airport Way/Daniels St
<p><b>1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive</b></p> <p>Atherton Drive</p> <p>90 (201) 145 (345) 48 (96)</p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>99 (69) 0 (0) 6 (2)</p> <p>197 (110) 1 (1) 5 (6)</p> <p>3 (5) 347 (207) 4 (8)</p>	<p><b>2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps</b></p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>223 (461) 117 (402)</p> <p>SR 120 EB Ramps</p> <p>292 (523) 2 (0) 60 (181)</p> <p>469 (280) 174 (106)</p>	<p><b>3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps</b></p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>307 (382) 264 (681)</p> <p>SR 120 WB Ramps</p> <p>332 (372) 0 (0) 76 (182)</p> <p>135 (66) 626 (737)</p>	<p><b>4. Airport Way/Daniels St</b></p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>135 (264) 256 (345) 18 (19)</p> <p>Daniels St</p> <p>21 (18) 51 (110) 181 (126)</p> <p>49 (362) 24 (118) 134 (592)</p> <p>404 (523) 392 (399) 162 (187)</p>
5. Airport Way/Wawona St.	6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	7. McKinley Ave/Yosemite Ave	8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street
<p><b>5. Airport Way/Wawona St.</b></p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>374 (657) 52 (52)</p> <p>46 (33) 46 (22)</p> <p>Wawona St.</p> <p>390 (715) 92 (64)</p>	<p><b>6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue</b></p> <p>Airport Way</p> <p>49 (52) 249 (336) 237 (171)</p> <p>Yosemite Avenue</p> <p>198 (171) 150 (193) 105 (226)</p> <p>16 (97) 151 (303) 53 (127)</p> <p>57 (52) 218 (380) 146 (277)</p>	<p><b>7. McKinley Ave/Yosemite Ave</b></p> <p>McKinley Ave</p> <p>15 (13) 27 (47) 97 (130)</p> <p>Yosemite Ave</p> <p>67 (160) 131 (153) 9 (27)</p> <p>14 (24) 111 (213) 16 (53)</p> <p>33 (18) 32 (30) 9 (15)</p>	<p><b>8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street</b></p> <p>Milo Candini Drive</p> <p>16 (13) 1 (3) 3 (23)</p> <p>Daniels Street</p> <p>11 (385) 430 (97) 22 (77)</p> <p>5 (20) 111 (711) 4 (17)</p> <p>20 (7) 0 (4) 6 (75)</p>

--- Future Roadway to be Constructed with Phase 1

Phase 1 Project Location

Study Intersection

Turn Lane

AM (PM) Peak Hour Traffic Volume

Traffic Signal

Stop Sign

Note: Traffic Counts Collected in February 2014



Not to Scale

Figure 3.14-5

## Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations - Existing Plus Project Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*





Figure 3.14-6

Cumulative Roadway Network

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*



1. Airport Way/Atherton Dr	2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	4. Airport Way/Daniels St
<p><b>1. Airport Way/Atherton Dr</b></p> <p>Atherton Dr</p> <p>160 (280) 240 (1,070) 170 (300)</p> <p>300 (200) 40 (70) 20 (50)</p> <p>320 (220) 10 (20) 10 (10)</p> <p>10 (10) 40 (370) 20 (20) 1,080 (370) 20 (20)</p>	<p><b>2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps</b></p> <p>SR 120 EB Ramps</p> <p>450 (1,100) 160 (480)</p> <p>460 (630) 10 (10) 120 (550)</p> <p>1,220 (560) 480 (230)</p>	<p><b>3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps</b></p> <p>SR 120 WB Ramps</p> <p>440 (610) 440 (1,170)</p> <p>460 (470) 10 (10) 170 (410)</p> <p>570 (170) 1,110 (1,020)</p>	<p><b>4. Airport Way/Daniels St</b></p> <p>Daniels St</p> <p>70 (260) 400 (750) 140 (90)</p> <p>70 (180) 40 (110) 300 (440)</p> <p>50 (320) 30 (110) 180 (550)</p> <p>270 (580) 850 (560) 450 (350)</p>
5. Airport Way/Wawona St.	6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	7. McKinley Ave/Yosemite Ave	8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street
<p><b>5. Airport Way/Wawona St.</b></p> <p>Wawona St</p> <p>450 (1,040) 60 (60)</p> <p>50 (40) 50 (70)</p> <p>790 (880) 130 (70)</p>	<p><b>6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue</b></p> <p>Yosemite Avenue</p> <p>410 (140) 420 (720) 310 (180)</p> <p>200 (240) 320 (300) 70 (230)</p> <p>60 (480) 270 (510) 50 (140)</p> <p>60 (50) 600 (690) 150 (250)</p>	<p><b>7. McKinley Ave/Yosemite Ave</b></p> <p>Yosemite Ave</p> <p>140 (50) 510 (270) 160 (140)</p> <p>70 (180) 370 (250) 340 (90)</p> <p>20 (170) 170 (460) 60 (180)</p> <p>140 (20) 180 (590) 50 (400)</p>	<p><b>8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street</b></p> <p>Daniels Street</p> <p>10 (10) 10 (10) 10 (30)</p> <p>20 (390) 90 (70) 30 (90)</p> <p>10 (10) 80 (440) 10 (10)</p> <p>10 (10) 10 (10) 20 (80)</p>

Study Intersection     
 Traffic Signal     
 Not to Scale  
 Turn Lane  
 Stop Sign  
 AM (PM) Peak Hour Traffic Volume



Figure 3.14-7  
 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes  
 and Lane Configurations -  
 Cumulative No Project Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*



- 1** Study Intersection
  - Turn Lane
  - AM (PM)** Peak Hour Traffic Volume
  - Traffic Signal
  - Stop Sign
- Not to Scale**

Figure 3.14-7(Cont.)  
 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes  
 and Lane Configurations -  
 Cumulative No Project Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*




Figure 3.14-8


# Phase 1 Project Trip Distribution Under Cumulative Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*



1. Airport Way/Atherton Dr	2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	4. Airport Way/Daniels St
<p><b>1. Airport Way/Atherton Dr</b></p> <p>Atherton Dr</p> <p>160 (280) 246 (1,107) 170 (300)</p> <p>300 (200) 40 (70) 20 (50)</p> <p>320 (220) 10 (20) 10 (10)</p> <p>10 (10) 1,119 (382) 20 (20)</p>	<p><b>2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps</b></p> <p>SR 120 EB Ramps</p> <p>456 (1,137) 180 (607)</p> <p>420 (450) 10 (10) 120 (550)</p> <p>1,259 (572) 480 (230)</p>	<p><b>3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps</b></p> <p>SR 120 WB Ramps</p> <p>410 (440) 466 (1,334)</p> <p>596 (504) 10 (10) 170 (410)</p> <p>570 (170) 1,109 (852)</p>	<p><b>4. Airport Way/Daniels St</b></p> <p>Daniels St</p> <p>138 (276) 400 (780) 140 (90)</p> <p>70 (180) 56 (115) 300 (440)</p> <p>59 (384) 33 (125) 176 (544)</p> <p>405 (446) 850 (560) 450 (350)</p>
5. Airport Way/Wawona St.	6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	7. McKimley Ave/Yosemite Ave	8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street
<p><b>5. Airport Way/Wawona St.</b></p> <p>Wawona St.</p> <p>514 (1,054) 60 (60)</p> <p>50 (40) 54 (71)</p> <p>799 (939) 131 (74)</p>	<p><b>6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue</b></p> <p>Yosemite Avenue</p> <p>410 (140) 439 (725) 310 (180)</p> <p>200 (240) 320 (300) 106 (236)</p> <p>60 (480) 270 (510) 59 (142)</p> <p>61 (58) 603 (709) 155 (283)</p>	<p><b>7. McKimley Ave/Yosemite Ave</b></p> <p>Yosemite Ave</p> <p>140 (50) 521 (274) 160 (140)</p> <p>70 (180) 370 (250) 340 (90)</p> <p>20 (170) 170 (460) 64 (181)</p> <p>141 (24) 182 (601) 50 (400)</p>	<p><b>8. Milo Candini Drive/Daniels Street</b></p> <p>Daniels Street</p> <p>26 (21) 10 (10) 10 (30)</p> <p>20 (320) 338 (127) 20 (60)</p> <p>15 (97) 119 (683) 24 (57)</p> <p>59 (166) 10 (10) 10 (40)</p>




Figure 3.14-9

## Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Lane Configurations - Cumulative Plus Project Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*






Figure 3.14-9(Cont.)  
 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes  
 and Lane Configurations -  
 Cumulative Plus Project Conditions



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*




Figure 3.14-10  
Cumulative Average Daily Traffic Forecasts

N:\2014\Projects\3206\_FEZ EIR\Graphics\Draft\GIS\MXD\Fig10\_CumulativeForecasts.mxd

## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*



## 3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

---

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

This section describes the regulatory setting, impacts associated with wastewater services, water services, storm drainage, and solid waste disposal that are likely to result from project implementation, and measures to reduce potential impacts to wastewater, water supplies, storm drainage, and solid waste facilities. This section is based in part on the following documents, reports and studies: *California's Groundwater*, *CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System*, *CalRecycle Jurisdiction Diversion/Disposal Rate Summary*, *Manteca Municipal Services Review* (Manteca 2008), the *San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan*, *South County Surface Water Supply Project EIR* (SSJID 1999), *Employment Density Study Summary Report* (SCAG 2001), *Urban Water Management Plan* (2005), *Water Master Plan* (2005), *Storm Drain Master Plan* (2013) *Wastewater Collection System Master Plan* (2012), *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update* (2006), *Draft Sewer Rate Study* (2008), *Family Entertainment Zone Utility Master Plan* (2014), and *Family Entertainment Zone Water Assessment* (2014). Comments were received during the public review period for the Notice of Preparation from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

### 3.15.1 WASTEWATER SERVICES

#### EXISTING SETTING

Wastewater service is provided by the City of Manteca via their network of collection infrastructure and the Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF), which is located north of the project site at 2450 West Yosemite Avenue. The WQCF provides services to the City of Manteca, City of Lathrop, and Raymus Village in San Joaquin County. As of 2010 the WQCF treated approximately 6.5 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater with a maximum capacity of 9.87 mgd.

#### **Wastewater Conveyance**

The existing wastewater collection system is owned and operated by the City of Manteca Public Works Department. The use of gravity sewers for the collection system is the preferred method of conveyance. Although initially more expensive due to larger size and depth of installation, gravity sewers tend to have lower operation and maintenance costs and a reduced risk of failure. The collection system in the City is comprised of gravity flow pipes sized between 6 and 36 inches. In places where topography is relatively flat or adverse for the use of gravity sewers, force mains ranging in size from 6 to 18 inches, and 11 wastewater pump stations are utilized.

#### GRAVITY SEWERS

The following standards are used in the design of gravity sewers. The minimum depth of cover is between 8 feet and 30 feet. Manholes are assumed every 400 feet for pipe diameters ranging from 8 inches to 18 inches, every 500 feet for pipe diameters ranging from 21 to 30 inch, and every 600 feet for pipe diameters larger than 30-inch. Manholes are also assumed at every junction or change in pipe diameter. Additionally, gravity sewer lines will be sized to flow 70-80 percent full, and pipe velocities will range from 2-6 feet per second (ft/sec).

FORCE MAINS

The following standards are used in the design of force mains. A minimum cover of 3 feet is required. Velocities will range from 2-6 ft/sec. Plug valves will be installed every 1,000 ft and at major crossings. Tracer wire will be provided. Force mains will be constructed of PVC, AWWA C900/C905.

SERVICE STATIONS AT PROJECT SITE

The project vicinity is currently served by gravity mains on the west, and by force mains on the north, east, and south. The mains range in size from 6 inches to 8 inches. Additionally, the area is served by one lift station located in the southeast corner of the project site.

**Wastewater Treatment**

Wastewater from the City is currently treated at the WQCF. The City owns and operates the WQCF. The City's *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update (2006)*, *Manteca Municipal Services Review (2008)*, *Wastewater Collection System Master Plan Update (2012)*, and *Industrial Sewer System Service Charge Analysis (2013-2015)* are the primary documents that outline the City's long term strategy for meeting future discharge and capacity requirements for a planning horizon that extends to build-out.

WQCF

The City conveys its wastewater to the WQCF for treatment and disposal. The City owns and operates the facility. The Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No R5-2009-0095 NPDES NO. CA0081558 allows the WQCF to expand capacity up to 17.5 mgd.

WASTEWATER QUALITY

According to the *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update (2006)*, the WQCF is a 6.95 million gallons per day (mgd) rated combined biofilter-activated sludge plant. Secondary effluent is land applied during the spring and summer (flood irrigation for agricultural production) and discharged to the San Joaquin River during the winter (October-March). The *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update (2006)* specifies that effluent from the WQCF typically do not exceed the quantities presented in Table 3.15-1 (Typical Effluent Quality Prior to Phase III Expansion Project).

**TABLE 3.15-1: TYPICAL EFFLUENT QUALITY PRIOR TO PHASE III EXPANSION PROJECT**

CONSTITUENT	UNITS	30 DAY AVERAGE
BOD5	mg/L	16
SS	mg/L	0.1
TSS	mg/L	19
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	23"
Oil and Grease	mg/L	2.1
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--
Ammonia	mg/L	0.20

SOURCE: WASTEWATER QUALITY CONTROL FACILITY MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2006, PG 2-2

The Manteca WQCF operates under Board Order Number R5-2004-0028 (NPDES Permit No. CA0081558). On 19 March 2004, the Regional Board adopted Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order No. R5-2004-0028, NPDES No. CA0081558, prescribing waste discharge requirements for the City of Manteca, City of Lathrop, and Dutra Farms at the Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) in San Joaquin County.

**TABLE 3.15-2: COMPARISON OF PROBABLE FUTURE WATER QUALITY LIMITATIONS VERSUS EFFLUENT QUALITY FOLLOWING PHASE III EXPANSION PROJECT**

CONSTITUENT	UNITS	COMPLIANCE CRITERIA	PROBABLE FUTURE LIMIT	PROJECTED EFFLUENT MEDIAN CONCENTRATION
BOD	mg/L	Monthly Average	10 or lower	<10
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	Monthly Average	10 or lower	<10
Total Coliform	MPN/100 mL	Weekly Average	2.2.	<2.2
Turbidity	NTU	1 Hour Average	2	<2
Settleable Solids	mg/L	Monthly Average	0.1	0.1
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	4-day Average	0.01	0.01
Oil and Grease	mg/L	Monthly Average	10	2.1
Aluminum	mg/L	Monthly Average	71	150
Electrical Conductivity	µmhos/cm	Monthly Average	1000	825
Ammonia <sup>a</sup>	mg/L	Monthly Average	2.1	2.1
Ammonia <sup>b</sup>	mg/L	Monthly Average	2.8	2.1
Arsenic	µg/L	Monthly Average	10	8
Copper	µg/L	Monthly Average	7.9	7
Cyanide	µg/L	Monthly Average	3.7	7
Iron	µg/L	Monthly Average	300	420
Manganese	µg/L	Monthly Average	50	33
MBAS	µg/L	Monthly Average	500	560
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	Monthly Average	10	5
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	Monthly Average	1	1
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	ug/L	Monthly Average	22	3.48
Bromodichloromethane	ug/L	Monthly Average	5	ND <sup>b</sup>
Dibromochloromethane	ug/L	Monthly Average	1.4	ND <sup>b</sup>
2, 4, 6-Trichlorophenol	ug/L	Monthly Average	34	3.28
<sup>a</sup> June - September				
<sup>b</sup> October - May				

SOURCE: WASTEWATER QUALITY CONTROL FACILITY MASTER PLAN UPDATE 2006, PG 2-17

### Future Demand

The City's *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update* projected wastewater generation factors for various land uses. Based on these calculations it was determined that the City will have flows totaling 19.5 mgd as of the General Plan horizon of 2023 with a buildout capacity of 23.0 mgd.

According to the 2012 *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update*, residential WGFs for future development have been reduced to reflect upcoming water conservation legislation for residential development based on a generation factors study. The study also focuses on reduction of industrial and general commercial WGFs to reflect historical water use data from local businesses.

The overall collection sewer strategy will consist of a combination trunk sewer gravity collection system with pump or lift stations located along the alignment to convey wastewater to an influent pump station located at the City Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF). The North Manteca Collection Strategy (NMCS) and South Manteca Collection Strategy (SMCS) will collect flow from areas where future growth is expected. The Central Manteca Collection Strategy (CMCS) will connect the existing collection system to the NMCS.

The continued use of existing pump stations, and addition of pump and lift stations, allows for a reduction in the depth of the trunk sewers proposed in previous master plans. Additionally, an increase in the ratio of liquid depth to pipe diameter (d/D) design criteria for pipe capacity from 40-60 percent full in previous master plans to 70-80 percent full at peak flow resulted in the downsizing of several links within the proposed trunk sewer strategy.

### **Sewer Master Plan**

The City of Manteca Wastewater Collection System Master Plan calls for a 48-inch to 54-inch diameter sewer trunk line through the Project site to replace the existing force main serving the southern portion of Manteca. This trunk line will extend from the existing 60-inch gravity line that has been stubbed just south of SR 120 to an existing 60-inch stub within the WQCF. This trunk line will be constructed with the development of land on the Project site inside the east utility corridor. Sanitary sewer generated by the proposed project will be conveyed to this trunk line via 8-inch gravity sewer lines located within proposed street rights-of-way.

The City has plans for an additional 36-inch gravity effluent line and one more 12-inch force main to be located along the western edge of the Project site. The existing 36-inch gravity effluent line will be relocated into the west utility corridor, and the new effluent lines will be installed alongside it. The existing 12-inch industrial waste force main will also be relocated into this utility corridor. Figure 2-11 depicts both the existing and proposed master sewer collection system components described above.

## **REGULATORY SETTING - WASTEWATER**

---

### **Clean Water Act (CWA) / National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits**

The CWA is the cornerstone of water quality protection in the United States. The statute employs a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters so that they can support "the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water."

The CWA regulates discharges from "non-point source" and traditional "point source" facilities, such as municipal sewage plants and industrial facilities. Section 402 of the Act creates the NPDES regulatory program which makes it illegal to discharge pollutants from a point source to the waters of the United States without a permit. Point sources must obtain a discharge permit from the

proper authority (usually a state, sometimes EPA, a tribe, or a territory). NPDES permits cover industrial and municipal discharges, discharges from storm sewer systems in larger cities, storm water associated with numerous kinds of industrial activity, runoff from construction sites disturbing more than one acre, mining operations, and animal feedlots and aquaculture facilities above certain thresholds.

Permit requirements for treatment are expressed as end-of-pipe conditions. This set of numbers reflects levels of three key parameters: (1) biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), (2) total suspended solids (TSS), and (3) pH acid/base balance. These levels can be achieved by well-operated sewage plants employing "secondary" treatment. Primary treatment involves screening and settling, while secondary treatment uses biological treatment in the form of "activated sludge."

All so-called "indirect" dischargers are not required to obtain NPDES permits. An indirect discharger is one that sends its wastewater into a city sewer system, so it eventually goes to a sewage treatment plant. Although not regulated under NPDES, "indirect" discharges are covered by another CWA program called pretreatment. "Indirect" dischargers send their wastewater into a city sewer system, which carries it to the municipal sewage treatment plant, through which it passes before entering surface water.

The City's current NPDES Permit, which regulates the wastewater effluent quantity and quality upon discharge, was issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board and is Order R5-2006-0094 and Order 5-01-251.

### **Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act**

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act is California's statutory authority for the protection of water quality. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, the State is required to adopt policies, plans, and objectives that will protect the State's waters for the use by and enjoyment of Californians. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has the authority and responsibility for establishing policy related to the State's water quality. Regional authority is delegated by the SWRCB to nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB). The Porter-Cologne Act authorizes the SWRCB and RWQCB to issue NPDES permits.

Under the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) NPDES permit system, all existing and future municipal and industrial discharges to surface water within the City would be subject to regulation. NPDES permits are required for operators of municipal separate storm sewer systems, construction projects, and industrial facilities. These permits contain limits on the amount of pollutants that can be contained in each facility's discharge.

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

#### ***Community Design Element Goals***

Goal PF-8. Maintain an adequate level of service in the City's sewage collection and disposal system to meet the needs of existing and projected development.

#### ***Community Design Element Policies***

PF-P-18. Ensure wastewater collection and treatment for all development in the City and the safe disposal of wastes.

PF-P-19. The City will maintain capacity to process combined residential, commercial, and industrial flow.

PF-P-20. The City shall develop new sewage treatment and trunk line capacity as necessary to serve new development.

PF-P-21. City sewer services will not be extended to unincorporated areas, except in extraordinary circumstances. Existing commitments for sewer service outside the city limits shall continue to be honored.

PF-P-22. Development of individual septic systems may be allowed only where the City makes a finding that it cannot feasibly provide public sewer service, and such systems shall only be used until such time as City sewer service becomes available. Such systems shall meet the minimum standards of the San Joaquin County Health Department.

PF-P-23. The City shall establish and maintain a growth management plan to ensure the development of a balanced mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses.

PF-P-24. Ensure that all new development provides for and funds a fair share of the costs for adequate sewer distribution, including line extensions, easements, and plant expansions.

PF-P-25. The City will maintain the ability to handle peak discharge flow while meeting State Regional Water Quality Control Board Standards as established in the current NPDES Permit.

PF-I-8. The City shall update the Public Facilities Implementation Plan regarding wastewater collection and treatment every five years. The update shall be reviewed annually for adequacy and consistency with the General Plan.

PF-I-9. The City will require all sewage generators within its service area to connect to the City's system, except those areas where on-site treatment and disposal facilities are deemed appropriate.

PF-I-10. The City will encourage and permit an industrial pretreatment program for business parks and other industrial uses in accordance with state and federal requirements.

PF-I-11. The City will investigate methods of improving the quality of the effluent from the City plant and will investigate options for reuse of treated wastewater. The recycled wastewater will be used for irrigation of public recreation lands, restoration of wetland areas, and irrigation of landscaped areas.

PF-I-12. The City will promote reduced wastewater system demand through efficient water use by:

- requiring water conserving design and equipment in new construction,
- encouraging retrofitting with water conserving devices,

- designing wastewater systems to minimize inflow and infiltration to the extent economically feasible; and
- maintaining a Citywide map of all sewer collection system components and monitoring the condition of the system on a regular basis.

#### ***Resource Conservation Element Goals***

Goal RC-2. Maximize the beneficial uses of water by recycling water for irrigation and other non-potable uses.

#### ***Resource Conservation Element Policies***

RC-P-1. The City shall continue to implement water conservation standards for all commercial and industrial development, and for all existing and new residential development.

RC-P-2. The City shall explore potential uses of treated wastewater when such opportunities become available.

RC-P-3. The City shall protect the quantity of Manteca's groundwater.

RC-P-4. The City shall require water conservation in both City operations and private development to minimize the need for the development of new water sources.

RC-P-5. Development of private water wells within the city limits shall be allowed only where the City makes a finding that municipal water service is not readily and feasibly available, and such private well systems shall only be allowed to be used until such time as City water service becomes available.

RC-I-1. Continue to implement standards for water conserving landscape practices, including the use of drought tolerant plants, for both public and private projects.

RC-I-2. Continue efforts to increase public participation in water conservation.

RC-I-3. Require large commercial and industrial water users to submit a use and conservation plan as part of the project entitlement review and approval process, and develop a program to monitor compliance with and effectiveness of that plan.

RC-I-4. Cooperate with other agencies and jurisdictions to expand water conservation programs, and to develop methods of water reuse.

RC-I-5. Actively pursue the use of treated wastewater in irrigation and industrial applications, including development of appropriate infrastructure.

#### **City of Manteca Municipal Code**

The City of Manteca Municipal Code, Title 13 (Public Services) chapter 13.12 (Sewer Connection Charges), chapter 13.14 (Sewer Capacity Charges), and chapter 13.16 (Sewer Service Charges) contain regulations associated with sewer management.

Title 13 (Public Services), chapter 13.38 (Public Facilities Implementation Program Fees), Section 13.38.050 (Establishment of a Sewer Fee) requires developers of property to pay a sewer facility development fee.

### Utility Master Plans

The City of Manteca maintains a variety of Master Plan documents that guide the design, development, and maintenance of the utilities within the city limits. These include: *Urban Water Management Plan (2005)*, *Water Master Plan (2005)*, *Storm Drain Master Plan (2013)*, *Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (2012)*, *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update (2006)*, *Draft Sewer Rate Study (2008)*.

### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE - WASTEWATER

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on the environment associated with Utilities if it will:

1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.
2. Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment and/or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
3. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

#### **Impact 3.15-1: The proposed project has the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. (less than significant)**

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS (WDRs) BOARD ORDER NUMBER R5-2004-0028 (NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0081558).

The City of Manteca owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system, and provides sewerage service to the City of Manteca and the City of Lathrop. On October 8, 2009, the RWQCB adopted Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R5-2009-0095 NPDES NO. CA0081558, prescribing waste discharge requirements for the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) and allowing expansion of the plant up to 17.5 mgd.

The City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) is a Publicly-Owned Domestic Wastewater Treatment Works. The Facility is divided into two parallel treatment systems, the north and south treatment systems. Primary treatment, which is identical in both systems, consists of mechanical screening, aerated grit removal, and primary sedimentation. At the north plant, the

primary effluent undergoes additional treatment through two biotowers with high-rate plastic media. The secondary treatment systems for both treatment systems are the same, which consists of conventional activated sludge, including nitrification-denitrification, followed by secondary sedimentation.

Grit and screenings are hauled offsite to a landfill for disposal. Sludge removed from primary and secondary sedimentation is thickened by dissolved air floatation, and then pumped to anaerobic digesters. After digestion, the treated sludge is dewatered by centrifuge, and then removed offsite for disposal in a privately-owned solid waste landfill.

Undisinfected secondary effluent is mixed with food processing waste and applied to agricultural fields that grow fodder and feed crops for dairy feed. Dischargers are responsible for maintaining the pipeline from the Facility to the agricultural fields.

Excess secondary effluent undergoes tertiary treatment through coagulation and flocculation, cloth media filtration, and ultraviolet light pathogen deactivation (UV Disinfection). Disinfected tertiary level treated effluent is discharged to the San Joaquin River. The San Joaquin River is a water of the United States, within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The Discharger also provides disinfected tertiary-level treated effluent for reuse for construction purposes (e.g. dust control).

The Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. R5-2009-0095 NPDES NO. CA0081558 includes: Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications, Receiving Water Limitations, Provisions, Compliance Determination, and Monitoring Requirements. This Order was approved on October 8, 2009.

The City of Manteca's wastewater treatment system is currently in compliance with the WDR requirements of Order No. R5-2009-0095 NPDES NO. CA0081558. The wastewater treatment system options covered under this Order include: City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) including the collection system, basin/disposal fields, discharge to the San Joaquin River, and recycling conveyance and irrigation system. The development of the proposed project under this permitted option would not exceed the wastewater discharge requirements in this Order. The proposed project is anticipated to have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic. The allocation of wastewater service capacity is discussed in the following impact topic.

**Impact 3.15-2: The proposed project has the potential to result in a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. (less than significant with mitigation)**

The City's *Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update* projected wastewater generation factors for various land uses. Based on these calculations it was determined that the City will have flows totaling 19.5 mgd as of the General Plan horizon of 2023 with a buildout capacity of 23.0 mgd. The study includes a reduction of industrial and general commercial wastewater generation factors to reflect historical water use data from local businesses.

The overall collection sewer strategy for the City of Manteca, including the proposed project, consist of a combination trunk sewer gravity collection system with pump or lift stations located along the collection system to convey wastewater to an influent pump station located at the City Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF). The North Manteca Collection Strategy (NMCS) and South Manteca Collection Strategy (SMCS) both collect flows from areas where future growth is expected. The Central Manteca Collection Strategy (CMCS) connects the existing collection system to the NMCS.

The continued use of existing pump stations, and addition of pump and lift stations, allows for a reduction in the depth of the trunk sewers proposed in previous master plans. Additionally, an increase in the ratio of liquid depth to pipe diameter (d/D) design criteria for pipe capacity from 40-60 percent full in previous master plans to 70-80 percent full at peak flow resulted in the downsizing of several links within the proposed trunk sewer strategy.

The hotel rooms (and water park) are estimated to generate approximately 45 gallons of wastewater per day. For the proposed project, the 500 room hotel would generate about 22,500 gallons of wastewater per day.

The retail, food and beverage, main street retail, and dining and entertainment uses total 34 acres of land. The *2010 Master Plan Update Wastewater Generation Factors Technical Memorandum* (Nolte 2010) recommends a 750 gallon per day wastewater generation factor as an average for commercial uses. Based on this rate, these commercial uses would generate an estimated 25,500 gallons of wastewater per day, which is equivalent to 14.1 gallons per square foot. Using this per square foot equivalent, the 37,500 square feet of commercial space and 30,000 square foot conference center within the hotel would generate an estimated 4,787 gallons of wastewater per day.

The ball fields are estimated to generate 3 gallons of wastewater per day per seat. There is not currently a refined site plan illustrating the number of seats for the ball fields; therefore, a conservative estimate of 300 seats per ball field will be made in this EIR. There are an estimated 5-10 ball fields. Under the maximum of 10 ball fields, there would be 3,000 seats. The total wastewater generated by the ball fields would be 9,000 gallons per day. (*Note: this is a very conservative estimate, and is likely an overestimate*).

The total wastewater generated by the proposed project is estimated to be 61,787 gallons per day.

The proposed project would increase the amount of wastewater requiring treatment. The wastewater would be treated at the WQCF. Occupancy of the proposed project would be prohibited without sewer allocation. An issuance of sewer allocation from the City's available capacity would ensure that there would not be a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider that there is inadequate capacity to serve the proposed project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Additionally, any planned expansion to the WQCF with a subsequent allocation of capacity to the proposed project would ensure that there would not be a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider that there is inadequate capacity to serve the proposed project's projected demand in

addition to the provider's existing commitments. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.15-1 would reduce this potential impact to a **less than significant** level.

#### MITIGATION MEASURE

**Mitigation Measure 3.15-1:** *Prior to occupancy of any building that would require wastewater treatment services; the project proponent shall secure adequate wastewater treatment allocation through the City's allocation process.*

### **Impact 3.15-3: The proposed project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (less-than-significant)**

The wastewater collection and conveyance system that will serve the proposed project will consist of engineered infrastructure consistent with the City's existing infrastructure requirements. Sizing of existing infrastructure in the City varies based on location, but generally includes gravity sewers and force mains ranging in size from 6 to 60 inches, and pump stations. The existing facilities have undergone environmental review and have waste discharge permits from the State.

New wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure needed for the proposed project will require trenching/excavation of earth, and placement of pipe within the trenches at specific locations, elevations, and gradients. The City of Manteca Wastewater Collection System Master Plan calls for a 48-inch to 54-inch diameter sewer trunk line through the Project site to replace the existing force main serving the southern portion of Manteca. This trunk line will extend from the existing 60-inch gravity line that has been stubbed just south of SR 120 to an existing 60-inch stub within the WQCF. This trunk line will be constructed with the development of land on the Project site inside the east utility corridor. Sanitary sewer generated by the proposed project will be conveyed to this trunk line via 8-inch gravity sewer lines located within proposed street rights-of-way. The City also has plans for an additional 36-inch gravity effluent line and one more 12-inch force main to be located along the western edge of the Project site. The existing 36-inch gravity effluent line will be relocated into the west utility corridor, and the new effluent lines will be installed alongside it. The existing 12-inch industrial waste force main will also be relocated into this utility corridor. Figure 2-11 depicts both the existing and proposed master sewer collection system components described above.

The installation of the wastewater collection and conveyance system infrastructure to serve the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

The wastewater treatment plant would not require upgrades or improvements in order to serve the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

### 3.15.2 WATER SUPPLIES

#### EXISTING SETTING

---

The project site is located within the Manteca city limits and within the City's Primary Urban Service Area (PUSA). The City's water system service area includes all areas within the PUSA. Therefore, the City is the identified public water system for the Project. The proposed project, if approved by the City, is capable of being served by the City from the City's existing and future portfolio of water supplies. The water supply for the proposed project will have the same water supply reliability and water quality as the water supply available to each of the City's other existing and future water customers.

#### **Water Service Area**

As described in the City's 2005 UWMP, the City is located in the flat plain at the northern end of California's San Joaquin Valley in south San Joaquin County. The City is located approximately 10 miles south of Stockton and 15 miles north of Modesto. Rich agricultural lands border Manteca on the north, east and south while areas to the west are used primarily for industry. The Southern Pacific Railroad cuts the City diagonally from southeast to northwest. State Route 120 crosses the southern portion of the City and provides a connection between Interstate 5, located about four miles to the west of the City, and State Route 99 along the eastern boundary of the City. The City's location creates a good setting for San Francisco Bay area commuter housing as well as new commercial and industrial locations.

Presently, the City limits encompass an area of about 17 square miles (10,890 acres). Approximately 67 percent (7,281 acres) of the area within the City limits have been developed. The City provides water service to about 16,000 residential and 700 institutional, commercial, and industrial customers. The City, along with much of the San Joaquin Valley, anticipates substantial future growth given the City's proximity to the San Francisco Bay area.

The water supply for the City consists of treated surface water delivered through the South County Water Supply Program (SCWSP) and groundwater extracted within the City. The water utility system is a self-supporting City enterprise. The water utility is responsible for operation, maintenance, and repair of the City's water distribution system, as well as water quality monitoring, meter installation, and meter reading. For reference, background information is presented below for the City service area, including projected population and climate.

#### **Historical and Future Water Demand**

The following information is contained in the *Water Supply Assessment for Family Entertainment Zone* (West Yost Associates. 2015). The City's most recently adopted UWMP (the City's 2005 UWMP) was adopted by the City Council on December 19, 2005<sup>1</sup>. The City's 2005 UWMP included existing and projected water demands for existing and projected future land uses to be developed

---

<sup>1</sup> Prepared by City of Manteca, *City of Manteca 2005 Urban Water Management Plan*. December 2005.

within the City’s General Plan Sphere of Influence through 2030. Although the Project’s potable water demand was not specifically designated in the City’s 2005 UWMP, the water demand projections in the City’s 2005 UWMP included existing City water demands, future water demands for developments within the existing City limit, and future water demands for future service areas outside the existing City limit.

Total water use throughout the City service area was projected in the City’s 2005 UWMP to increase from 18,310 AFY in 2010 to 35,735 AFY in 2030, an increase of 17,425 AFY. In 2010, the City’s actual total water use was 13,064 AFY, which was 5,246 AFY less than the volume projected in the 2005 UWMP. City staff has also updated the projected potable water demand for 2035 to be 31,499 acre-feet. The water demand projection included in the City’s 2005 UWMP did not include the impacts of the City’s water conservation plan, nor did it include compliance with the Water Conservation Act of 2009, known as SBx7-7, since that law was promulgated after adoption of the City’s 2005 UWMP.

The City’s 2005 UWMP showed a slight water supply deficit by the year 2030. However, as noted above, the City has recently revised its demand and supply projections based on current water use and projected new development. The revised projections indicate that sufficient water supply exists, or will exist, to serve the Project. This is described further in Chapters 5 and 6 of this WSA.

**Projected Water Demand for City of Manteca**

The City’s 2005 UWMP describes the projected City water demand through 2030. The City has recently developed revised potable water demand projections, shown in Table 3.15-3. The City’s detailed projections are included in Attachment B of the Water Supply Assessment.

**TABLE 3.15-3: CITY OF MANTECA TOTAL WATER DEMAND PROJECTION<sup>(A)</sup>**

YEAR	PROJECTED NORMAL YEAR DEMAND, AFY	PROJECTED SINGLE DRY YEAR DEMAND, AFY(B)	PROJECTED MULTI-DRY YEAR DEMAND, AFY(C)
2015	20,950	18,113	20,575
2020	23,169	20,104	22,785
2025	25,728	22,401	25,334
2030	28,602	24,982	28,198
2035	31,499	27,583	29,636

<sup>(a)</sup> Received from City staff, January 13, 2015. Total Water Demand Projection includes non-potable (raw water) City Park irrigation, and private well demand within the PUSA. Refer to Attachment B.

<sup>(b)</sup> Assumes Stage 2 Water Conservation (25% reduction in irrigation demand and 10% reduction in potable demand).

<sup>(c)</sup> Assumes Stage 1 Water Conservation (25% reduction in irrigation demand).

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

Several steps, including demand reduction, are being taken to help ensure an adequate water supply for the City. The City’s 2005 UWMP provides a discussion of how the City is evaluating and implementing the 14 Demand Management Measures (DMM) required by the Urban Water Management Planning Act. These DMMs include programs such as water surveys for single-family and multi-family residences, residential plumbing retrofits, and school education. In addition, the City’s proposed water conservation ordinance (included in its 2005 UWMP) describes four stages of action to be undertaken to achieve a water use reduction of up to 50 percent.

**Water Supplies**

The City’s 2005 UWMP describes the City’s available water supplies. The City’s water supplies include local groundwater and treated surface water from the SSJID South County Water Supply Project (SCWSP). Historical and recent supplies of groundwater and surface water are summarized in Table 3.15-4.

**TABLE 3.15-4: HISTORICAL AND RECENT POTABLE WATER SUPPLY (1960-2013) FOR THE CITY OF MANTECA<sup>(a)</sup>**

YEAR	GROUNDWATER PUMPING, AFY	TREATED SURFACE WATER DELIVERIES, AFY	TOTAL, AFY
1960	2,277	—	2,277
1970	3,115	—	3,115
1980	5,785	—	5,785
1990	9,873	—	9,873
2000	12,608	—	12,608
2001	12,969	—	12,969
2002	13,509	—	13,509
2003	14,298	—	14,298
2004	14,933	—	14,933
2005	11,276	2,749	14,025
2010	7,343	5,721	13,064
2011	7,893	5,843	13,736
2012	8,945	5,894	14,839
2013	8,351	7,399	15,750

<sup>(a)</sup> Water production data prior to 2003 are from Trails of Manteca WSA. Water production data from 2003 and later are from the Water Conservation and Drought Planning staff presentation to City Council, February 4, 2014.

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

**SURFACE WATER**

The principal component of future water supply for the City is deliveries from the SCWSP. The SCWSP is a joint effort of SSJID and the cities of Escalon, Manteca, Lathrop, and Tracy to supply treated potable water to the participating cities. The City has entered into a Water Supply Development Agreement with SSJID for its share of the SCWSP. SCWSP water allotments are presented in Table 3.13-5. The Phase I and Phase II SCWSP water allotments for the City are 11,500 ac-ft/yr and 18,500 ac-ft/yr, respectively. Phase I of the SCWSP is assumed through 2020 and Phase II is assumed for 2025 and later.

**TABLE 3.15-5: SOUTH COUNTY WATER SUPPLY PROGRAM WATER ALLOTMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING CITIES**

PARTICIPATING CITIES	ALLOTMENT, AFY	
	PHASE I	PHASE II
Escalon	2,015	2,799
Lathrop	6,787	10,671
Manteca	11,500	18,500
Tracy	11,120	11,120
<i>Total</i>	<i>31,522</i>	<i>43,090</i>

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

The SCWSP includes a water treatment plant (WTP) located near Woodward Reservoir and 36.5 miles of pipeline ranging in diameter from 20-inches to 54-inches to transport treated water to

various turnouts for each of the four cities. The WTP has an initial capacity of 36 million gallons per day (mgd) and a planned ultimate capacity of 60 mgd.

#### GROUNDWATER

The local groundwater basin and City groundwater use are described in the City's 2005 UWMP. A brief description of the groundwater basin and a discussion of historical and projected groundwater pumping are provided below.

##### ***Basin Boundaries, Soils, and Storage Capacity***

The City's wells are located in the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin. The basin is not adjudicated; however, a basin management plan has been created. The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan (ESJGB-GMP) (NSJCGB, 2004) was prepared in September 2004. The purpose of the ESJGB-GMP is "to review, enhance, assess, and coordinate existing groundwater management policies and programs in Eastern San Joaquin County and to develop new policies and programs to ensure the long-term sustainability of groundwater resources in Eastern San Joaquin County." According to Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 (DWR, 2006), the ESJGB is in a critical condition of overdraft. Groundwater levels have declined in the basin since the 1960s with the lowest groundwater levels found in eastern San Joaquin County.

Most of the fresh groundwater is encountered at depths of less than 1,000 feet, and most of this shallow groundwater is unconfined. A discussion of basin hydrogeology is provided in the ESJGB-GMP. The Victor formation is the uppermost formation and extends from the ground surface to a maximum depth of about 150 feet. Compared to the underlying formations, the Victor formation is generally more permeable and the groundwater is typically unconfined.

The underlying Laguna formation includes discontinuous lenses of unconsolidated to semi-consolidated sands and silts interspersed with lesser amounts of clay and gravel. The Laguna formation is hydraulically connected to the Victor formation and is estimated to be 750 to 1,000 feet thick. Moderate permeability has been reported within the Laguna formation with some highly permeable coarse-grained beds. Most of the municipal and industrial wells in the Manteca area penetrate through the Victor formation into the Laguna formation.

##### ***Past and Projected Future Groundwater Pumping***

Groundwater pumping in Manteca increased from 2,277 AFY in 1960 to a maximum of 14,933 AFY in 2004 prior to the SCWSP delivering treated surface water to the City.

According to the City's 2005 UWMP, the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin was estimated in a 1985 study to be approximately 1 acre-foot per acre per year. Although groundwater pumping in some years has exceeded that rate, as part of the SCWSP, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping within the PUSA to that rate or less. At this time, the area of the City's PUSA is 13,790 acres. Therefore, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to a long-term average of no greater than 13,790 afy.

**Dry Year Water Supply Availability and Reliability**

**SURFACE WATER RELIABILITY**

SSJID has existing agreements to provide surface water to agricultural interests, federal and state agencies, and cities in the south San Joaquin area. Some of these agreements are long-term, while others are as short as one week for agricultural water deliveries.

**SURFACE WATER ENTITLEMENTS**

Both the SSJID and the Oakdale Irrigation District (OID) were formed in 1909 following the acquisition of the old Tulloch Ditch Company water rights. SSJID receives a major portion of its water supply from the Stanislaus River, pursuant to a number of pre-1914 water rights, beginning with 1853 diversion rights. Based on these pre-1914 water rights, SSJID and OID are entitled to a combined 1,816.6 cubic feet per second (cfs) of direct surface water diversions from the Stanislaus River annually.

These pre-1914 water rights are equally shared with OID and are adjudicated (SSJID, 1999). A 1988 agreement between SSJID, OID, and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) recognized and protected the OID and SSJID senior water rights that would be affected by the New Melones Reservoir. The agreement entitles SSJID and OID to 600,000 ac-ft/yr in years when inflow to New Melones Reservoir is equal to or exceeds 600,000 ac-ft. In years when inflow to New Melones Reservoir is less than 600,000 ac-ft, the entitlement is reduced based on a predetermined formula. During periods of normal flow, SSJID’s entitlement is 300,000 ac-ft/yr.

**RELIABILITY OF SCWSP DELIVERIES**

A summary of projected SCWSP surface water supply availability is presented in Table 3.15-6.

**TABLE 3.15-6: PROJECTED ANNUAL SCWSP DELIVERIES FOR NORMAL HYDROLOGIC YEAR<sup>(A)</sup>**

YEAR	SCWSP DELIVERIES, AFY
2015	11,500
2020	11,500
2025	18,500
2030 <sup>(B)</sup>	18,500
2035 <sup>(B)</sup>	18,500

NOTE: ASSUMES SCWSP PHASE II WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO 2025. REFER TO ATTACHMENT B.

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

According to the 2010 SSJID UWMP, possible reductions in surface water supply for the City from the SCWSP could be required in Single Dry and Multiple Dry Years. The projected surface water deliveries to the City are presented in Table 3.15-7.

Under single-year and multiple-year dry period scenarios, deliveries to the City by SSJID could be reduced. The City could compensate for this reduction in deliveries through increased groundwater pumping, implementation of water conservation measures, and possibly the expanded use of recycled water.

**TABLE 3.15-7: SCWSP SURFACE WATER DELIVERIES TO THE CITY OF MANTECA DURING HYDROLOGIC SINGLE- AND MULTIPLE-DRY YEARS <sup>(A)</sup>**

DELIVERY TYPE	SCWSP DELIVERIES TO MANTECA BY YEAR, AC-FT/YR				
	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
NORMAL YEAR	11,500	11,500	18,500	18,500	18,500
SINGLE-YEAR DRY PERIOD <sup>(B)</sup>	7,245	7,245	11,655	11,655	11,655
MULTIPLE-YEAR DRY PERIOD <sup>(C)</sup>	9,890	9,890	15,910	15,910	15,910

<sup>(a)</sup> Based on values provided by City, refer to Attachment B for more detail.

<sup>(b)</sup> Per City staff, the SSJID 2012 Agricultural Water Management Plan states the minimum supply for any year would be 63% of total supply. Sixty three percent of 11,500 AFY is 7,245 AFY, and 63% of 18,500 AFY is 11,655 AFY.

<sup>(c)</sup> SSJID 2010 UWMP TABLE 6.5 INDICATES 85.6 PERCENT DELIVERY IN 2015, 84.8 PERCENT IN 2020, 87.7 PERCENT IN 2025, AND 91.5 PERCENT IN 2030. ASSUMED 91.5 PERCENT IN 2035. PER CITY STAFF, THE VALUES SHOWN ARE 86% OF THE NORMAL YEAR SUPPLY.

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

It is important to note that in this current drought, SSJID is delivering 100 percent of the City’s requested surface water allocation.

**GROUNDWATER RELIABILITY**

Projected total available water supplies during hydrologic normal years, single-year dry periods, and multiple-year dry periods are summarized in Table 3.15-8. As presented in Table 3.15-8, the surface water supply may decrease under single-year and multiple-year dry period conditions. This shortfall would be made up through increased groundwater pumping and city-wide conservation measures. Groundwater extractions will be maintained within the safe yield of the groundwater basin. As documented in the City’s 2005 UWMP, the maximum groundwater pumping is based on the estimated safe aquifer yield of 1 afy/acre, and a Primary Urban Service Area (PUSA) area of 13,790 acres. Therefore, the City is targeting a groundwater pumping regime that will not exceed 13,790 afy on a long-term average.

**TABLE 3.15-8: SUMMARY OF PROJECTED WATER SUPPLY DURING HYDROLOGIC NORMAL, SINGLE-DRY, AND MULTI-DRY YEARS FOR CITY OF MANTECA**

YEAR	AVAILABLE WATER SUPPLY								
	NORMAL YEAR, AFY			SINGLE-DRY YEAR DROUGHT, AFY			MULTI-DRY YEAR DROUGHT, AFY		
	GROUND WATER	SURFACE WATER <sup>A</sup>	TOTAL	GROUND WATER	SURFACE WATER <sup>A</sup>	TOTAL	GROUND WATER	SURFACE WATER <sup>A</sup>	TOTAL
2015	12,000	11,500	23,500	13,790	7,245	21,035	12,000	9,890	21,890
2020	13,790	11,500	25,290	13,500	7,245	20,745	13,790	9,890	23,680
2025	13,790	18,500	32,290	13,790	11,655	25,445	13,790	15,910	29,700
2030	13,790	18,500	32,290	13,790	11,655	25,445	13,790	15,910	29,700
2035	13,790	18,500	32,290	16,000	11,655	27,655	13,790	15,910	29,700

NOTE : (A)SCWSP DELIVERIES TO CITY OF MANTECA.

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

**Water Master Plan**

The City of Manteca currently provides domestic water to its customers via a network of wells and transmission lines which draw groundwater and distribute throughout the City. The City also provides treated surface water via the South County Surface Water Supply Project (SCSWSP), a joint project with the South San Joaquin Irrigation District, the City of Lathrop, the City of Tracy, and the City of Escalon.

*Existing Facilities:* Existing distribution improvements in the vicinity of the FEZ include a 12” main in Daniels Street, extending from Airport Way to the west end of Daniels Street, and a 12” main in Milo Candini Drive extending from Daniels Street to the north limits of Big League Dreams. North of the project, there is an existing 12-inch line in Yosemite Avenue.

*Proposed Facilities:* The FEZ will receive water service by extending the existing distribution system through the proposed development. Specifically, a 12-inch distribution main will be installed within the proposed alignment of Milo Candini from its current northern terminal to Yosemite Avenue, providing a looped connection between Daniels Street and Yosemite Avenue. This system will be further extended through the development with 12-inch lines in the loop road and Wawona Street, as well as Daniels Street to McKinley Avenue. This will provide a reliable distribution network to serve the proposed uses within the project. Smaller water lines (not shown in the master plan) will be installed as needed to extend water from the 12-inch distribution mains to the proposed developments. No additional water supply (well) or storage (tank) will be required for the development of the project.

*Recycled Water:* The City has plans to develop a recycled water system that will provide landscape irrigation water to public parks, landscaping, etc., with recycled water from the City’s Water Quality Control Facility (WQCF). The FEZ will be a natural recipient of this recycled water due to its close proximity to the WQCF and its large areas of open space/park. Proposed recycled water improvements within the Project site will include the installation of 12-inch distribution mains extending from the WQCF south along the west side of the WQCF to Wawona Street and then east to the proposed utility corridor west of Big League Dreams and then south to connect to the existing recycled water line in Daniels Street. These recycled water lines will be charged from the domestic system initially, but will ultimately be disconnected from the City’s domestic system and isolated as a recycled water (purple pipe) system. Figure 2-10 depicts both the existing and proposed master water distribution system components described above.

## REGULATORY SETTING – WATER SUPPLIES

---

### **Safe Drinking Water Act**

The federal Safe Drinking Water Act as passed in 1947 and amended in 1986 and 1996. It is the Country’s primary law regulating drinking water quality and in implemented by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA). The Safe Drinking Water Act authorizes the US EPA to set national health-based standards for drinking water and requires actions to protect drinking water and its sources. Additionally, it provides for treatment, monitoring, sampling, analytical methods, reporting, and public information requirements. Implementation of the Act, in California, is under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), Division of Drinking Water and Environmental Management. Drinking Water regulations are set forth in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Titles 7 and 22.

### **Water Conservation Projects Act**

California’s requirements for water conservation are codified in the Water Conservation Projects Act of 1985 (Water Code Sections 11950 – 11954).

Consistent with California Water Code Sections 11950 – 11954, the City has implemented various water conservation efforts, as well as Water Shortage Contingency Plan that identifies actions that can be taken to respond to catastrophic interruption of water supply.

### **Senate Bill (SB) 610**

Senate Bill (SB) 610 was adopted in 2001 and reflects the growing awareness of the need to incorporate water supply and demand analysis at the earliest possible stage in the land use planning process. SB 610 amended the statutes of the Urban Water Management Planning Act, as well as the California Water Code Section 10910 et seq. The foundation document for compliance with SB 610 is the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which provides an important source of information for cities and counties as they update their general plans. Likewise, planning documents such as general plans and specific plans form the basis for the demand information contained in an UWMP, as well as a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) required under SB 610.

Water Code Section 10910 (c)(4) states “If the city or county is required to comply with this part pursuant to subdivision (b), the water assessment for the project shall include a discussion with regard to whether the total projected water supplies, determined to be available by the city or county for the project during normal, single dry and multiple dry water years during a 20-year projection, will meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed project, in addition to existing and planned future uses, including agricultural and manufacturing uses.”

Water supply planning under SB 610 requires reviewing and identifying adequate available water supplies necessary to meet the demand generated by a project, as well as the cumulative demand for the general region over the next 20 years, under a broad range of water conditions. This information is typically found in the current UWMP for the project area. SB 610 requires the identification of the public water supplier for a project.

In addition, SB 610 requires the preparation of a WSA if a project meets the definition of a “Project” under Water Code Section 10912 (a). The code defines a “Project” as meeting any of the following criteria:

- A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units;
- A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space;
- A commercial building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space;
- A hotel or motel with more than 500 rooms;
- A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park, planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area;
- A mixed-use project that includes one or more of these elements; or
- A project creating the equivalent demand of 500 residential units.

Alternately, if a public water system has less than 5,000 service connections, the definition of a “Project” includes any proposed residential, business, commercial, hotel or motel, or industrial development that would account for an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of service connections for the public water system. The proposed project includes more than 650,000 square feet of floor area as part of a proposed industrial uses, and therefore, qualifies as a “Project” under Section 10912 (a) of the Water Code. Thus, the City has prepared a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) as required by these criteria under SB 610. The WSA is included in appendix of this EIR.

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

#### ***Land Use Element Goals***

Goal LU-4. Provide for land uses that expand employment, education, recreation and cultural opportunities for residents and enhance Manteca as the commercial and service center for southern San Joaquin County.

#### ***Land Use Element Policies***

LU-P-30: The City shall promote, cooperate in, and assist in the maintenance and expansion of Manteca’s industrial sector employment development within the City of Manteca and in the south San Joaquin County area that will help reduce the home-to-work commute distance for Manteca residents.

LU-P-31: New employment centers that may include office, business professional, research and development, and light industrial or industrial development and shall be located in areas served by full City services or served by suitable facilities approved by the City. Employment centers should be located along major arterials with easy freeway access and with access from public transit, and accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians.

LU-P-32: The City shall continue to support full development of its existing industrial park.

LU-P-33: The City shall promote the development of “clean” industries that do not create problems or pose health risks associated with water and air pollution or potential leaks or spills. However, the City will designate appropriate locations that accommodate light industrial and heavy industrial uses.

LU-P-34: Redevelopment incentives shall be used judiciously to promote industrial employment development in approved Project Areas and for projects benefiting approved Project Areas.

LU-P-35: The City shall monitor employment development to maintain the balance of residential, commercial, and industrial development.

LU-P-36: The City shall promote and plan for at least one Primary Employment Center to accommodate a variety of employment opportunities compatible with the employment skills of the Manteca resident labor force.

#### ***Public Facilities and Services Element Goals***

PF-6. Public facilities and services agencies will cooperate on a regional basis.

PF-7. Maintain an adequate level of service in the City's water system to meet the needs of existing and projected development.

PF-8. Maintain an adequate level of service in the City's sewage collection and disposal system to meet the needs of existing and projected development.

PF-9. Maintain an adequate level of service in the City's drainage system to accommodate runoff from existing and projected development and to prevent property damage due to flooding.

***Public Facilities and Services Element Policies***

PF-P-1. Facilitate development in the in-fill areas by extending infrastructure.

PF-P-2. Encourage comprehensive development rather than incremental, single project development.

PF-P-3. Make use of the public right-of-way as a tool for facilitating quality design and development.

PF-I-1. The City shall periodically review its fee schedules for water and sewer connections and for city facilities and major equipment and revise them as necessary.

PF-P-4. Secure sufficient sources of water to meet the needs of the existing community and planned residential and commercial growth.

PF-P-5. City will continue to rely principally on groundwater resources for its municipal water in the near term, will participate in the regional improvements to deliver surface water to augment the City's groundwater supply.

PF-P-6. The City shall develop new water sources as necessary to serve new development.

PF-P-7. The City shall develop new water storage facilities and major distribution lines as necessary to serve new development.

PF-P-8. The City will provide water for future development to maintain a balance of jobs and housing.

PF-P-9. City water services shall not be extended to unincorporated areas except in extraordinary circumstances. Existing commitments for City water service outside the City limits shall continue to be honored.

PF-P-10. Development of private water wells within the City limits shall be allowed only where the City makes a finding that it cannot feasibly provide water service. Such systems shall only be allowed to be used until such time as City water service becomes available.

PF-P-11. The City will develop and implement water conservation measures as necessary elements of the water system.

PF-P-12. The City shall continue to assess a water development fee on all new commercial, industrial, and residential development sufficient to fund system wide capacity improvements. The water development fee schedule shall be periodically reviewed and revised as necessary.

PF-P-13. Ensure that all new development provides for and funds a fair share of the costs for adequate water distribution, including line extensions, easements, and plant expansions.

PF-P-14. The City shall continuously monitor water flows through the City's water system to identify areas of potential water loss and cases of under billing for water service and shall make improvements in the systems as necessary.

PF-P-15. The City shall monitor water quality regularly and take necessary measures to prevent contamination.

PF-P-16. The City of Manteca shall include a groundwater analysis as a technical analysis of water system capacity in the update of the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP), and shall prepare an environmental analysis in the PFIP that addresses the quality and availability of groundwater.

PF-P-17. The City of Manteca shall consider incremental increases in the demands on groundwater supply and water quality when reviewing development applications.

PF-P-18. Ensure wastewater collection and treatment for all development in the City and the safe disposal of wastes.

PF-P-19. The City will maintain capacity to process combined residential, commercial, and industrial flow.

PF-P-20. The City shall develop new sewage treatment and trunk line capacity as necessary to serve new development.

PF-P-21. City sewer services will not be extended to unincorporated areas, except in extraordinary circumstances. Existing commitments for sewer service outside the city limits shall continue to be honored.

PF-P-22. Development of individual septic systems may be allowed only where the City makes a finding that it cannot feasibly provide public sewer service, and such systems shall only be used until such time as City sewer service becomes available. Such systems shall meet the minimum standards of the San Joaquin County Health Department.

PF-P-23. The City shall establish and maintain a growth management plan to ensure the development of a balanced mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses.

PF-P-24. Ensure that all new development provides for and funds a fair share of the costs for adequate sewer distribution, including line extensions, easements, and plant expansions.

PF-P-25. The City will maintain the ability to handle peak discharge flow while meeting State Regional Water Quality Control Board Standards as established in the current NPDES Permit.

PF-P-26. The City shall continue to complete gaps in the drainage system in areas of existing development.

PF-P-27. The City shall require the dedication and improvement of drainage detention basins as a condition of development approval according to the standards of the Drainage Master Plan. The responsibility for the dedication and improvement of detention basins shall be based on the prorated share of storm water runoff resulting from each development.

PF-P-28. Storm drainage systems within new development areas shall include open drainage corridors where feasible to supplement or replace an underground piped drainage system. The drainage systems would provide for short-term storm water detention, storm water conveyance for storm waters exceeding a 10-year event, storm water quality treatment, bike and pedestrian paths, and visual open space within neighborhoods. The width and length of the corridors would be determined by the storm water management requirements. The drainage systems would provide a pedestrian connection between parks and access to open space from residential neighborhoods. The neighborhoods would be designed with homes oriented to, rather than backing on the open space corridor.

***Public Facilities and Services Element Implementation Measures***

PF-I-2. The City shall update the Public Facilities Implementation Plan, regarding water supply and distribution, every five years. The update shall be reviewed annually for adequacy and consistency with the General Plan.

PF-I-3. The City shall require, as a condition of project approval, dedication of land and easements, or payment of appropriate fees and exactions, to help offset municipal costs of expansion of water treatment facilities and delivery systems.

PF-I-4. The City shall retain a water conservation ordinance requiring the installation of low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads, and similar features in all new development.

PF-I-5. The City shall institute a remote monitoring program for the City's water system and replace faulty meters in the system as necessary. The City will continue the practice of identifying and replacing faulty meters at service connections on an ongoing basis.

PF-I-6. The City shall regularly monitor water quality in City wells and take remedial action as necessary.

PF-I-7. The City will encourage the use of recycled water for landscape irrigation where feasible, within the parameters of State and County Health Codes and standards.

PF-I-8. The City shall update the Public Facilities Implementation Plan regarding wastewater collection and treatment every five years. The update shall be reviewed annually for adequacy and consistency with the General Plan.

PF-I-9. The City will require all sewage generators within its service area to connect to the City's system, except those areas where on-site treatment and disposal facilities are deemed appropriate.

PF-I-10. The City will encourage and permit an industrial pretreatment program for business parks and other industrial uses in accordance with state and federal requirements.

PF-I-11. The City will investigate methods of improving the quality of the effluent from the City plant and will investigate options for reuse of treated wastewater. The recycled wastewater will be used for irrigation of public recreation lands, restoration of wetland areas, and irrigation of landscaped areas.

PF-I-12. The City will promote reduced wastewater system demand through efficient water use by:

- requiring water conserving design and equipment in new construction,
- encouraging retrofitting with water conserving devices,
- designing wastewater systems to minimize inflow and infiltration to the extent economically feasible; and
- maintaining a Citywide map of all sewer collection system components and monitoring the condition of the system on a regular basis.

PF-I-13. The City shall update the Storm Drainage Master Plan and Public Facilities Implementation Plan, regarding water supply and distribution, every five years. The update shall be reviewed annually for adequacy and consistency with the General Plan.

### ***Safety Element Goals***

S-5. Participate in a Regional Flood Management Plan.

### ***Safety Element Policies***

S-P-7. Regulate all uses and development in areas subject to potential flooding through zoning and other land use regulations.

S-P-8. Cooperate with other agencies in the pursuit of a regional approach to flood issues.

S-P-9. Combine flood control, recreation, water quality, and open space functions where feasible.

S-P-10. Ensure that any existing structures subject to the 200-year flood provide adequate protection from flood hazards.

S-P-11. Ensure that the impacts of potential flooding are adequately analyzed when considering areas for future urban expansion.

S-P-12. New residential development, including mobile homes, shall be constructed so that the lowest floor is at least one foot above the 200-year flood level.

S-P-13. Non-residential development shall be anchored and flood-proofed in accord with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards to prevent damage or causing damage due to a 200-year flood or, alternatively, elevated to at least one foot above the 200-year flood level.

S-P-14. When improvements to existing developments are made costing at least 50 percent of the current market value of the structure before improvements, the structure shall be brought into compliance with FEMA standards.

S-P-15. Ensure the city is in compliance with the Central Valley Flood Protect Plan.

***Safety Element Implementation Measures***

S-I-4. The City shall continue to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program. To this end, the City shall ensure that local regulations are in full compliance with standards adopted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The City shall adopt and implement local flood management development standards.

S-I-5. Provide flood warning and forecasting information to City residents.

S-I-6. Discourage large continuous paved areas unless provided with engineered drainage facilities.

S-I-7. Where feasible, require the use of pervious paving materials, such as brick or stepping stones with sand joints.

S-I-8. New development shall be required to maintain natural stream courses and adjacent habitat and combine flood control, recreation, water quality, and open space functions.

S-I-9. Participate in the development of a collaborative local flood plan for San Joaquin County.

***Resource Conservation Element Goals***

RC-1. Minimize the consumption of water to reasonable levels consistent with a high level of amenities and quality of life for City residents and visitors.

RC-2. Maximize the beneficial uses of water by recycling water for irrigation and other non-potable uses.

RC-6. Preserve and maintain Manteca's soils to avoid pollution of surface waters, decreased air quality, and loss of soil.

RC-7. To protect water quality in the San Joaquin River and in the area's groundwater basin.

***Resource Conservation Element Policies***

RC-P-1. The City shall continue to implement water conservation standards for all commercial and industrial development, and for all existing and new residential development.

RC-P-2. The City shall explore potential uses of treated wastewater when such opportunities become available.

RC-P-3. The City shall protect the quantity of Manteca's groundwater.

RC-P-4. The City shall require water conservation in both City operations and private development to minimize the need for the development of new water sources.

RC-P-5. Development of private water wells within the city limits shall be allowed only where the City makes a finding that municipal water service is not readily and feasibly available, and such private well systems shall only be allowed to be used until such time as City water service becomes available.

RC-P-10. Minimize soil erosion and loss of topsoil from land development activities, wind, and water flow.

RC-P-11. Minimize sedimentation and loss of topsoil from soil erosion.

RC-P-12. Minimize pollution of waterways and other surface water bodies from urban runoff.

RC-P-13. Protect the quality of Manteca's groundwater.

RC-P-14. Encourage participation by the County and surrounding communities in a basin-wide groundwater management study.

RC-P-15. Once sewer service has been extended to incorporated areas, new septic tanks shall not be permitted.

### ***Resource Conservation Element Implementation Measures***

RC-I-1. Continue to implement standards for water conserving landscape practices, including the use of drought tolerant plants, for both public and private projects.

RC-I-2. Continue efforts to increase public participation in water conservation.

RC-I-3. Require large commercial and industrial water users to submit a use and conservation plan as part of the project entitlement review and approval process, and develop a program to monitor compliance with and effectiveness of that plan.

RC-I-4. Cooperate with other agencies and jurisdictions to expand water conservation programs, and to develop methods of water reuse.

RC-I-5. Actively pursue the use of treated wastewater in irrigation and industrial applications, including development of appropriate infrastructure.

RC-I-16. All new development shall comply with the Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements for specific site development and construction standards for specific soil types.

RC-I-17. All new development shall comply with the Uniform Building Code (UBC), Chapter 70, regulating grading activities including drainage and erosion control.

RC-I-18. Require site-specific land management and development practices for proposed development projects, including appropriate mitigation measures for avoiding or reducing erosion.

RC-I-19. The City shall work with the County and surrounding communities to develop an action plan and/or to create an agency to manage and protect local and regional groundwater resources.

RC-I-20. The City shall not approve new industrial or commercial development that has a significant potential for adversely affecting water quality in the San Joaquin River or in the area's groundwater basin.

RC-I-21. The City shall regularly monitor water quality in City wells for evidence of toxics, saltwater intrusion, and other contaminants.

RC-I-22. Maintain a buffer area between waterways and urban development to protect water quality and riparian areas.

RC-I-23. Utilize cost-effective urban runoff controls, including Best Management Practices (BMPs), to limit urban pollutants from entering the water courses.

RC-I-24. Comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board's regulations and standards to maintain and improve groundwater quality in Manteca.

### Utility Master Plans

The City of Manteca maintains a variety of Master Plan documents that guide the design, development, and maintenance of the utilities within the city limits. These include: Urban Water Management Plan (2005), Water Master Plan (2005), Storm Drain Master Plan (2013), Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (2012), Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update (2006), and Draft Sewer Rate Study (2008).

### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE- WATER SUPPLY

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project may have a significant impact on the environment associated with Utilities if it would:

1. Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
2. Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or if new or expanded entitlements are needed.

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **Impact 3.15-4: The proposed project has the potential to require construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (less than significant)**

The City of Manteca currently provides domestic water to its customers via a network of wells and transmission lines which draw groundwater and distribute throughout the City. The City also provides treated surface water via the South County Surface Water Supply Project (SCSWSP), a joint project with the South San Joaquin Irrigation District, the City of Lathrop, the City of Tracy, and the City of Escalon.

## 3.15 UTILITIES

---

Existing distribution improvements in the vicinity of the project site include a 12” main in Daniels Street, extending from Airport Way to the west end of Daniels Street, and a 12” main in Milo Candini Drive extending from Daniels Street to the north limits of Big League Dreams. North of the project, there is an existing 12-inch line in Yosemite Avenue.

The provision of public services and the construction of onsite and offsite infrastructure improvements will be required to accommodate the development of the proposed project. The utility plans were developed to provide services and infrastructure that meet City standards, to integrate with existing and planned facilities and connections, and to ensure that the utility needs do not diminish services to existing residents or businesses within the City.

The proposed project will receive water service by extending the existing distribution system through the proposed development. Specifically, a 12-inch distribution main will be installed within the proposed alignment of Milo Candini from its current northern terminal to Yosemite Avenue, providing a looped connection between Daniels Street and Yosemite Avenue. This system will be further extended through the development with 12-inch lines in the loop road and Wawona Street, as well as Daniels Street to McKinley Avenue. There will also be a 16-inch line installed along the project boundary near Costco. This will provide a reliable distribution network to serve the proposed uses within the project. Smaller water lines (not shown in the master plan) will be installed as needed to extend water from the 12-inch distribution mains to the proposed developments. No additional water supply (well) or storage (tank) will be required for the development of the project.

The City also has plans to develop a recycled water system that will provide landscape irrigation water to public parks, landscaping, etc., with recycled water from the City’s Water Quality Control Facility (WQCF). The proposed project will be a natural recipient of this recycled water due to its close proximity to the WQCF and its large areas of open space/park. Proposed recycled water improvements within the Project site will include the installation of 12-inch distribution mains extending from the WQCF south along the west side of the WQCF to Wawona Street and then east to the proposed utility corridor west of Big League Dreams and then south to connect to the existing recycled water line in Daniels Street. These recycled water lines will be charged from the domestic system initially, but will ultimately be disconnected from the City’s domestic system and isolated as a recycled water (purple pipe) system. Figure 2-10 depicts both the existing and proposed master water distribution system components described above.

All offsite water utility improvements will be in or adjacent to existing roadways, thereby limiting any potential impact to areas that were not already disturbed. Construction of the offsite potable water infrastructure would not have the potential to induce growth as the proposed project is planned for non-residential uses and such uses were anticipated in the General Plan. The proposed offsite potable water utility infrastructure will be sized consistent with the City approved standards.

The proposed project would require the construction of new onsite water infrastructure for potable water and irrigation water. All onsite water utility improvements will be within existing agricultural lands, the impacts of which are discussed in Section 3.2 Agricultural Resources.

Construction of the onsite potable water infrastructure would not have the potential to induce growth as the proposed project is planned for non-residential uses and such uses were anticipated in the General Plan. The proposed offsite potable water utility infrastructure will be sized consistent with the City approved standards.

The proposed project would not require the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing water treatment facilities for potable or irrigation water beyond the distribution system that is described above. Additionally, the proposed project would not require the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing water treatment facilities for water service beyond the distribution system that is described above. Water utility improvements would not induce substantial growth. Implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

**Impact 3.15-5: The proposed project has the potential to have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (less than significant)**

***Project Water Demand***


The projected water demand for the Project is shown in Table 3.15-9. As indicated, the total projected annual potable water demand for the Project is projected to be 428 AFY, assuming an 80 percent occupancy rate at the proposed hotel (Planning Area 16). This value includes a 10.3 percent factor for unaccounted for water to match the value in the 2005 UWMP. The Project intends to use low water use fixtures, re-circulate water through the water park, and incorporate other water efficient features. The Project also intends to use recycled water for outdoor irrigation. Proposed athletic fields will either use artificial turf, or be irrigated with recycled water. Detailed potable and recycled water demand projections are included in Attachment A of the Water Supply Assessment.

**TABLE 3.15-9: PROJECTED WATER DEMAND FOR THE FAMILY ENTERTAINMENT ZONE<sup>(A)</sup>**

<i>COMPONENT</i>	<i>PROJECTED ANNUAL POTABLE WATER DEMAND, AFY(B)</i>	<i>PROJECTED ANNUAL RECYCLED WATER DEMAND, AFY(B)</i>
Family Entertainment Zone(c)	384	244
Unaccounted-for Water(d)	44	28
<b>Total Water Demand</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>272</b>
<sup>(a)</sup> See Attachment A for detailed water demand projections. <sup>(b)</sup> AFY = Acre-Feet per Year <sup>(c)</sup> Does not include existing Big League Dreams Ball Park Demands. <sup>(d)</sup> Based on 10.3 percent of total water production (see City of Manteca 2005 UWMP Table 7).		

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

A comparison of the City’s projected water supplies and demands is shown in the exhibit below for Normal, Single Dry, and Multiple Dry Years. As can be seen on the exhibit, there is no projected supply deficit under the projected hydrologic conditions.



WEST YOST ASSOCIATES  
 n:\1487\02-14-06\wp1\WSA\0530\4\_2163-1  
 last revised: 01/18/13

City of Manteca  
 Water Supply Assessment for  
 Family Entertainment Zone

Table 3.15-10 presents a summary of the project demand vs supply during normal, single-dry, and multi-dry years. The supply-demand difference shown in Table 3.15-10 indicates that, in average precipitation years, the City will have sufficient water to meet its customers’ needs through 2035. Water demand for current and proposed uses in the City of Manteca is 31,499 AFY (Normal Year), 27,583 (Single Dry Year), and 29,636 (Multi-Dry Year). The city has a total supply of 32,290 AFY (Normal Year), 27,655 (Single Dry Year), and 29,700 (Multi-Dry Year). The proposed project’s demand would be 428 AFY. The City has adequate water supplies to support existing demand in the City in addition to the proposed project under average daily and maximum daily demand conditions.

**TABLE 3.15-10: SUMMARY OF PROJECTED WATER SUPPLY DURING HYDROLOGIC NORMAL, SINGLE-DRY, AND MULTI-DRY YEARS FOR CITY OF MANTECA**

YEAR	AVAILABLE WATER SUPPLY											
	NORMAL YEAR, AFY				SINGLE-DRY YEAR DROUGHT, AFY				MULTI-DRY YEAR DROUGHT, AFY			
	GROUND WATER	SURFACE WATER <sup>A</sup>	TOTAL	Demand	GROUND WATER	SURFACE WATER <sup>A</sup>	TOTAL	Demand	GROUND WATER	SURFACE WATER <sup>A</sup>	TOTAL	Demand
2015	12,000	11,500	23,500	20,950	13,790	7,245	21,035	18,113	12,000	9,890	21,890	20,575
2020	13,790	11,500	25,290	23,169	13,500	7,245	20,745	20,104	13,790	9,890	23,680	22,785
2025	13,790	18,500	32,290	25,728	13,790	11,655	25,445	22,401	13,790	15,910	29,700	25,334
2030	13,790	18,500	32,290	28,602	13,790	11,655	25,445	24,982	13,790	15,910	29,700	28,198
2035	13,790	18,500	32,290	31,499	16,000	11,655	27,655	27,583	13,790	15,910	29,700	29,636

NOTE : (A)SCWSP DELIVERIES TO CITY OF MANTECA.

SOURCE: WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, 2015

The City is currently in the process of preparing an update to their Water Supply Master Plan as well as their UWMP. The mix of projected groundwater and surface water supplies available to meet future demand is expected to change, with a higher fraction of surface water use than is documented in the 2005 UWMP. Although not quantified in the WSA, it should be noted that the reclaimed water use in the City could significantly reduce potable water demands in the future as the recycled water system is developed.

**Conclusion**

Based on the analysis described above, the WSA demonstrates that the City’s existing and projected potable water supplies are sufficient to meet the City’s existing and projected future potable water demands, including those future water demands associated with the Project, to the year 2035 under all hydrologic conditions.

As identified above, the proposed project would not result in insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less than significant** impact to water supplies.

### 3.15.3 STORM WATER

#### EXISTING SETTING

---

##### **Existing City Facilities**

The following information was provided in the City of Manteca Storm Drain Master Plan (2013). The City of Manteca provides and maintains a system of storm drains, detention basins, and pumping facilities as well as monitoring and control of the operations of the storm drain system. Additionally the City enforces storm drain regulations established by the US EPA and the State of California.

The City maintains a dynamic computer model of its storm drainage system. The model was formulated as an XP-SWMM model originally developed by the US EPA. The current version was advanced by a private sector organization, XP Software, Inc. The model provides analysis over time and offers the ability to maximize the efficiency of detention basin and pump operations along with the ability to monitor and control downstream water levels to minimize flooding problems with a minimum of new capital improvements.

The South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) owns a complex network of irrigation Laterals and Drains that run throughout the City limits. These facilities deliver irrigation water to various farming operations in the region, and they convey excess irrigation water and field runoff to downstream receiving waters, specifically the San Joaquin River. The City relies on SSJID's facilities to convey its storm water runoff to the San Joaquin River and will continue to do so through buildout of the City's General Plan.

The City and SSJID have a long-standing agreement that authorizes the City to discharge its storm water runoff into SSJID facilities for ultimate disposal to the San Joaquin River. In 1975 the City first entered into a storm drainage agreement with SSJID, and in 2006 the City renewed its drainage agreement with SSJID. Of the many requirements in the 2006 Agreement, the two most significant new requirements are that all storm water discharges into SSJID facilities must be monitored and controlled such that the capacity of SSJID's facilities is not exceeded, and that storm water quality must be controlled such that it complies with all applicable laws.

The City meets the first requirement by requiring all new development to attenuate its runoff in a storage facility before pumping it into SSJID's facilities. In addition, the City uses real-time water level monitoring stations at critical low points in the conveyance system complete with SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) facilities. Regarding the water quality requirement, the City is classified as a Phase II city by the State Water Resources Control Board. As such, the City, and consequently new development, is required to comply with the State Board's storm water NPDES permit for Phase II cities.

Per the City/SSJID Master Drainage Agreement, SSJID prohibits the direct discharge of storm water runoffs into its facilities. Accordingly, the City requires all new developments to attenuate its runoff in a storage facility before pumping it into SSJID's facilities. For surface attenuation facilities,

there are two allowable basin types for non-residential applications: Interim Percolation Basin or Permanent Sole Use Percolation Basin.

#### INTERIM PERCOLATION BASIN: RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS

Percolation basins may be used as an interim measure for retention and disposal of storm water runoff in those areas that will not receive storm drainage service from a major storm drain system by the time development occurs. When discharge capability to a major storm drain system becomes available, the basins are to be exchanged for or converted to detention basins with pumped discharge facilities. Interim percolation basins are to be sized to store two, 10- year, 48-hour duration storm runoff volumes over the entire contributing area.

#### PERMANENT SOLE USE PERCOLATION BASIN: NON-RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS

Sole use percolation basins may be allowed as a permanent measure for retention and disposal of storm water runoff for large (minimum 80 acres) non-residential applications as approved by the City. Permanent percolation basins shall be designed to empty the entire runoff volume of a 10-year, 48-hour duration storm within 96 hours. The permanent percolation basin shall be oversized by 50%.

The groundwater separation distance between the bottom of the percolation basin and the seasonally high ground water table is a minimum of five feet to reduce the risk of groundwater contamination. For situations where the groundwater separation is less than 5 feet, percolation basins are prohibited.

The percolation basins require a minimum soil infiltration rate of 0.5 inch per hour, not exceeding 3 inch per hour, should not be used as temporary sediment traps during construction, and are not allowed at sites with Hydrologic Soil Type C and D, e.g., clay. As part of the percolation basin approval process, the developer must prepare an operations and maintenance plan for the facility documenting all maintenance and rehabilitation activities and costs for approval by the City. Access to percolation basin must be provided for regular maintenance activities.

Prior to acceptance of the Basin, the property owner must provide an approved fully funded mechanism or entity for funding all maintenance and rehabilitation needs of the basin. The maintenance entity must be permanent and responsible for meeting all storm water quality requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board.

#### LATERALS FOR STORM WATER CONVEYANCE

As previously described, SSJID owns a complex network of irrigation Laterals and Drains that run throughout the City's limits. The hydraulic connectivity of SSJID's system is as follows: 1) irrigation water is conveyed to farming operations via a vast network of Laterals; 2) the Laterals carry excess irrigation water and field runoff to several Drains; 3) the Drains convey water to a large central drain called the French Camp Outlet Canal (FCOC); and 4) the FCOC conveys water to the San Joaquin River.

A fundamental goal of previous storm drain master plans was to minimize the use of SSJID's Laterals for conveyance of storm water runoff to SSJID's Drains. Accordingly, previous master plans specified the construction of a separate storm water conveyance network that by-passed the Laterals and transported storm drainage directly to the Drains. Once the City's storm water reached the Drains, the Drains would continue to provide conveyance to the FCOC and to the San Joaquin River. In the 2013 SDMP, however, the City recognizes the opportunity to minimize infrastructure costs for all parties by abandoning the concept of separate conveyance systems and instead expanding the use of SSJID's Laterals. Laterals that are targeted to convey both storm water and irrigation water to Drains are called dual-use facilities.

This concept is viable since SSJID's Laterals are 1) found virtually everywhere in the existing and undeveloped areas of the City, 2) most of these Laterals are already 42-inch diameter pipe, which is a sufficient size for the City's drainage needs, and 3) SSJID already requires new development projects that disturb their Laterals to remove, realign and replace that infrastructure with an equal or larger diameter pipeline. For situations where the existing Lateral is 36-inch diameter, and SSJID does not require a 42-inch or larger pipe to be installed as a replacement, the City will require a minimum 42-inch diameter pipeline to be installed, and the developer will be reimbursed the upsizing cost for the larger diameter pipe via the Public Facilities Implementation Fee (PFIP) program.

### **Existing Flood Concerns**

Several XP-SWMM model scenarios were run to assess the capabilities of the existing facilities to provide adequate level of drainage and flood control protection in the City of Manteca. In general, the 96-hour pumping rate policy and the "no 25 cfs" policy had significant positive impacts on the existing drainage system. Virtually all of the flooding and capacity issues identified in the 2006 SDMP are no longer issues because of these policies. The Project area is served by Drain 7, which has not had flooding issues.

### **Planned Infrastructure Updates**

To account for an increased need to prevent flooding due to storm water in the planning area several additions to the existing infrastructure have been proposed for the South Drain storm pump station infrastructure.

Development of the FEZ will require the relocation of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8. It is proposed that each of these facilities ultimately be converted from an open water canal to an underground conveyance system, and that these facilities will be routed north through the east utility corridor (just west of Big League Dreams) to the northern property boundary, then west to the current FCOC canal next to the railroad. The ultimate undergrounding of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 may be completed in phases. It is anticipated that the first phase would include undergrounding the portions of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 that occur within the Planning Area 16 in association with the hotel resort facility (i.e. from the southern project boundary to a point just north of Daniels Road). The balance of the FCOC is anticipated to be relocated to the new north-south alignment from Daniels to the northern property boundary then west to the existing FCOC as shown Figure 2-12; however, this section may be temporarily left as an open water canal until such time that the

Planning Areas north of Daniels are developed. It is also possible that portions of the realigned FCOC (i.e. the east-west segment located along the northern project boundary) could be left open water in perpetuity as a buffer between the project and the WQCF.

It is anticipated that The FCOC carries a peak flow of approximately 150 cubic feet per second (cfs). To accommodate this flow, the channel will be replaced with dual 60-inch pipes. Installation of this conveyance system is expected to occur with the first phase of infrastructure, along with the construction of the Daniel Street extension to McKinley Avenue.

The Project site is divided into three major watersheds (each consisting of two sub-sheds). Runoff from each watershed will be collected by a network of pipe systems and conveyed to a storage facility serving the watershed. The peak volume from the design storm will be retained in the storage facility and then emptied (pumped) into the FCOC off-peak (when capacity in the FCOC is available).

The proposed storm drain system will include water quality features designed in conformance with the standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region, the City of Manteca, and SSJID. Storm water regulations for construction projects using Best Management Practices will be incorporated into the design. Discharge flow rates from each detention facility into the FCOC will be in conformance with the requirements of the City of Manteca and the SSJID. Figure 2-12 depicts both the proposed storm drainage components described above.

## REGULATORY SETTING - STORM WATER

---

### Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) regulates the water quality of all discharges into waters of the United States including wetlands, perennial and intermittent stream channels. Section 401, Title 33, Section 1341 of the CWA sets forth water quality certification requirements for “any applicant applying for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity including, but not limited to, the construction or operation of facilities, which may result in any discharge into the navigable waters.” Section 404, Title 33, Section 1344 of the CWA in part authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to:

- Set requirements and standards pertaining to such discharges: subparagraph (e); Issue permits “for the discharge of dredged or fill material into the navigable waters at specified disposal sites”: subparagraph (a);
- Specify the disposal sites for such permits: subparagraph (b);
- Deny or restrict the use of specified disposal sites if “the discharge of such materials into such area will have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies and fishery areas”: subparagraph (c);
- Specify type of and conditions for non-prohibited discharges: subparagraph (f);

- Provide for individual State or interstate compact administration of general permit programs: subparagraphs (g), (h), and (j);
- Withdraw approval of such State or interstate permit programs: subparagraph (i);
- Ensure public availability of permits and permit applications: subparagraph (o);
- Exempt certain Federal or State projects from regulation under this Section: subparagraph (r); and,
- Determine conditions and penalties for violation of permit conditions or limitations: subparagraph (s).
- Section 401 certification is required prior to final issuance of Section 404 permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The California State Water Resources Control Board and RWQCBs enforce State of California statutes that are equivalent to or more stringent than the Federal statutes. RWQCBs are responsible for establishing water quality standards and objectives that protect the beneficial uses of various waters including the San Joaquin River, and other waters in the Manteca Planning Area. In the Manteca Planning Area the RWQCB is responsible for protecting surface and groundwater from both point and non-point sources of pollution. Water quality objectives for all of the water bodies within the Manteca Planning Area were established by the RWQCB and are listed in its Basin Plan.

### **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)**

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits are required for discharges of pollutants to navigable waters of the United States, which includes any discharge to surface waters, including lakes, rivers, streams, bays, the ocean, dry stream beds, wetlands, and storm sewers that are tributary to any surface water body. NPDES permits are issued under the Federal Clean Water Act, Title IV, Permits and Licenses, Section 402 (33 USC 466 et seq.)

The RWQCB issues these permits in lieu of direct issuance by the Environmental Protection Agency, subject to review and approval by the Environmental Protection Agency Regional Administrator. The terms of these NPDES permits implement pertinent provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and the Act's implementing regulations, including pre-treatment, sludge management, effluent limitations for specific industries, and anti- degradation. In general, the discharge of pollutants is to be eliminated or reduced as much as practicable so as to achieve the Clean Water Act's goal of "fishable and swimmable" navigable (surface) waters. Technically, all NPDES permits issued by the RWQCB are also Waste Discharge Requirements issued under the authority of the CWA.

These NPDES permits regulate discharges from publicly owned treatment works, industrial discharges, stormwater runoff, dewatering operations, and groundwater cleanup discharges. NPDES permits are issued for five years or less, and are therefore to be updated regularly. The rapid and dramatic population and urban growth in the Central Valley Region has caused a

significant increase in NPDES permit applications for new waste discharges. To expedite the permit issuance process, the SWRCB has adopted several general NPDES permits, each of which regulates numerous discharges of similar types of wastes. The SWRCB has issued general permits for stormwater runoff from industrial and construction sites statewide. Stormwater discharges from industrial and construction activities in the Central Valley Region can be covered under these general permits, which are administered jointly by the SWRCB and RWQCB.

A new Phase II Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) General Permit was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on February 5, 2013 became effective July 1, 2013. The Permit has numerous new components and the City is required to implement these components in stages over the five year period of the Permit. The first year requirements must be implemented by July 1, 2014.

### **Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)**

San Joaquin County is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), a Federal program administered by FEMA. Participants in the NFIP must satisfy certain mandated floodplain management criteria. The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 has adopted as a desired level of protection, an expectation that developments should be protected from floodwater damage of the Intermediate Regional Flood (IRF). The IRF is defined as a flood that has an average frequency of occurrence on the order of once in 100 years, although such a flood may occur in any given year. Communities are occasionally audited by the Department of Water Resources to insure the proper implementation of FEMA floodplain management regulations.

### **Department of Water Resources**

The Department of Water Resources' (DWR) major responsibilities include preparing and updating the California Water Plan to guide development and management of the State's water resources, planning, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the State Water Resources Development System, protecting and restoring the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, regulating dams, providing flood protection, assisting in emergency management to safeguard life and property, educating the public, and serving local water needs by providing technical assistance. In addition, the DWR cooperates with local agencies on water resources investigations; supports watershed and river restoration programs; encourages water conservation; explores conjunctive use of ground and surface water; facilitates voluntary water transfers; and, when needed, operates a State drought water bank.

### **California Water Code**

California's primary statute governing water quality and water pollution issues with respect to both surface waters and groundwater is the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970 (Division 7 of the California Water Code) (Porter-Cologne Act). The Porter-Cologne Act grants the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) and each of the RWQCBs power to protect water quality, and is the primary vehicle for implementation of California's responsibilities under the Federal Clean Water Act. The Porter-Cologne Act grants the SWRCB and the RWQCBs authority and responsibility to adopt plans and policies, to regulate discharges to surface and groundwater,

to regulate waste disposal sites and to require cleanup of discharges of hazardous materials and other pollutants. The Porter-Cologne Act also establishes reporting requirements for unintended discharges of any hazardous substance, sewage, or oil or petroleum product.

Each RWQCB must formulate and adopt a water quality control plan (Basin Plan) for its region the regional plans are to conform to the policies set forth in the Porter-Cologne Act and established by the SWRCB in its State water policy. The Porter-Cologne Act also provides that a RWQCB may include within its regional plan water discharge prohibitions applicable to particular conditions, areas, or types of waste.

The Water Code Section 13260 requires all dischargers of waste that may affect water quality in waters of the state to prepare and provide a water quality discharge report to the RWQCB. Section 13260a-c is as follows:

(a) Each of the following persons shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of the discharge, containing the information that may be required by the regional board:

(1) A person discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the state, other than into a community sewer system.

(2) A person who is a citizen, domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, outside the boundaries of the state in a manner that could affect the quality of the waters of the state within any region.

(3) A person operating, or proposing to construct, an injection well.

(b) No report of waste discharge need be filed pursuant to subdivision (a) if the requirement is waived pursuant to Section 13269.

(c) Each person subject to subdivision (a) shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of waste discharge relative to any material change or proposed change in the character, location, or volume of the discharge.

### **Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Valley Region**

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Valley Region (Basin Plan) includes a summary of beneficial water uses, water quality objectives needed to protect the identified beneficial uses, and implementation measures. The Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for all the ground and surface waters of the region. The term “water quality standards,” as used in the Federal Clean Water Act, includes both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of quality that must be met and maintained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan includes an implementation plan describing the actions by the RWQCB and others that are necessary to achieve and maintain the water quality standards.

The RWQCB regulates waste discharges to minimize and control their effects on the quality of the region's ground and surface water. Permits are issued under a number of programs and authorities. The terms and conditions of these discharge permits are enforced through a variety of technical, administrative, and legal means. Water quality problems in the region are listed in the Basin Plan, along with the causes, where they are known. For water bodies with quality below the levels necessary to allow all the beneficial uses of the water to be met, plans for improving water quality are included. The Basin Plan reflects, incorporates, and implements applicable portions of a number of national and statewide water quality plans and policies, including the California Water Code and the Clean Water Act.

### **200-Year Flood Protection in Central Valley**

Both State policy and recently enacted State legislation (Senate Bill 5) call for 200-year (0.5% annual chance) flood protection to be the minimum level of protection for urban and urbanizing areas in the Central Valley. Senate Bill 5 (SB5) requires that the 200-year protection be consistent with criteria used or developed by the Department of Water Resources. SB 5 requires all urban and urbanizing areas in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys to achieve 200-year flood protection in order to approve development. The new law restricts approval of development after 2015 if "adequate progress" towards achieving this standard is not met. Urban and urbanizing areas protected by State-Federal project levees cannot use "adequate progress" as a condition to approve development after 2025.

The levee system is designed to a 100-year protection standard; however, RD-17 has been working with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to analyze 200-year protection. RD-17 acquired land along the levee system to construct the 100-year improvements is anticipated to provide sufficient space for any additional incremental improvements to provide 200-year protection in the future.

### **City of Manteca General Plan**

#### ***Public Facilities Element Goals***

Goal PF-9. Maintain an adequate level of service in the City's drainage system to accommodate runoff from existing and projected development and to prevent property damage due to flooding.

#### ***Public Facilities Element Policies***

PF-P-26. The City shall continue to complete gaps in the drainage system in areas of existing development.

PF-P-27. The City shall require the dedication and improvement of drainage detention basins as a condition of development approval according to the standards of the Drainage Master Plan. The responsibility for the dedication and improvement of detention basins shall be based on the prorated share of storm water runoff resulting from each development.

PF-P-28. Storm drainage systems within new development areas shall include open drainage corridors where feasible to supplement or replace an underground piped drainage system. The

drainage systems would provide for short-term storm water detention, storm water conveyance for storm waters exceeding a 10-year event, storm water quality treatment, bike and pedestrian paths, and visual open space within neighborhoods. The width and length of the corridors would be determined by the storm water management requirements. The drainage systems would provide a pedestrian connection between parks and access to open space from residential neighborhoods. The neighborhoods would be designed with homes oriented to, rather than backing on the open space corridor.

### ***Public Facilities Element Implementation Measures***

PF-I-13. The City shall update the Storm Drainage Master Plan and Public Facilities Implementation Plan, regarding water supply and distribution, every five years. The update shall be reviewed annually for adequacy and consistency with the General Plan.

## **City of Manteca Municipal Code**

### TITLE 13 CHAPTER 13.28 STORM WATER MANAGEMENT DISCHARGES

The purpose of this chapter is to establish minimum storm water management requirements and controls to protect and safeguard the general health, safety and welfare of the public residing in watersheds within the city of Manteca. This chapter seeks to meet that purpose through the following objectives:

- A. Minimize increases in storm water runoff from any development in order to reduce flooding, siltation and stream bank erosion and maintain the integrity of drainage channels;
- B. Minimize increases in non-point source pollution caused by storm water runoff from development that would otherwise degrade local water quality;
- C. Minimize the total annual volume of surface water runoff that flows from any specific site during and following development to not exceed the pre-development hydrologic regime to the maximum extent practicable; and
- D. Reduce storm water runoff rates and volumes, soil erosion and non-point source pollution wherever possible, through storm water management controls and to ensure that these management controls are properly maintained and pose no threat to public safety. (Ord. 1253 § 1, 2004)

### TITLE 13 CHAPTER 13.28 SECTION 13.28.060 DISCHARGES IN VIOLATION OF INDUSTRIAL OR CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY NPDES STORM WATER DISCHARGE PERMIT.

- A. Any person subject to an industrial NPDES storm water discharge permit shall comply with all provisions of such permit. Proof of compliance with said permit may be required in a form acceptable to the director upon inspection of the facility, during any enforcement proceeding or action or for any other reasonable cause.
- B. Any person subject to a construction activity NPDES storm water discharge permit shall comply with all provisions of such permit. Proof of compliance with said permit may be required in a form acceptable to the director prior to or as a condition of a subdivision map, site plan, building permit or development or improvement plan; upon inspection of the facility; during any enforcement proceeding or action; or for any other

reasonable cause. Prior to issuance of a construction permit a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be submitted to the city. (Ord. 1253 § 1, 2004)

### Utility Master Plans

The City of Manteca maintains a variety of Master Plan documents that guide the design, development, and maintenance of the utilities within the city limits. These include: Urban Water Management Plan (2005), Water Master Plan (2005), Storm Drain Master Plan (2013) Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (2012), Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update (2006), and Draft Sewer Rate Study (2008).

### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE- STORM WATER

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project may have a significant impact on the environment associated with Utilities if it would:

1. 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?

### IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES- STORM WATER

---

#### **Impact 3.15-6: The proposed project has the potential to 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 (less than significant)**

The proposed project includes storm drainage improvements that are consistent with the City of Manteca Storm Drain Master Plan (2013) in which storm drainage facilities sufficient to deal with potential impacts from development within the FEZ are planned. Final engineering of the storm drainage system will be accomplished through the improvement plan preparation of each phase.

Development of the FEZ will require the relocation of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8. It is proposed that each of these facilities ultimately be converted from an open water canal to an underground conveyance system, and that these facilities will be routed north through the east utility corridor (just west of Big League Dreams) to the northern property boundary, then west to the current FCOC canal next to the railroad. The ultimate undergrounding of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 may be completed in phases. It is anticipated that the first phase would include undergrounding the portions of the FCOC and Drains 7 and 8 that occur within the Planning Area 16 in association with the hotel resort facility (i.e. from the southern project boundary to a point just north of Daniels Road). The balance of the FCOC is anticipated to be relocated to the new north-south alignment from Daniels to the northern property boundary then west to the existing FCOC as shown Figure 2-12; however, this section may be temporarily left as an open water canal until such time that the Planning Areas north of Daniels are developed. It is also possible that portions of the realigned FCOC (i.e. the east-west segment located along the northern project boundary) could be left open water in perpetuity as a buffer between the project and the WQCF.

It is anticipated that The FCOC carries a peak flow of approximately 150 cubic feet per second (cfs). To accommodate this flow, the channel will be replaced with dual 60-inch pipes. Installation of this conveyance system is expected to occur with the first phase of infrastructure, along with the construction of the Daniel Street extension to McKinley Avenue.

The Project site is divided into three major watersheds (each consisting of two sub-sheds). Runoff from each watershed will be collected by a network of pipe systems and conveyed to a storage facility serving the watershed. The peak volume from the design storm will be retained in the storage facility and then emptied (pumped) into the FCOC off-peak (when capacity in the FCOC is available). The three watersheds are described below:

- **Watershed A (80 acres):** This watershed consists of the north (A2) and northwest (A1) portions of the project. Runoff from this watershed will be conveyed to a basin located along the north edge of the site, just east of Street C1. In order to reduce the size of this basin, the future parking lots under the power line easements will be designed to accommodate an average of 3 inches of storage above the pavement during the design storm.
- **Watershed B (87 acres):** This watershed consists of the retail commercial area located at the center of the project (B1) and Big League Dreams (B2). Runoff from this watershed will be stored in a detention facility central to the commercial area. Two options are being explored; 1) a detention pond and 2) a lake. If Option 1 is chosen, it will operate much like other basins in the project. However, if Option 2 is chosen, the water elevation in the lake will be established to maintain approximately 24-inches freeboard that will serve as the storage area for peak runoff. Additionally, the Big League Dreams Parking lot will retain runoff during a peak storm to an average depth of 4 inches. Storage in the Lake will be pumped into the FCOC via a pump station and force main.
- **Watershed C (44 acres):** This watershed consists of PA-16 (C2&C3) and the Southwest (C1) portion of the project. Runoff from this watershed will be conveyed to dual basins located at the south side of PA-16. These basins will be hydraulically connected and will outfall into Drain 8 via a storm drain pump station. Additionally, the two large parking lots within PA-16 site will retain an average of 6 inches of storage above the pavement during the design storm.
- **OPTION:** The city is considering sending the runoff from sub-shed C3 to Basin B instead of Basin C. Sub-shed C3 is high enough in elevation to be able to gravity flow into Basin B. If this option is selected, Basin B will increase in volume by 1.43 ac-ft. (the storage volume required for sub-shed C3), and Basin C will decrease in volume by this same amount.

The proposed storm drain system will include water quality features designed in conformance with the standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region, the City of Manteca, and SSJID. Storm water regulations for construction projects using Best Management Practices will be incorporated into the design. Discharge flow rates from each detention facility

---

into the FCOC will be in conformance with the requirements of the City of Manteca and the SSJID. Figure 2-12 depicts both the proposed storm drainage components described above.

**Conclusion:** Storm drainage infrastructure to serve the proposed project will include undergrounding of the FCOC, an underground piped drainage system, a detention/retention/surge basin, and pumps as needed. The drainage systems would provide for short-term storm water detention, storm water conveyance for storm waters exceeding a 10-year event, storm water quality treatment, none of which are anticipated to result in significant environmental effects. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a **less than significant** impact regarding this topic.

3.15.4 SOLID WASTE

EXISTING SETTING

The City of Manteca Solid Waste Division (SWD) provides solid waste hauling service for the City of Manteca and would serve the proposed project. The SWD consists of more than 30 employees, including a SWD Superintendent, yard personnel, office staff, and recycling coordinators. SWD’s services include residential and commercial trash pick-up, residential and commercial recycling pick-up, green waste pick-up, and hazardous waste collections.

Commercial size containers ranging from two cubic yards to six cubic yards are available for commercial trash. Larger drop box containers from 10 cubic yards to 40 cubic yards are also available. Driers operate front-loaders on commercial trash pickup routes. SWD also provides commercial recycling in businesses and can arrange pick-up services from once a week to five times per week depending on the needs of the business. Commercial recycling bins are for co-mingled recycling, which allows materials to be mixed in one container and then sorted after the hauler takes the materials to a sorting facility where the materials are separated for recycling. The City of Manteca does not have a sorting facility; however the solid waste transferred to the Forward Landfill is sorted onsite. SWD provides commercial green waste services with green waste bins ranging in size from two cubic yards to four cubic yards. Similar to recycling pick-up service, green waste can be arranged to be picked up once, or up to five times per week.

Solid waste from Manteca is primarily landfilled at the Forward Sanitary Landfill, located northeast of Manteca. Other landfills used include Foothill Sanitary and North County. All three landfills are summarized in Table 3.15-11 below. Table 3.15-12 summarizes the City of Manteca’s disposal rate targets, as identified by Cal Recycle.

**TABLE 3.15-11 CITY OF MANTECA LANDFILL SUMMARY**

<i>LANDFILL</i>	<i>LOCATION</i>	<i>MAXIMUM DAILY THROUGHPUT (TONS/DAY)</i>	<i>REMAINING CAPACITY (CUBIC YARDS)</i>	<i>ANTICIPATED CLOSURE DATE</i>
Forward Sanitary	Manteca	8,668	23.7 Million	2020
Foothill Sanitary	Linden	1,500	97.9 Million	2054
North County	Victor	825	15.3 Million	2035

SOURCE: CAL RECYCLE 2010

**TABLE 3.15-12 CITY OF MANTECA WASTE DISPOSAL RATE TARGETS (POUNDS/DAY)**

<i>POPULATION</i>		<i>EMPLOYMENT</i>	
Target	Annual	Target	Annual
5.1	5.6	21.1	21.6

SOURCE: CAL RECYCLE 2010

---

## REGULATORY SETTING – SOLID WASTE

---

### **AB 939: California’s Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989**

California’s Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) set a requirement for cities and counties to divert 50 percent of all solid waste from landfills by January 1, 2000, through source reduction, recycling and composting. In order to achieve this goal, AB 939 requires that each City and County prepare and submit a Source Reduction and Recycling Element. AB 939 also established the goal for all California counties to provide at least 15 years of ongoing landfill capacity.

AB 939 also established requirements for cities and counties to develop and implement plans for the safe management of household hazardous wastes. In order to achieve this goal, AB 939 requires that each city and county prepare and submit a Household Hazardous Waste Element.

### **AB 341 (75 Percent Solid Waste Diversion)**

AB 341 requires CalRecycle to issue a report to the Legislature that includes strategies and recommendations that would enable the state to divert 75 percent of the solid waste generated in the state from disposal by January 1, 2020, requires businesses that meet specified thresholds in the bill to arrange for recycling services by January 1, 2012, and also streamlines various regulatory processes.

### **SB 1374 (Construction and Demolition Waste Materials Diversion)**

Senate Bill 1374 (SB 1374), Construction and Demolition Waste Materials Diversion Requirements, requires that jurisdictions summarize their progress realized in diverting construction and demolition waste from the waste stream in their annual AB 939 reports. SB 1374 required the CIWMB to adopt a model construction and demolition ordinance for voluntary implementation by local jurisdictions.

### **AB 2176 (Montanez, Chapter 879, Statues of 2004)**

This law requires the largest venue facilities and events (as defined) in each city and county to plan and implement solid waste diversion programs, and annually report the progress of those upon the request of their local government. In turn, local jurisdictions must report to the CIWMB waste diversion information for the top 10 percent of venues and events by waste generation.

A large event is defined as:

1. Serves an average of more than 2,000 individuals per day of operation (both people attending the event and those working at it—including volunteers—are included in this number); and
2. Charges an admission price or is run by a local agency.

The bill specifically includes public, nonprofit, or privately owned parks, parking lots, golf courses, street systems, or other open space when being used for an event, including, but not limited to, a sporting event or a flea market in addition to events that meet both of the above.

A large venue is defined as:

- A permanent facility that annually seats or serves an average of more than 2,000 individuals within the grounds of the facility per day of operation (both people attending the event and those working at it—including volunteers too—are included in this number).

Venues include, but are not limited to airports, amphitheaters, amusement parks, aquariums, arenas, conference or civic centers, fairgrounds, museums, halls, horse tracks, performing arts centers, racetracks, stadiums, theaters, zoos, and other public attraction facilities.

### CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS CODE (CALGREEN)

CALGreen requires the diversion of at least 50 percent of the construction waste generated during most new construction projects (CALGreen Sections 4.408 and 5.408) and some additions and alterations to nonresidential building projects.

## City of Manteca General Plan

### *Public Facilities and Services Element Goals*

PF-12. Maintain efficient, effective and economical solid waste services for the residents, businesses and visitors to Manteca.

### *Public Facilities and Services Element Policies*

PF-P-31. The City will implement and enforce the provisions of its Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

PF-P-32. The City shall support the continued use of the Lovelace Transfer Station on Lovelace Road, between Union Road and Airport Way, for the processing and shipping of solid waste materials.

### CITY OF MANTECA MUNICIPAL CODE, CHAPTER 8.12

Chapter 8.12 of the Municipal Code regulates the management of garbage, recyclables, and other wastes. Chapter 8.12 sets forth solid waste collection, disposal, and diversion requirements for residential, commercial, industrial, and other uses and addresses yard waste, hazardous materials, recyclables, and other forms of solid waste.

## THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE- SOLID WASTE

---

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project will have a significant impact on the environment associated with Utilities if it will:

1. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

2. Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

### **Impact 3.15-7: The proposed project has the potential to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (less than significant)**

As previously described, permitted maximum disposal at the Forward Landfill is 8,668 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 51.04 million cubic yards, which is expected to accommodate an operational life until January 1, 2020. The remaining capacity is 23,700,000 cubic yards. Solid waste generated by the proposed project was estimated based on CalRecycle generation rates (discussed below). The addition of the volume of solid waste associated with the proposed project to the landfill would not exceed the landfill's remaining capacity.

The hotel rooms in California generate approximately 2 pounds of solid waste per day. For the proposed project, the 500 room hotel would generate about 1,000 pounds of solid waste per day.

The commercial space within the hotel (restaurant, etc.) is estimated to generate 2.5 pounds per day per 1,000 square feet. For the proposed project, the 37,500 square feet of commercial space within the hotel would generate 93.5 pounds per day.

The conference center is estimated to generate 1 pound per day per 1,000 square feet. For the proposed project, the 30,000 square feet of conference center would generate 30 pounds per day.

The water park is estimated to generate 3.12 pounds per day per 100 square feet. For the proposed project, the 75,000 square feet of water park would generate 2,340 pounds per day.

The recreational facilities/ball fields are estimated to generate 3.12 pounds per day per 1,000 square feet. For the proposed project, the 197,000 square feet of recreational facilities/ball fields would generate 615 pounds per day.

The commercial/retail space (space not within the hotel) is estimated to generate 2.5 pounds per day per 1,000 square feet. For the proposed project, the 360,000 square feet of commercial space would generate 900 pounds per day.

The total solid waste generated by the proposed project is estimated to be 4,979 pounds per day, or 2.49 tons per day. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable state and local requirements including those pertaining to solid waste, construction waste diversion, and recycling.

As previously described, solid waste generated in the City is disposed at the Forward Landfill. This landfill is projected to close in the year 2020. At that time the City can utilize the Foothill Landfill as a location for solid waste disposal. The City's solid waste per capita generation has decreased since 2007 due to the waste diversion efforts of the City. The permitted maximum disposal at the

## 3.15 UTILITIES

---

Forward Landfill is 8,668 tons per day. Currently, the average daily disposal is 620 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 51.04 million cubic yards. The addition of the volume of solid waste associated with the proposed project, approximately 2.49 tons per day at total buildout, to the Forward Landfill would not exceed the landfill's remaining capacity. This is a **less than significant** impact.

CEQA requires an EIR to evaluate a project's effects in relationship to broader changes occurring, or that are foreseeable to occur, in the surrounding environment. Accordingly, this chapter presents a discussion of CEQA-mandated analysis for cumulative impacts, significant irreversible effects, and significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed Project. Growth Inducement is discussed in Section 3.10, Land Use and Population.

## 4.1 CUMULATIVE SETTING AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

### INTRODUCTION

---

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contain an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with the proposed Project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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 (as defined by Section 15130). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. A cumulative impact occurs from:

*...the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.*

In addition, Section 15130(b) identifies that the following three elements are necessary for an adequate cumulative analysis:

1) Either:

(A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or,

(B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

2) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

3) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.

### CUMULATIVE SETTING

#### Cumulative Projections and Anticipated Projects

The following section conveys the City of Manteca's projected development for 10 and 20-year planning horizons. The population projections shown in Table 4.0-1 are based on the growth projections developed by the Business Forecasting Center at University of the Pacific (UOP) under contract with San Joaquin Council of Governments<sup>1</sup> and growth estimates based on a maximum 3.9 percent growth rate in accordance with the Growth Management Ordinance. These projections were developed during preparation of the 2011 San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Plan.

**TABLE 4.0-1: POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

YEAR	ESTIMATED POPULATION
2013	71,948 <sup>1</sup>
2015	-
2020	87,471
2025	97,410
2030	107,766
2035	117,010

*SOURCE: 2010 US CENSUS AND SJCOG GROWTH PROJECTIONS.*

#### Sphere Capacity

The City anticipates the annexation of four projects to the City: Machado Estates, Oakwood Shores, South of Woodward – North, and South of Woodward - South. These anticipated annexations all either have applications on file at the City, or have entitlement approvals. These annexations are expected to play a significant role in accommodating population growth in Manteca within the 10-Year Horizon.

While the City of Manteca General Plan 2023 specifies 2013 as the ten-year planning horizon, the years 2014-2024 will be used for the 10-year planning horizon and 2024-2034 for the 20-year planning horizon in the Municipal Services Review given the time lapse between the present and

<sup>1</sup> San Joaquin Council of Governments Staff Report: Countywide Population / Household / Employment 12/2009.

2003 when the General Plan was adopted. Table 4.0-2 provides the maximum acreage, units, and population potential for the sphere of influence broken down by city limits, and 10 and 20-year Planning Horizons.

**TABLE 4.0-2: EXISTING ACREAGES AND POPULATION POTENTIAL<sup>1</sup> (CITY LIMITS, 10-YEAR, 20-YEAR)**

AREA	ACRES	EXISTING DWELLING UNITS AND POPULATION <sup>1</sup>		MAXIMUM FUTURE DWELLING UNITS AND POPULATION <sup>1</sup>	
		UNITS	POPULATION	UNITS	POPULATION
Within City Limits	11,008.83	23,449 <sup>2</sup>	71,948 <sup>3</sup>	31,773 <sup>4</sup>	94,378 <sup>4</sup>
10-Year Planning Horizon	2,949.31	N/A	N/A	8,512 <sup>5</sup>	25,536 <sup>5</sup>
20-Year Planning Horizon	3,934.58	N/A	N/A	11,356 <sup>5</sup>	34,068 <sup>5</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,892.72</b>	<b>23,449</b>	<b>71,948</b>	<b>51,641</b>	<b>153,982</b>

1. POPULATION CALCULATION IS BASED ON 3.0 PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT.

2. 2008-2012 AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (2012)

3. ANNUAL ESTIMATES OF THE RESIDENT POPULATION: APRIL 1, 2010 TO JULY 1, 2013, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, POPULATION DIVISION (2013)

4. ESTIMATED FUTURE UNITS AND POPULATIONS OBTAINED FROM THE CITY OF MANTECA 2010 HOUSING ELEMENT (POPULATION AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS) (2010)

5. ESTIMATED FUTURE UNITS AND POPULATION CALCULATED BASED ON RESIDENTIAL ACREAGES, AVERAGE UNITS/ACRE IN MANTECA, AND AVERAGE POPULATION OF 3 PERSONS PER UNIT.

#### WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS

**Residential Land:** Future dwelling unit estimates within the City are based on the available residential land use planning designations (51,641 units). A sizeable amount of the future residential growth within the existing City limits reflects development opportunities created by under-utilized and blighted properties within the inner city. While vacant land in single or limited ownership outside the City limits is easier to develop than inner City underutilized properties in multi-ownership, residential development within the City limits (underutilized and vacant development) is expected to approach 8,324 units within the planning horizon. This includes an estimated 5,689 units associated with approved/pending development projects, and an estimated 2,635 units associated with underutilized and vacant land in the City. The approved/pending development projects include: Union Ranch project (2,263 units), the Oleander and Sundance projects (1,074 units), the Trails Project (1,500 units), Tara Park (583 units), and Terra Ranch (269 units). Table 4.0-3 below provides a breakdown of the residential land uses within the City limits.

**TABLE 4.0-3: RESIDENTIAL LAND USES – CITY LIMITS**

LAND USE	ACREAGE
	CITY LIMITS
Residential	
HDR – High Density Residential	434.52
LDR – Low Density Residential	4,910.08
MDR – Medium Density Residential	335.41
UR-LDR – Urban Reserve Low Density Residential	
UR-MDR – Urban Reserve Medium Density Residential	
UR-VLDR – Urban Reserve Very Low Density Residential	148.27
VLDR – Very Low Density Residential	40.01

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA GIS 2013.

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

**Non-residential land:** There is also a variety of non-residential land uses within the city limits that would provide for various commercial, industrial, and public uses. Table 4.0-4 below provides a breakdown of the land uses and acreages within the city limits.

**TABLE 4.0-4 NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USES – CITY LIMITS**

LAND USE	ACREAGE
	CITY LIMITS
<b>Industrial</b>	
BIP – Business Industrial Park	270.74
BP – Business Park	14.14
HI – Heavy Industrial	556.52
LI – Light Industrial	522.80
UR-BIP – Urban Reserve Business Industrial Park	70.00
UR-LI – Urban Reserve Light Industrial	78.34
<b>Commercial</b>	
CMU – Commercial Mixed Use	556.52
GC – General Commercial	774.68
NC – Neighborhood Commercial	173.55
UR-CMU – Urban Reserve Commercial Mixed Use	51.06
UR-GC – Urban Reserve General Commercial	
<b>Public</b>	
OS – Open Space	365.75
P – Park	633.18
PQP – Public/Quasi-public	951.98
UR-P – Urban Reserve Park	
UR-PQP – Urban Reserve Public/Quasi-public	
<b>Other</b>	
AG – Agriculture	
UR – Urban Reserve	
UR-AG – Urban Reserve Agriculture	

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA GIS 2013.

### WITHIN THE TEN-YEAR PLANNING HORIZON

**Residential Land:** Future dwelling unit estimates within the City are based on the available residential land use planning designations (8,512 units). Table 4.0-5 below provides a breakdown of the residential land uses within the 10-year horizon.

**TABLE 4.0-5 RESIDENTIAL LAND USES - 10-YEAR**

LAND USE	ACREAGE
	SOI-10 YEAR
<b>Residential</b>	
HDR – High Density Residential	15.19
LDR – Low Density Residential	1,327.10
MDR – Medium Density Residential	30.86
UR-LDR – Urban Reserve Low Density Residential	355.32
UR-MDR – Urban Reserve Medium Density Residential	19.74
UR-VLDR – Urban Reserve Very Low Density Residential	
VLDR – Very Low Density Residential	16.73

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA GIS 2013.

The four annexation projects that will play a significant role in adding residential and commercial projects to the City are as follows: Machado Estates, South of Woodward Avenue-North, South of Woodward Avenue-South, and Oakwood Shores. Together they account for 2,561 residential units of the total 8,512 unit capacities within the 10-Year Planning Horizon. Additionally, there is an estimated 130,000 square feet of general commercial space.

**TABLE 4.0-6 POTENTIAL ANNEXATION PROJECTS**

PROJECT	RESIDENTIAL UNITS	COMMERCIAL SF
Machado Estates	575	
South of Woodward-North	706	
South of Woodward-South	800	30,000
Oakwood Shores	480	100,000
Total	2,561	130,000

**Machado Estates.** The Machado Estates is a 575-unit proposed subdivision on approximately 150 acres of unincorporated land that resides in the southwest area of the City (see **Figure 2-1**). The site is currently within the 10-year planning horizon and is bordered by the City limits at Woodward Ave. on the north and the 20-Year Planning Horizon on the south. The site is currently vacant and is not in agricultural use. The project would result in the development of 575 residential units built in 4 phases over a 4-5 year period. Assuming 3 persons per household, the project would accommodate a population of 1725 persons at build-out.

**South of Woodward Avenue (SOWA)-North:** The SOWA North project is made up of three project sites referred to as Atherton Homes at Woodward Park I, Atherton Homes at Woodward Park II, and DeJong with a total single-family residential development of 706 units (171, 185, and 350 units, respectively). These sites are currently within the 10-year planning horizon and are bordered by the City limits at Woodward Ave. on the north and the SOWA-South project on the south. The project would allow for approximately 706-units. The project would be built in multiple phases over an extended period based on the economic market conditions. Assuming 3 persons per household, the project would accommodate a population of 2,118 persons at build-out.

**South of Woodward Avenue (SOWA)-South:** The SOWA South project includes the development of approximately 184 acres into an age-restricted 800 single-family residential lots; 452 lots will contain approximately 4,500 square feet and the remaining 348 lots will contain approximately 5,500 square feet. The project will also have an approximately 30 acre parcel to accommodate the existing 30,000 square foot mansion that will be converted to a community club house for the residents of the project area. The project is bordered the SOWA-North project to the north, and the 20-year planning horizon to the south.

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

**Oakwood Shores:** The Oakwood Shores project includes the development of approximately 480 single-family residential lots that were approved and partially developed in the unincorporated San Joaquin County. There is also a general commercial land use that is undeveloped with no current application on file, although an estimate of approximately 100,000 sf of commercial is assumed in this report. The project is bordered the Union Pacific Railroad to the north, the City limits to the east, and the sphere of influence boundary to the south and west.

**Non-residential land:** There is also a variety of non-residential land uses within the city limits that would provide for various commercial, industrial, and public uses. **Table 4.0-7** below provides a breakdown of the land uses and acreages.

**TABLE 4.0-7 NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USES - 10-YEAR**

LAND USE	ACREAGE
	SOI-10 YEAR
<b>Industrial</b>	
BIP	
BP	
HI	152.48
LI	383.28
UR-BIP	94.21
UR-LI	36.11
<b>Commercial</b>	
CMU	13.44
GC	30.07
NC	12.66
UR-CMU	43.06
UR-GC	43.47
<b>Public</b>	
OS	
P	59.79
PQP	188.17
UR-P	8.79
UR-PQP	

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA GIS 2013.

### WITHIN THE 20-YEAR PLANNING HORIZON

**Residential Land:** Future dwelling unit estimates within the City are based on the available residential land use planning designations (11,356 units)<sup>2</sup>. **Table 4.0-8** below provides a breakdown of the residential land uses within the 20-year horizon.

<sup>2</sup> 2012 American Community Survey (1-year estimates) US Census Bureau.

**TABLE 4.0-8 RESIDENTIAL LAND USES - 20-YEAR**

LAND USE	ACREAGE
	SOI-20 YEAR
<b>Residential</b>	
HDR	302.91
LDR	4.07
MDR	876.22
UR-LDR	4.57
UR-MDR	
UR-VLDR	
VLDR	

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA GIS 2013.

**Non-residential land:** There is also a variety of non-residential land uses within the city limits that would provide for various commercial, industrial, and public uses. **Table 4.0-9** below provides a breakdown of the land uses and acreages within the 20-year horizon.

**TABLE 4.0-9 NON-RESIDENTIAL LAND USES - 20-YEAR**

LAND USE	ACREAGE
	SOI-20 YEAR
<b>Industrial</b>	
BIP	
BP	
HI	
LI	
UR-BIP	227.77
UR-LI	
<b>Commercial</b>	
CMU	7.11
GC	59.61
NC	
UR-CMU	74.26
UR-GC	
<b>Public</b>	
OS	84.23
P	29.34
PQP	25.44
UR-P	58.73
UR-PQP	11.65
<b>Other</b>	
AG	302.91
NA	
UR	

SOURCE: CITY OF MANTECA GIS 2013.

## Development Projections

Manteca has generally grown in a concentric fashion, developing outward to areas from its historic center. In addition, planned land uses and vacant land along Highway 120 have created development opportunities along this corridor. The San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) updates the population projections for the Cities of San Joaquin County every four years to facilitate their regional transportation planning efforts. SJCOG's latest population projections for Manteca

are 117,010 people by 2035. The City of Manteca has a Growth Management Ordinance that caps growth in the City at a 3.9% maximum growth rate, which is a cap of approximately 165,000 people by 2035. Based on historical trends in Manteca it is not expected that population growth would come close to the cap within the planning horizon. The SJCOG's estimates are considered a more realistic projection of future growth in the City of Manteca based on historical trends.

The currently designated SOI and the 10 and 20-Year Planning Horizons will provide for population growth of up 153,982 people; however, it is not expected that actual population growth will approach this maximum horizon based on the historical trends and SJCOG's population projections for Manteca. There are many factors that will ultimately influence the actual population (i.e. job availability, housing availability/affordability, etc.). It is realistic to rely on the SJCOG future population for 117,010 by 2035. The land in the SOI, 10-year, and 20-year planning horizon would accommodate this population growth.

### CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

---

Cumulative settings are identified under each cumulative impact analysis. Cumulative settings vary because the area that the impact may affect is different. For example, noise impacts generally only impact the local surrounding area because noise travel a relatively short distance while air quality impacts affect the whole air basin as wind currents control air flow and are not generally affected by natural or manmade barriers which would affect noise. Cumulative project impacts are addressed and summarized below.

#### **Method of Analysis**

Although the environmental effects of an individual project may not be significant when that project is considered separately, the combined effects of several projects may be significant when considered collectively. State CEQA Guidelines 15130 requires a reasonable analysis of a project's cumulative impacts, which are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." The cumulative impact that results from several closely related projects is: the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (State CEQA Guidelines 15355[b]). Cumulative impact analysis may be less detailed than the analysis of the project's individual effects (State CEQA Guidelines 15130[b]).

There are two approaches to identifying cumulative projects and the associated impacts. The list approach identifies individual projects known to be occurring or proposed in the surrounding area in order to identify potential cumulative impacts. The projection approach uses a summary of projections in adopted General Plans or related planning documents to identify potential cumulative impacts. This EIR uses a combination of the list approach and the projection approach for the cumulative analysis and considers the development anticipated to occur upon buildout of the various General Plans in the area in addition to the pending and proposed projects in the area.

## Project Assumptions

The proposed Project's contribution to environmental impacts under cumulative conditions is based on full buildout of the Project site. See Chapter 2, Project Description, for a complete description of the proposed Project.

## Cumulative Impacts

Some cumulative impacts for issue areas are not quantifiable and are therefore discussed in general terms as they pertain to development patterns in the surrounding region. Exceptions to this are traffic, utilities and air quality (the latter two of which are associated with traffic volumes), which may be quantified by estimating future traffic patterns, pollutant emitters, etc. and determining the combined effects that may result. In consideration of the cumulative scenario described above, the proposed Project may result in the following cumulative impacts.

### AESTHETICS

The cumulative setting for aesthetics is the City of Manteca and surrounding areas of Lathrop and San Joaquin County.

#### ***Impact 4.1: project implementation may substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

There are no designated State Scenic Highways in the vicinity of the Project site. Only one highway section in San Joaquin County is listed as a Designated Scenic Highway by the Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System; the segment of State Route 580 from Interstate 5 to State Route 205. This route traverses the edge of the Coast Range to the west and Central Valley to the east. The City of Manteca and the Project site are not visible from this roadway segment. Additionally, there are no "eligible" highway segments in the vicinity of the Project site that may be included in the State Scenic Highway system. Cumulative development in the city would not impact a Designated Scenic Highway. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts relative to scenic resources would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution** and no mitigation is required.

#### ***Impact 4.2: Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)***

As described in Section 3.1- Aesthetics, implementation of the proposed Project would convert the Project site from its existing agricultural character to a developed commercial and recreational complex with various buildings, landscaping, ball fields/recreational amenities, and parking areas. Project implementation would alter the existing visual character of the Project site; however, the guidelines and standards within the proposed Project would ensure consistent development that is in line with the City's vision for the community's identity.

Under cumulative conditions, buildout of the General Plan for Manteca and the surrounding jurisdictions could result in changes to the visual character and quality of the City of Manteca

through development of undeveloped areas and/or changes to the character of existing communities. Development of the proposed Project, in addition to other future projects in the area, would change the existing visual and scenic qualities of the City. There are no mitigation measures that could reduce this impact except a ceasing of all future development, which is not a feasible option. As such, this is a **cumulatively considerable contribution** and a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

***Impact 4.3: project implementation may result in light and glare impacts (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Implementation of the lighting and design standards in the proposed Project would ensure that lighting features do not result in light spillage onto adjacent properties and do not significantly impact views of the night sky. Adherence to the design requirements in the proposed Project and the subsequent design review of future projects within the Project site would ensure that excessively reflective building materials are not used, and that the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to daytime glare. Future projects within Manteca, Lathrop, and San Joaquin County would be subject to the light and glare standards established by the individual jurisdictions. These regulations are designed to minimize potential light and glare impacts of new development. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future projects minimize their potential light and glare impacts resulting in a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**, and no mitigation is required.

### AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

The cumulative setting for agriculture and forest resources is all of San Joaquin County. According to the Department of Conservation, the County had 754,229 acres of farmland in 2010, the majority of which is identified as prime farmland. Of the total farmland, prime farmland represents 42 percent (385,337 acres), farmland of statewide importance represents nine percent (83,307 acres), and unique farmland represents eight percent (69,481 acres).

***Impact 4.4: Cumulative Impact on Agricultural and Forest Resources (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)***

As described in Section 3.2, development of the proposed Project would result in a conversion of 182.2 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the map prepared under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), to nonagricultural uses. The loss of Important Farmland as classified under the FMMP is considered a potentially significant environmental impact.

The City's agricultural mitigation fee program requires that future development pay the agricultural mitigation fee, currently \$2,511.67 per acre, to mitigate the conversion of agricultural land to urban use. The City will use these funds to purchase conservation easements or deed restrictions on agricultural land to ensure that the land remains in agricultural use in perpetuity.

In addition to the City's agricultural mitigation fee program, the SJMSCP requires development to pay fees on a per-acre basis for impacts to agricultural lands that function as habitat for biological resources. SJCOG will then use these funds to purchase the conservation easements on agricultural and habitat lands in the project vicinity. The compensation results in the purchase of conservation easements that are placed over agricultural land, such as alfalfa and row crops. As such, the Project fees paid to SJCOG as administrator of the SJMSCP will result in the preservation of agricultural lands in perpetuity.

The purchase of conservation easements and/or deed restrictions through the City agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP allows the landowners to retain ownership of the land and continue agricultural operations, and preserves such lands in perpetuity.

While the proposed Project will contribute fees toward the purchase of conservation easements on agricultural lands through the City's agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP mitigation program as required by Mitigation Measure 3.2-1, those fees and conservation easements would not result in the creation of new farmland to offset the loss that would occur with Project implementation. As such, the loss of Important Farmland would be a **cumulatively considerable contribution** and a **significant and unavoidable** impact.

#### AIR QUALITY

The cumulative setting for air quality impacts is the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB), which consists of eight counties, stretching from Kern County in the south to San Joaquin County in the north. The SJVAB is bounded by the Sierra Nevada in the east, the Coast Ranges in the west, and the Tehachapi mountains in the south.

#### ***Impact 4.5: Cumulative Impact on the Region's Air Quality (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)***

Under buildout conditions in the San Joaquin County, the SJVAB would continue to experience increases in criteria pollutants and efforts to improve air quality throughout the basin would be hindered. As described in Section 3.3, San Joaquin County has a state designation of nonattainment for Ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and is either unclassified or attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of nonattainment for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Table 3.3-2 in Section 3.3 presents the state and federal attainment status for San Joaquin County.

As discussed under Impact 3.3-1 in Section 3.3, the proposed Project would result in increased emissions primarily from vehicle miles travelled associated with project implementation. The SJVAPCD has established operations related emissions thresholds of significance and it was determined that annual emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

There are limited mitigation inputs available within the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod)<sup>TM</sup> (v.2011.1.14) to quantify emission reductions for commercial and recreational projects. As shown in Table 3.3-8, even with basic mitigation incorporated into the model, the proposed Project would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for operations. In addition,

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

---

it was found that even with basic mitigation incorporated into the model, the proposed Project would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for construction.

The proposed Project is subject to the SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Rule), which could result in substantial mitigation of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The reductions are accomplished by the incorporation of mitigation measures into projects and/or by the payment of an Indirect Source Rule fee for any required reductions that have not been accomplished through project mitigation commitments. The current fees are \$9,350 per ton of NO<sub>x</sub> and \$9,011 per ton per of PM. The actual calculations will be accomplished by the SJVAPCD and project proponent as individual projects (i.e. portions of the FEZ) are brought forward for approval under Rule 9510.

The substantial reductions in NO<sub>x</sub> (and associated ROG) and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions accomplished by the application of the ISR probably represent the best achievable mitigation for indirect sources. However, even with the application of these measures, emissions levels would remain above the defined thresholds of significance. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would have a **cumulatively considerable contribution** and **significant and unavoidable** impact from air emissions.

### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The cumulative setting for biological resources includes the Project site and the greater San Joaquin County region. Development associated with implementation of the local General Plan(s) would contribute to the ongoing loss of natural and agricultural lands in San Joaquin County, including the Project site. Cumulative development would result in the conversion of existing habitat to urban uses. The local General Plan(s), in addition to regional, State and federal regulations, includes policies and measures that mitigate impacts to biological resources associated with General Plan buildout. Additionally, local land use authorities in San Joaquin County require development to participate in the SJMSCP, which is a habitat conservation plan and natural community conservation plan for San Joaquin County that provides a mechanism for compensatory mitigation for habitat and species loss in accordance with federal and state laws.

#### ***Impact 4.6: Cumulative Loss of Biological Resources Including Habitats and Special Status Species (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Under cumulative conditions, buildout of the General Plan(s) within San Joaquin County will result in impacts to biological resources in the cumulative area through new and existing development. The General Plan(s) includes policies that are designed to minimize impacts to the extent feasible and the SJMSCP has been established to provide a mechanism for compensatory mitigation and standardized avoidance and minimization measures as needed.

As described in Section 3.4 Biological Resources, construction in the Project site has the potential to result in impacts to special-status species in the region. There are no known special-status species that have been observed in the Project site. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation with the SJMSCP, which includes fees that will be used to purchase conservation lands for a variety of special status species. The SJMSCP was created and adopted to address both

the project and cumulative impacts to biological resources, including special status species. The proposed Project will participate in the SJMSCP, including payment of fees and implementation of all Incidental Take Minimization Measures required by the SJCOG through the authorization of SJMSCP coverage.

Section 3.4 Biological Resources also indicates that the Project site contains delineated wetlands and other waters, consisting of wetlands, and an irrigation ditch. The development of Phase 1 will include the fill of Wetland 1 (1.19 acres) and Wetland 2 (1.25 acres) totaling 2.44 acres of wetland habitat. The proposed wetland fill would require authorization from several agencies, including the USACE, CDFW, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Regardless of the final determination by the regulatory agencies on the jurisdiction and impact acreage, the impact caused by the proposed project is potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 and 3.4-4 would reduce this cumulative impact to a **less than significant** level. As such, impacts to biological resources would be a ***less than cumulatively considerable contribution***.

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

The geography of cultural resources impact can be defined by region, by political subdivision or by the geography of the cultural resources present in an area, where sufficient inventory data is available to define it. The cumulative setting for cultural resources includes all of the San Joaquin County. There are extensive cultural sites located in the region.

#### ***Impact 4.7: Cumulative Impacts on Known and Undiscovered Cultural Resources (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Cumulative development anticipated in the City of Manteca, including growth projected by adopted future projects, may result in the discovery and removal of cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, and Native American resources and human remains. As discussed in Section 3.5 Cultural Resources, no prehistoric artifacts or evidence of prehistoric use of the survey area was found. No historic resources were recorded. The existing in-use railroad line lies outside the Project site. There is a segment of a post-1915, pre-1952 irrigation canal within the Project area that has been researched and recorded in other locations in the region in 1993 by JRP (P-39-000103). The recorders of the nearby segments concluded that there was no way to find a specific date of construction for any segment of the ditch system since the SSJID does not maintain records with that information. The ditches were not considered eligible resources under the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places, and similarly would in no way be eligible for the California Register. The ditch system is forever recorded through the plotting of its location on the Lathrop 1952, 1968, 1978 and 1996 USGS topographic maps.

Any unknown cultural resources which are discovered during development of the proposed Project would be required to be preserved, either through preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. With implementation of the mitigation measures provided in Section 3.5, the proposed Project is not anticipated to considerably contribute to a significant reduction in cultural resources.

All future projects in the regional vicinity would be subject to their respective General Plans (i.e. City of Manteca, City of Lathrop, and San Joaquin County), each of which have policies and measures that are designed to ensure protection of undiscovered cultural resources. In addition, all discretionary projects in these jurisdictions would require environmental review per regulations established in CEQA.

Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to cultural resources would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impacts related to geology and soils are not inherently cumulative. Geology and soils concerns are related to risks, hazards or development constraints that are largely site-specific. However, seismic hazards are regional, and management of seismic hazards is vested with the local planning and building authority. For this reasons, the potential for cumulative geology and soils impacts are considered in the context of the City of Manteca and vicinity.

#### ***Impact 4.8: Cumulative Impact on Geologic and Soils Resources (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

As discussed in Section 3.6 Geology and Soils, implementation of the proposed Project has limited potential for expansive soils and lateral spreading, and a higher potential for liquefaction due to its high groundwater table. However, mitigation measures provided in Section 3.6 ensure this impact will be less than significant. While the City is not within an area known for its seismic activity, there will always be a potential for groundshaking caused by seismic activity anywhere in California, including the Project site. Seismic activity could come from a known active fault such as the Greenville fault, or any number of other faults in the region. In order to minimize potential damage to the buildings and site improvements, all construction in California is required to be designed in accordance with the latest seismic design standards of the California Building Code. Additionally, the City of Manteca has incorporated numerous policies relative to seismicity to ensure the health and safety of all people. Design in accordance with these standards and policies would reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level.

Geologic and soils impacts tend to be site-specific and project-specific. With the mitigation measures presented in Section 3.6, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in increased risks or hazards related to geologic conditions in the cumulative setting area, nor would it result in any off-site or indirect impacts. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to geologic and soil resources would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

## GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The cumulative setting for greenhouse gas emissions and climate change impacts for this analysis is San Joaquin County, which is the boundary for the California Air Resources Board's regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

### ***Impact 4.9: Cumulative Impact on Climate Change from Increased project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Greenhouse gas emissions from a single project will not cause global climate change; however, greenhouse gas emission from multiple projects throughout a region or state could result in a cumulative impact with respect to global climate change.

In California, there has been extensive legislation passed with the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The legislative goals are as follows: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by 2020 and 3) 80% below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. To achieve these goals the California Air Resources Board has developed regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the automobile and light truck sectors (the largest single source of greenhouse gas emissions) for 2020 and 2035. The regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established for San Joaquin County by the California Air Resources Board require a 5 percent decrease in per capita CO<sup>2</sup> emissions in 2020 and 10 percent decrease in 2035 when compared to 2005 levels.

To demonstrate the ability for the region (San Joaquin County) to attain the regional reduction targets, a Sustainable Communities Strategy is currently being prepared by the San Joaquin Council of Governments, serving as the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Regional Transportation Planning Agency in San Joaquin County. The San Joaquin Council of Governments will calculate the levels of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions using the regions travel demand model and the California Emissions Factor (EMFAC) model for a variety of growth scenarios in an effort to find an acceptable scenario that would reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the regional targets.

In August 2008, the SJVAPCD adopted its Climate Change Action Plan. The Climate Change Action Plan directed the SJVAPCD's Air Pollution Control Officer to develop guidance to assist APCD staff, Valley businesses, land use agencies and other permitting agencies in addressing GHG emissions as part of the CEQA process. Regarding CEQA guidance, some of the goals of the Climate Change Action Plan are to assist local land use agencies, developers and the public by identifying and quantifying GHG emission reduction measures for development projects and by providing tools to streamline evaluation of project-specific GHG effects, and to assist Valley businesses in complying with State law related to GHG emissions. A product of this direction to provide CEQA guidance is the Final Staff Report – Climate Change Action Plan: Addressing GHG Emissions Impacts, presented to the APCD Board in December 2009. A central component of the Final Staff Report is the establishment of Best Performance Standards, which are specifications or project design elements that identify effective, feasible GHG emission reduction measures. Emission reductions achieved through Best Performance Standards implementation would be pre-quantified, thus negating the need for project-specific quantification of GHG emissions. For projects not implementing Best

Performance Standards, demonstration of a 29% reduction in GHG emissions from business-as-usual conditions is required to determine that a project would have a less than cumulatively significant impact.

With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-1, the overall annual GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would be reduced by over 36.8 percent by the year 2020 when compared to the business as usual scenario. This is consistent with applicable standards and thresholds of a 29 percent reduction established by the SJVAPCD. Because the proposed Project would meet the 29 percent minimum reduction threshold, the proposed Project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target. The percentage reduction is consistent with the GHG reduction percentage sought by the state's Scoping Plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with the reduction target set in the Climate Change Action Plan and consistent with the Scoping Plan. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The cumulative context for the analysis of cumulative hazards and human health impacts is San Joaquin County, including all cumulative growth therein, as represented by full implementation of each respective General Plan (i.e. Manteca, Lathrop, and San Joaquin County). As discussed in Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts related to this environmental topic with the implementation of the mitigation measures provided in Section 3.8.

#### ***Impact 4.10: Cumulative Impact Related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The proposed Project, in conjunction with cumulative development in the region, would include areas designated for a variety of urban, agricultural, and open space uses as defined by the applicable General Plan. Cumulative development would include continued operation of or development of new facilities as allowed under each land use designation. New development would inevitably increase the use of hazardous materials within the region, resulting in potential health and safety effects related to hazardous materials use. For the most part, potential impacts associated with new and future development would be confined to commercial and industrial areas and would not involve the use of hazardous substances in large quantities or that would be particularly hazardous. Incidents, if any, would typically be site specific and would involve accidental spills or inadvertent releases. Associated health and safety risks would generally be limited to those individuals using the materials or to persons in the immediate vicinity of the materials and would not combine with similar effects elsewhere (i.e., construction workers). Hazard-related impacts tend to be site-specific and project-specific. The Project site is not associated with any existing hazardous materials spills; however, there are numerous areas throughout the County where hazardous conditions are present.

Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant increased risks of hazards in the cumulative setting area, nor would it result in any significant off-site or indirect impacts. Mitigation measures have been included to reduce the risk of on-site hazards associated with the use of on-site hazardous materials. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

#### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Potential cumulative issues associated with surface waters can be addressed on a watershed basis, or in the case of groundwater in the context of a groundwater basin. Because water resources are highly interconnected, the cumulative setting is based on San Joaquin County which is located in the San Joaquin River Hydrological Region. Cumulative development in this region, including the proposed Project, would impact the water quality and hydrological features of the San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region. With respect to surface waters, the Project site is located adjacent to an irrigation canal that discharges into the Delta at the downstream end of its relatively large watershed. The City of Manteca and much of the surrounding area is located in the Eastern San Joaquin River Groundwater Basin. This groundwater basin covers approximately 1,105 square miles. The Project site is located in the Oakwood Lake - San Joaquin River watershed. Any matter that may affect water quality draining from the Project site will eventually end up in the Delta or within the groundwater basin.

#### ***Impact 4.11: Cumulative Increases in Peak Stormwater Runoff from the Project site (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Implementation of the proposed Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the Project site, which could increase peak stormwater runoff rates and volumes on and downstream on the Project site. However, the proposed Project includes an extensive system of on-site stormwater collection, treatment and retention facilities to accommodate the increased stormwater flows that would originate in the Project site.

As with the entire City of Manteca, the proposed stormwater collection system functions by discharging all runoff directly into the SSJID irrigation canals. When the rate of runoff exceeds the pump station capacity, water “backs up” into the surge basins until the runoff rate declines and once again equals the capacity of the canals. The water level in the surge basins then decreases, emptying completely. The proposed project includes a man-made lake, which will function in part as a surge/detention/retention basin, and as a visual amenity of the project.

With the design and construction of flood control improvements, the proposed Project would not increase peak stormwater runoff. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to stormwater runoff would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

### ***Impact 4.12: Cumulative Impacts Related to Degradation of Water Quality (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The proposed Project, along with several of the related projects within the City of Manteca would discharge stormwater runoff to the SSJID canals, which ultimately flow to the nearby Delta waterways. This would potentially degrade water quality of the system.

Construction of the proposed Project would contribute to a cumulative increase in urban pollutant loading, which could adversely affect water quality. Cumulative development in the Manteca area, including the proposed Project, would also result in increased impervious surfaces that could increase the rate and amount of runoff, thereby potentially adversely affecting existing surface water quality through increased erosion and sedimentation. The primary sources of water pollution include: runoff from roadways and parking lots; runoff from landscaping areas; non-stormwater connections to the drainage system; accidental spills; and illegal dumping. Runoff from roadway and parking lots could contain oil, grease, and heavy metals; additionally, runoff from landscaped areas could contain elevated concentrations of nutrients, fertilizers, and pesticides.

The proposed Project will be required to comply with Mitigation Measure 3.9.1 which requires the development and approval of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to regulate stormwater quality for the Project site which will be designed in accordance with the City of Manteca's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) issued by the RWQCB.

While there are no assurances that other projects in the County would incorporate the same degree or methods of treatment as the proposed Project, several of the projects within the City of Manteca would phase out existing agricultural runoff discharges from their respective sites and, similar to the proposed Project, could provide some level of water quality improvement. Also, each related project that would discharge stormwater runoff would be required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge permits from the RWQCB, which adjusts requirements on a case-by-case basis to avoid significant degradation of water quality. Therefore, while a greater quantity of urban runoff may be discharged to the Delta system with implementation of the related projects, because of an increase in impervious surfaces, the associated surface water quality impacts would be expected to be less than significant because of improved or similar quality of runoff compared to existing conditions.

Compliance with city and county water quality protection regulations, approval from the RWQCB and Mitigation Measure 3.9-1 would ensure that the proposed Project minimizes impacts to surface water quality. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to water quality would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

### ***Impact 4.13: Cumulative Impacts Related to Degradation of Groundwater Supply or Recharge (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The proposed Project would result in new impervious surfaces and could reduce rainwater infiltration and groundwater recharge. Infiltration rates vary depending on the overlying soil types.

In general, sandy soils have higher infiltration rates and can contribute to significant amounts of ground water recharge; clay soils tend to have lower percolation potential; and impervious surfaces such as pavement significantly reduce infiltration capacity and increase surface water runoff.

The Project site has soils with a hydrologic rating of “A”, which is indicative of soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission. Development of the proposed Project will cover at least 50% of the existing Project site with impervious surfaces and could reduce rainwater infiltration and groundwater recharge further. The collection of rainwater for those areas of impervious surfaces will be routed into the proposed Project’s storm drainage system and eventually flow into the San Joaquin River. The ball fields will remain largely pervious. The exact design of the drainage basin is not known at this time, therefore, it is not known whether the drainage basin will percolate or not (i.e. unlined or lined).

The project site is located in the Eastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Basin. The basin is not adjudicated; however, a basin management plan has been created. The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan (ESJGB-GMP) (NSJCGB, 2004) was prepared in September 2004. The purpose of the ESJGB-GMP is “to review, enhance, assess, and coordinate existing groundwater management policies and programs in Eastern San Joaquin County and to develop new policies and programs to ensure the long-term sustainability of groundwater resources in Eastern San Joaquin County.” According to Department of Water Resources (DWR) Bulletin 118 (DWR, 2006), the ESJGB is in a critical condition of overdraft. Groundwater levels have declined in the basin since the 1960s with the lowest groundwater levels found in eastern San Joaquin County.

Groundwater pumping in Manteca increased from 2,277 AFY in 1960 to a maximum of 14,933 AFY in 2004 prior to the SCWSP delivering treated surface water to the City. According to the City’s 2005 UWMP, the sustainable yield of the groundwater basin was estimated in a 1985 study to be approximately 1 acre-foot per acre per year. Although groundwater pumping in some years has exceeded that rate, as part of the SCWSP, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to that rate or less. At this time, the area of the City’s PUSA is 13,790 acres. Therefore, the City intends to limit groundwater pumping to a long-term average of no greater than 13,790 afy. Groundwater pumping is not projected to reach 13,790 ac-ft/yr prior to 2035.

While the Project site’s soils have a high infiltration rate based on the high percentage of sands, much of the groundwater recharge in the basin occurs in the sand and gravels along the San Joaquin River from Sierra snowmelt flowing downstream. Precipitation in the region is 13.81 inches, most of which falls between November through April. A portion of this annual rainfall infiltrates the soil and groundwater basin, while a portion is discharged downstream into the Delta. While the proposed project would reduce the amount of pervious surfaces within the project site, it will retain at least 50% of the site as a pervious surface.

For the reasons mentioned above, the proposed Project would not cause the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

***Impact 4.14: Cumulative Impacts Related to Flooding  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

As shown on Figure 3.9-2, the Project site is not within a 100-year flood zone as delineated by FEMA. Therefore, the proposed Project is not at risk of the 100-year flood. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

### LAND USE AND POPULATION

The cumulative setting for land use and population impacts is the City of Manteca.

***Impact 4.15: Cumulative Impact on Communities and Local Land Uses  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Cumulative land use impacts, such as the potential for conflicts with adjacent land uses and consistency with adopted plans and regulations, are typically site- and project-specific. Prior to project authorization, City adoption of the proposed Project would include approval of the Master Plan for the Family Entertainment Zone. The General Plan designated the project site as Public/Quasi-Public, which allows government-owned facilities, public and private schools, institutions, civic uses and public utilities, and quasi-public uses such as hospitals and churches. The Project would be a government-owned facility that provides recreation and visitor-serving uses. As a government-owned facility, the Project does not conflict with the uses allowed under the Manteca GP. Therefore, the Project is substantially consistent with the Manteca GP land use requirements and would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to the Manteca GP.

The proposed Project has been designed to be consistent with applicable aspects of the City's General Plan, and as described in this EIR, the proposed Project would not be incompatible with any of the surrounding land uses with the incorporation of mitigation and design measures. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to communities and land uses would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

***Impact 4.16: Cumulative Impacts on Population and Housing  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

As described in Section 3.10, the proposed project would not add housing, nor are there any existing homes or other types of residential structures in the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would directly increase the population and would not displace any persons or existing housing. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative

impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to population and housing would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

The cumulative setting for mineral resources is San Joaquin County. The primary mineral resources in San Joaquin County are sand, gravel, and natural gas, with limited mining of peat, gold, and silver. In 2012, the California Geological Survey assessed the Stockton-Lodi Production-Consumption (P-C) Region mineral resources, with a focus on aggregate resources. The Stockton-Lodi P-C Region contains about 969 million tons PCC-grade aggregate resources and 67 million tons PCC-grade sand resources.

***Impact 4.17: Cumulative Impacts Resulting in the Loss of a Known Mineral Resource (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The Project site is not mapped as having a known mineral resource of value to the region. The Project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site in the City's General Plan. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the loss of mineral resources. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to mineral resources would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

#### NOISE

The cumulative setting for noise impacts consists of the existing and future noise sources that could affect the Project site or surrounding uses.

***Impact 4.18: Cumulative Exposure of Existing and Future Noise- Sensitive Land Uses to Increased Noise Resulting from Cumulative Development (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Construction Noise: Noise generated by construction would be temporary, and would not add to the permanent noise environment or be considered as part of the cumulative context. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to construction noise would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

Traffic Noise: Cumulative noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to the proposed Project and other projects within the area. Table 4.0-10 shows cumulative traffic noise levels. The related noise level increases under development of the proposed project are predicted to range between 0.1 to 2.3 dB. Some noise sensitive receptors located along the project-area roadways are currently exposed to exterior traffic noise levels exceeding the City of Manteca 60 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard for residential uses. These receptors will continue to experience elevated exterior noise levels with implementation of the proposed project. The project's contribution to existing traffic noise increases is predicted to be 2.3 dB, or less. This is less than the City's substantial increase criteria of 5-10 dB for project level impacts. Therefore, the increase of 2.3 dB  $L_{dn}$  is considered less than significant relative to the

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

City's substantial increase threshold. As such, impacts related to traffic noise would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

**TABLE 4.0-10: CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS VS. CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS**

ROADWAY	SEGMENT	NOISE LEVELS (L <sub>DN</sub> , DB)			DISTANCE TO 2030 + PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS, FEET <sup>1</sup>		
		2030	2030 + PROJECT	CHANGE (DB)	70 DB L <sub>DN</sub>	65 DB L <sub>DN</sub>	60 DB L <sub>DN</sub>
Airport Way	North of Yosemite	67.0	67.0	0.0	47	102	219
Airport Way	Yosemite to Wawona	65.8	66.5	0.7	44	94	202
Airport Way	Wawona to Daniels	66.5	66.6	0.1	45	96	208
Airport Way	Daniels to Atherton	66.2	66.9	0.7	62	134	289
Airport Way	South of Atherton	68.6	68.7	0.1	62	133	286
McKinley Ave	North of Yosemite	60.7	60.7	0.0	48	104	224
McKinley Ave	South of Yosemite	70.0	72.3	2.3	71	153	329
Yosemite Ave	West of McKinley	63.1	63.1	0.0	35	74	160
Yosemite Ave	McKinley to Airport	67.0	67.4	0.4	50	108	232
Yosemite Ave	East of Airport	66.7	66.8	0.1	46	99	214
Wawona St	East of Airport	59.5	59.6	0.1	10	22	47
Daniels Street	East of Airport	69.3	69.3	0.0	54	117	251
Atherton Drive	West of Airport	54.4	54.4	0.0	7	15	32
Atherton Drive	East of Airport	54.8	54.8	0.0	7	16	34
Milo Candini	Yosemite to Wawona	N/A	56.8	N/A	10	21	46

<sup>1</sup> DISTANCES TO TRAFFIC NOISE CONTOURS ARE MEASURED IN FEET FROM THE CENTERLINES OF THE ROADWAYS. ACTUAL DISTANCES MAY VARY DUE TO SHIELDING FROM EXISTING NOISE BARRIERS OR INTERVENING STRUCTURES. TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS MAY VARY DEPENDING ON ACTUAL SETBACK DISTANCES AND LOCALIZED SHIELDING.

SOURCE: FHWA-RD-77-108 WITH INPUTS FROM FEHR & PEERS AND J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

### Railroad Noise:

The UPRR line was measured to generate an exterior noise level of 74 dBA L<sub>dn</sub> at a distance of 50 feet. Based upon this measurement, railroad noise levels at the project site were predicted. Railroad noise level are not predicted to exceed the City of Manteca 70 dB L<sub>dn</sub> exterior noise level standard at proposed outdoor recreation areas, as shown in Table 4.0-11.

**TABLE 4.0-11: CUMULATIVE + PROJECT TRANSPORTATION NOISE LEVELS AT PROPOSED USES**

ROADWAY	RECEPTOR DESCRIPTION	APPROXIMATE SETBACK, FEET <sup>1</sup>	ADT	PREDICTED TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS, dB L <sub>DN</sub>			
				NO WALL	6' WALL	7' WALL	8' WALL
SR 120	Hotel Pool Area <sup>2</sup>	500	130,200	60 dB	--	--	--
SR 120	PA-6	750	130,200	68 dB	--	--	--
N/A	PA-10/11	150	Rail	67 dB	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> SETBACK DISTANCES ARE MEASURED IN FEET FROM THE CENTERLINES OF THE ROADWAYS TO THE CENTER OF THE OUTDOOR RECREATION AREA.

<sup>2</sup> INCLUDES A PARTIAL VIEW CORRECTION TO ACCOUNT FOR SHIELDING FROM PROPOSED BUILDING FACADES.

-- MEETS THE CITY OF MANTECA EXTERIOR NOISE STANDARD WITHOUT MITIGATION.

SOURCE: FHWA-RD-77-108 WITH INPUTS FROM FEHR & PEERS, AND J.C. BRENNAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 2014.

The railroad noise levels would comply with the City's 70 dB  $L_{dn}$  exterior noise level standard for playground and neighborhood park uses. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to railroad noise would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

#### PUBLIC SERVICES

Cumulative setting would include all areas covered in the service areas of the City of Manteca Fire, Parks and Recreation, the Manteca Unified School District, and any other relevant public services.

***Impact 4.19: Cumulative Impact on Other Public Services  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Implementation of the proposed Project would contribute toward an increased demand for public services and facilities within the City of Manteca. It has been determined that the impacts to the Manteca Police, Fire, and Parks and Recreation Departments would be less-than-significant. Additionally, it has been determined that the impacts to the Manteca Unified School District would be less-than-significant. The proposed Project would be subject to all fees that are paid toward the enhancement of public services within the region. Payment of the applicable impact fees by the project proponent, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes, sales taxes, and other revenues generated by the proposed Project, would assist in maintaining existing fire, police, schools, and park services. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to other public services would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

A Cumulative Conditions analysis was performed to identify potential impacts of Phase 1 of the project under Year 2030 conditions. Roadway assumptions and associated traffic forecasts along with the intersection and freeway segment operations analysis results are presented in this section.

**Intersection Operations:** The study intersections, including the two future SR 120/McKinley interchange ramp-terminal intersections, were analyzed under Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Phase 1 conditions. As shown in Table 4.0-12, many of the study intersections are projected to operate at unacceptable service levels regardless of whether the project is developed. This is due to expected traffic growth and a lack of any planned improvements at these locations.

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

**Table 4.0-12: Intersection Operations – Cumulative Conditions**

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1)	
				Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS
1. Airport Way/Atherton Drive	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	<b>83 (2570)</b>	F (F)	<b>109 (378)</b>	F (F)
			PM	<b>49 (1193)</b>	E (F)	<b>46 (1178)</b>	E (F)
2. Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	<b>101</b>	F	<b>112</b>	F
			PM	<b>87</b>	F	<b>58</b>	E
3. Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	42	D	54	D
			PM	<b>105</b>	F	<b>76</b>	E
4. Airport Way/Daniels Street	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	27	C	31	C
			PM	<b>189</b>	F	<b>219</b>	F
5. Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	4 ( <b>48</b> )	A (E)	4 ( <b>60</b> )	A (F)
			PM	9 ( <b>161</b> )	A (F)	11 ( <b>216</b> )	B (F)
6. Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	39	D	41	D
			PM	<b>75</b>	E	<b>79</b>	E
7. McKinley Avenue/Yosemite Avenue	City of Lathrop	Traffic Signal	AM	36	D	37	D
			PM	46	D	47	D
8. Daniels Street/Milo Candini Drive	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	23	C	23	C
			PM	14	B	20	B
9. McKinley Ave/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	15	B	24	C
			PM	17	B	20	B
10. McKinley Ave/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	14	B	18	B
			PM	12	B	17	B
11. McKinley Ave/Daniels St Extension	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	Intersection does not exist under this scenario		11	B
			PM	Intersection does not exist under this scenario		21	C

Notes:

- For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for all approaches. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay and LOS for the most-delayed individual movement is shown in parentheses next to the average intersection delay and LOS. All results are rounded to the nearest second.
- Bold** indicates unacceptable LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

Although operations at the Airport Way/Atherton Drive intersection are anticipated to be at LOS F without or with the project, the project impact is not considered cumulatively significant because side-street delay would not worsen when the project is implemented.

The two unsignalized study intersections were re-evaluated under cumulative conditions to determine if they would satisfy the Peak Hour warrant for consideration of a traffic signal. Both intersections would satisfy the warrant during one or both peak hours under Cumulative No Project and Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions.

**Freeway Analysis:** Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1) freeway operations were evaluated for the AM and PM peak hours. The results are shown in Table 4.0-13. This table shows only those freeway facilities that would be used by project trips. As shown, all ramp merge/diverge movements would operate at LOS D or better. These results assume the

planned widening of SR 120 to six lanes. They also include the planned two-lane off-ramp (and deceleration lane) on eastbound SR 120 at McKinley Avenue.

Intersection	Type	Cumulative No Project Conditions				Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions			
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
1. SR 120 EB off-ramp at McKinley Ave	Diverge	14	B	27	C	15	B	28	C
2. SR 120 WB on-ramp at McKinley Ave	Merge	33	D	26	C	33	D	27	C
3. SR 120 EB on-ramp at Airport Way	Merge	25	C	31	D	25	C	32	D
4. SR 120 WB off-ramp at Airport Way	Diverge	30	D	33	D	31	D	33	D
5. SR 120 EB off-ramp at Union Road	Diverge	16	D	21	C	16	B	31	C
6. SR 120 WB slip on-ramp at Union Road	Merge	25	C	27	C	27	C	27	C

Notes:

1. Evaluated using the HCS2010 software, which applies the methods from the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010).
2. Bold and underlined text indicates unacceptable operations. Shaded cells indicate a significant impact.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

**Project Buildout Travel Characteristics:** Future phases of the Manteca Family Entertainment Zone may include a variety of new sports, recreation, entertainment, and shopping facilities within the project site. These additional facilities are not currently planned, and the proposed project does not include site plan review or other entitlements that would allow for their implementation. The following conceptual land uses have been prepared for the various numbered, Planning Areas (PA) within the project site:

- PA-1 (northeast corner of Project Site): Potential land uses could include three international soccer fields, two U-12 soccer fields, and one U-8 soccer field. Alternatively, the international soccer fields could be divided into two U-12 youth soccer fields, yielding a total of eight U-12 play fields, and one U-8 size field.
- PA-1a & PA-1b (directly west of the existing Big League Dreams complex): Two new baseball fields.
- PA-2 (northcentral portion of Project Site): Two U-12 and two U-13 sized youth soccer fields.
- PA-3, PA-4, and PA-5 (north of the Daniels Street extension and west of the existing Big League Dreams Complex): 360,000 square feet of food and beverage, restaurant, and general retail space.
- PA-6 and PA-6a (southwest portion of Project Site): serves as expansion for the family entertainment offerings, and potential location of the Yosemite/South Sierra Nevada Visitors Center, relocated Manteca Convention and Visitors Bureau, and bus terminal / temporary bus parking for tours connecting to Yosemite and the Sierras.
- PA-7 (west portion of Project Site, north of Daniels Street): intended to be developed as an Adventure Zone with active and passive recreational facilities.

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

---

- PA-8 (central portion of Project Site): incorporates an Indoor All-Season Sports & Exhibition Center.
- PA-9 and PA-10 (west portion of Project Site, north of Daniels Street and east of McKinley Avenue): is slated for future FEZ expansion.
- PA-11 (northwest portion of Project Site): is intended to be developed as a sport field with spectator seating.
- PA-12 (northcentral portion of Project Site): is envisioned to serve as an outdoor sports zone.
- PA-13, PA-14, and PA-15 (northern portion of Project Site): comprises the PG&E right-of-way, which will be used for shared parking for the FEZ property.

To support buildout of the FEZ, the following roadway improvements would be completed.

- Extend Daniels Street as a four-lane roadway from its current terminus to McKinley Avenue.
- Extend Wawona Street westerly as a two-lane roadway from Airport Way to Milo Candini Drive.
- Extend Milo Candini Drive northeasterly from the FEZ property to Yosemite Avenue.

A detailed technical analysis of project buildout was not conducted due to the speculative nature of the land use proposals. At this time, the specific amount of retail versus restaurant is not known. The degree to which retail and restaurant uses will be configured to complement the sporting activities is not known. The types of sporting activities (i.e., soccer practices versus matches, and spectator sizes for the international fields) are not known. The size and types of land uses on PA-6 through PA-12 are not known. Therefore, any analysis that attempts to analyze (and mitigate for) project-specific or cumulative transportation impacts associated with project buildout would be speculative. Instead, a programmatic assessment of travel conditions under cumulative conditions was conducted. This evaluation consisted of estimating the average daily traffic (ADT) volume on roadways bordering and within the project site assuming no development and with project buildout.

Figure 3.14-10 displays the Cumulative No Project ADT forecasts using the same forecasting procedure described earlier in this section. The ‘no project’ forecasts assume no additional development west of Airport Way, north of SR 120, east of McKinley Avenue, and south of Yosemite Avenue.

The following four-step process was then used to estimate the Cumulative Plus Project ADT forecasts. The “project buildout” forecasts are also shown on Figure 3.14-10.

- Step 1: Add proposed roadway improvements to travel demand model.
- Step 2: Develop four new traffic analysis zones (TAZs) to represent project buildout. Inputs to each TAZ are as follows:

- TAZ 1 (PA-1 and PA-2): Input retail employees such that zone generates 910 daily trips, which is ITE's estimate of the trip generation of 13 soccer fields.
- TAZ 2 (FEZ commercial uses): Enter three retail employees per thousand square feet.
- TAZ 3 (Hotel Facility): Use multi-family residential, office, and retail employees to match expected trip generation (model doesn't have a hotel land use category).
- TAZ 4 (PA-6 through PA-12): Enter two retail employees per thousand square feet of building space (based on the square footage yields in the NOP).
- Step 3: Review reasonableness of model forecasts in terms of trip generation, internalization, and external directionality of trips.
- Step 4: Develop ADT forecasts using the procedure described earlier in this section.

According to Figure 3.14-10, project buildout (along with planned roadway improvements) would cause increases in traffic on segments of Airport Way and McKinley Avenue. The following key conclusions are drawn from this figure:

- The SR 120/McKinley Avenue interchange has been 'sized' to accommodate buildout of the Manteca and Lathrop General Plans (including development of the FEZ property). Accordingly, project buildout would not adversely affect its design or operations.
- Project buildout would cause the ADT on Airport Way between Daniels Street and SR 120 to increase from 32,100 to 36,000, a 12 percent increase. This could potentially cause impacts to the SR 120/Airport Way interchange, which is not currently planned to be upgraded.
- According to Figure 3.14-10, project buildout would result in Daniels Street between Airport Way and McKinley Avenue carrying no more than 12,500 ADT, which is well within the capacity of a four-lane road. It is noted that the Wawona Street extension to Milo Candini Drive would carry 11,200 ADT. This volume is due, partially, to the assumption that a significant amount of parking would be provided along the power line corridor, which is directly accessible via this road. The Airport Way/Wawona Street intersection would require signalization and additional lanes to accommodate this traffic.
- An extension of Milo Candini to Yosemite Ave (separate City improvement project) is projected to accommodate a modest traffic volume (2,100 ADT). Accordingly, it may be included in one of the later phases of the FEZ or constructed as a separate project.

***Impact 4.20: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would cause significant impacts at intersections (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable).***

The project (Phase 1) would cause the following intersections to worsen to a significant degree according to the results in Table 3.14-13 and the established significance criteria:

- Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps (LOS F operations worsened during the AM peak hour)
- Airport Way/Daniels Street (LOS F operations worsened during the PM peak hour)
- Airport Way/Wawona Street (LOS E or F operations worsened during the AM and PM peak hours)

## 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

- Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue (LOS E operations worsened during the PM peak hour)

Phase 1 project impacts to these study intersections are considered a potentially significant impact. Table 4.0-14 displays traffic operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions with the proposed mitigation measures in place. As shown, all impacted study intersections would operate acceptably with the proposed mitigation measures in place.

Some of these measures are considered infeasible for reasons described below. The improvements at the SR 120/Airport Way interchange are within Caltrans' right-of-way and beyond the control of the City of Manteca to implement. The improvements at the Airport Way/Daniels Street and Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue intersections would likely require additional right-of-way from adjacent properties. For these reasons, these intersection impacts are considered to be **significant and unavoidable** and a **cumulatively considerable contribution**.

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Cumulative No Project		Cumulative Plus Project (Phase 1)		Cumulative Plus Project w/ Mitigation <sup>3</sup>	
				Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay <sup>1</sup> (sec/veh)	LOS
Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	<b>101</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>F</b>	14	B
			PM	<b>87</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>E</b>	12	B
Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps	Caltrans	Traffic Signal	AM	42	D	54	D	14	B
			PM	<b>105</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>E</b>	12	B
Airport Way/Daniels Street	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	27	C	31	C	32	C
			PM	<b>189</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>F</b>	51	D
Airport Way/Wawona Street	City of Manteca	Side-Street Stop	AM	4 ( <b>48</b> )	A ( <b>E</b> )	4 ( <b>60</b> )	A ( <b>F</b> )	7	A
			PM	9 ( <b>161</b> )	A ( <b>F</b> )	11 ( <b>216</b> )	B ( <b>F</b> )	7	A
Airport Way/Yosemite Avenue	City of Manteca	Traffic Signal	AM	39	D	41	D	30	C
			PM	<b>75</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>E</b>	37	D

Notes:

1. For signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, average intersection delay is reported in seconds per vehicle for all approaches. For side-street stop controlled intersections, the delay and LOS for the most-delayed individual movement is shown in parentheses next to the average intersection delay and LOS. All results are rounded to the nearest second.
2. **Bold** indicates unacceptable LOS.
3. Refer to previous page for description of proposed mitigations.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2014

### MITIGATION MEASURES

Implement Mitigation Measures 3.14-2 through 3.14-5.

**Impact 4.21: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable).**

The addition of project (Phase 1) traffic would maintain acceptable (i.e. LOS D or better) operations on study freeway facilities. However, project traffic would exacerbate vehicle queuing

on the Airport Way WB off-ramp that spills back onto the SR 120 mainline. This occurs as a result of insufficient capacity at the interchange ramp terminal intersections. This is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.14-2 recommends that the project proponent contribute fair share funding toward the reconstruction of the SR 120/Airport Way interchange. The capacity improvements would reduce queuing on the westbound off-ramp. However, this improvement would require approval from Caltrans. It would also require the remaining funding (beyond the project's fair share contribution) to be identified. Although implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the significance of the impact, the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable** and a **cumulatively considerable contribution** because there is no assurance that Manteca can implement these improvements.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

*Implement Mitigation Measure 3.14-2.*

***Impact 4.22: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would adversely affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable).***

The project (Phase 1) would provide sidewalks along the extension of Daniels Street. The project would not disrupt or interfere with existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities. The *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003) indicates that a Class II bicycle lane is planned along Daniels Street from Airport Way to McKinley Avenue. There are bicycle lanes and paths proposed in the project area, specifically on Daniels Street which is consistent with the *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003). The following measure is designed to ensure consistency with the *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* (2003). Consequently, this impact would be reduced to a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** level with mitigation.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

*Implement Mitigation Measure 3.14-3.*

***Impact 4.23: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would not adversely affect transit services or facilities (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable).***

The project (Phase 1) could potentially increase transit ridership on Manteca Transit bus routes 1, 2, and 3, which includes a stop on Daniels Street near the project site. The project would not disrupt or interfere with existing or planned public transit services or facilities. It would not create an inconsistency with policies concerning transit systems set forth in a General Plan or in the *City of Manteca Short Range Transit Plan* (2009). Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** level.

***Impact 4.24: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) could cause potentially significant impacts to at-grade rail crossings (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable).***

Yosemite Avenue and McKinley Avenue each feature at-grade crossings of a UP railroad track. The project (Phase 1) would add about 200 and 100 vehicles per day, respectively, to these two at-grade crossings. Each crossing has advanced warning signs, railroad crossing pavement markings, stop lines, crossing gates, flashing lights, and warning bells. The project would not cause an increase in delay during train crossings that would correspond to LOS D or worse conditions. Furthermore, the project would not add traffic to an at-grade crossing with a known safety problem. Therefore, this impact is considered **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** level.

***Impact 4.25: Under cumulative conditions, proposed project buildout could cause significant impacts at intersections and freeway facilities (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable).***

Project buildout would generate more external vehicle trips than the Phase 1 project. Accordingly, cumulative project impacts may be greater and require greater levels of mitigation than what is required for Phase 1. Due to the uncertainty of the specific land use types, attendance levels, on-site activities, and other factors, a detailed analysis of project buildout conditions is not possible at this time. Nevertheless, based on the preliminary traffic assessment presented earlier in this chapter, project buildout impacts are considered a potentially significant impact. Due to the likelihood that identified additional improvements may require additional right-of-way and/or approvals from other agencies, this impact is considered **significant and unavoidable** and a **cumulatively considerable contribution**.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

*Implement Mitigation Measure 3.14-6.*

### UTILITIES

The cumulative setting would include all areas covered in the service areas of the City's wastewater system, water system, stormwater system, and the solid waste collection and disposal services. Under General Plan buildout conditions, the City would see an increased demand for water service, sewer service, solid waste disposal services, and stormwater infrastructure needs.

***Impact 4.26: Cumulative Impact on Wastewater Utilities (Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The City of Manteca owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system, and provides sewerage service to the City of Manteca and the City of Lathrop. On October 8, 2009, the RWQCB adopted Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R5-2009-0095 NPDES NO. CA0081558, prescribing waste discharge requirements for the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) and allowing expansion of the plant up to 17.5 mgd.

The City of Manteca's wastewater treatment system is currently in compliance with the WDR requirements of Order No. R5-2009-0095 NPDES NO. CA0081558. The wastewater treatment system options covered under this Order include: City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) including the collection system, basin/disposal fields, discharge to the San Joaquin

River, and recycling conveyance and irrigation system. The development of the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater discharge requirements in this Order. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

The wastewater collection and conveyance system that will serve the proposed project will consist of engineered infrastructure consistent with the City's existing infrastructure requirements. Sizing of existing infrastructure in the City varies based on location, but generally includes gravity sewers and force mains ranging in size from 6 to 60 inches, and pump stations. The existing facilities have undergone environmental review and have waste discharge permits from the State.

New wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure needed for the proposed project will require trenching/excavation of earth, and placement of pipe within the trenches at specific locations, elevations, and gradients. The location of the wastewater collection and conveyance infrastructure (onsite and offsite) is depicted in Figure 2-11 Sanitary Sewer Exhibit. All onsite wastewater utility improvements will be within existing agricultural lands, the impacts of which are discussed throughout this EIR. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

The hotel rooms (and water park) are estimated to generate approximately 45 gallons of wastewater per day. For the proposed project, the 500 room hotel would generate about 22,500 gallons of wastewater per day.

The retail, food and beverage, main street retail, and dining and entertainment uses total 34 acres of land. The *2010 Master Plan Update Wastewater Generation Factors Technical Memorandum* (Nolte 2010) recommends a 750 gallon per day wastewater generation factor as an average for commercial uses. Based on this rate, these commercial uses would generate an estimated 25,500 gallons of wastewater per day, which is equivalent to 14.1 gallons per square foot. Using this per square foot equivalent, the 37,500 square feet of commercial space and 30,000 square foot conference center within the hotel would generate an estimated 4,787 gallons of wastewater per day.

The ball fields are estimated to generate 3 gallons of wastewater per day per seat. There is not currently a refined site plan illustrating the number of seats for the ball fields; therefore, a conservative estimate of 300 seats per ball field will be made in this EIR. There are an estimated 5-10 ball fields. Under the maximum of 10 ball fields, there would be 3,000 seats. The total wastewater generated by the ball fields would be 9,000 gallons per day. (*Note: this is a very conservative estimate, and is likely an overestimate*).

The total wastewater generated by the proposed project is estimated to be 61,787 gallons per day. The proposed project would increase the amount of wastewater requiring treatment. The wastewater would be treated at the WQCF. Occupancy of the proposed project would be prohibited without sewer allocation. An issuance of sewer allocation from the City's available capacity would ensure that there would not be a determination by the wastewater treatment

and/or collection provider that there is inadequate capacity to serve the proposed project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

While the project by itself does not exceed the existing capacity of the wastewater treatment plant, the proposed Project in combination with future projects under buildout conditions would likely result in a deficit of capacity warranting improvements to increase treatment capacity. The City will have flows totaling 19.5 mgd as of the General Plan horizon of 2023 with a buildout capacity of 23.0 mgd. Each project that receives wastewater collection and treatment services is required to pay a connection fee, which serves as a project share of service expansion. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

***Impact 4.27: Cumulative Impact on Water Utilities  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The proposed project would require extension of offsite water infrastructure to the Plan Area for potable water and irrigation water. All offsite water utility improvements will be in or adjacent to existing roadways, thereby limiting any potential impact to areas that were not already disturbed. Construction of the offsite potable water infrastructure would not have the potential to induce growth as the proposed project is planned for non-residential uses and such uses were anticipated in the General Plan. The proposed offsite potable water utility infrastructure will be sized consistent with the City approved standards.

The proposed project would require the construction of new onsite water infrastructure for potable water and irrigation water. All onsite water utility improvements will be within existing agricultural lands, the impacts of which are discussed throughout this EIR. Construction of the onsite potable water infrastructure would not have the potential to induce growth as the proposed project is planned for non-residential uses and such uses were anticipated in the General Plan. The proposed offsite potable water utility infrastructure will be sized consistent with the City approved standards.

The proposed project would not require the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing water treatment facilities for water service.

The City has adequate water supplies to support existing demand in the City in addition to the proposed project under average daily and maximum daily demand conditions. Water demand for current and proposed uses in the City of Manteca is 31,499 AFY (Normal Year), 27,583 (Single Dry Year), and 29,636 (Multi-Dry Year). The city has a total supply of 32,290 AFY (Normal Year), 27,655 (Single Dry Year), and 29,700 (Multi-Dry Year). The proposed project's demand would be 428 AFY.

The City is currently in the process of preparing an update to their Water Supply Master Plan as well as their UWMP. The mix of projected groundwater and surface water supplies available to meet future demand is expected to change, with a higher fraction of surface water use than is documented in the 2005 UWMP. Although not quantified in the WSA, it should be noted that the reclaimed water use in the City could significantly reduce potable water demands in the future as the recycled water system is developed.

Based on the analysis described above, the City's existing and projected potable water supplies are sufficient to meet the City's existing and projected future potable water demands, including those future water demands associated with the Project, to the year 2035 under all hydrologic conditions. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

***Impact 4.28: Cumulative Impact on Stormwater Facilities  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

The proposed project includes storm drainage improvements that are consistent with the City of Manteca Storm Drain Master Plan (2013) in which storm drainage facilities sufficient to deal with potential impacts from development within the FEZ and surrounding area are planned. Final engineering of the storm drainage system will be accomplished through the improvement plan preparation of each phase. Storm drainage infrastructure to serve the proposed project will include undergrounding of the FCOC, an underground piped drainage system, a detention/retention/surge basin, and pumps as needed. The drainage systems would provide for short-term storm water detention, storm water conveyance for storm waters exceeding a 10-year event, storm water quality treatment, none of which are anticipated to result in significant environmental effects. The design of such infrastructure considers the drainage volume that flows through the drainage from the entire watershed to ensure that there isn't flooding. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** and **less than cumulatively considerable** impact relative to this topic.

***Impact 4.29: Cumulative Impact on Solid Waste Facilities  
(Less than Significant and Less than Cumulatively Considerable)***

Solid waste generated in the City is disposed at the Forward Landfill. This landfill is projected to close in the year 2020. At that time the City can utilize the Foothill Landfill as a location for solid waste disposal. The permitted maximum disposal at the Forward Landfill is 8,668 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 51.04 million cubic yards, which is expected to accommodate an operational life until January 1, 2020. The remaining capacity is 23,700,000 cubic yards.

The total solid waste generated by the proposed project is estimated to be 4,979 pounds per day, or 2.49 tons per day. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable state and local requirements including those pertaining to solid waste, construction waste diversion, and recycling. The addition of the volume of solid waste associated with the proposed project, approximately 3.15 tons per day at total buildout, to the Forward Landfill would not exceed the landfill's remaining capacity. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. As such, impacts related to solid waste facilities would be a **less than cumulatively considerable contribution**.

## 4.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE EFFECTS

### LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA Section 15126.2(c) and Public Resources Code Sections 21100(b)(2) and 21100.1(a), requires that the EIR include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes which would be

involved in the proposed action should it be implemented. Irreversible environmental effects are described as:

- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of a project would generally commit future generations to similar uses (e.g., a highway provides access to previously remote area);
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- The phasing of the proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

Determining whether the proposed project would result in significant irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed such that there would be little possibility of restoring them. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

### **Analysis**

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the conversion of approximately 182.2 acres of land currently used for agricultural uses for the development of lodging, commercial, and recreational facilities. Development of the proposed Project would constitute a long-term commitment to these uses. It is unlikely that circumstances would arise that would justify the return of the land to its original condition as agricultural or vacant rural land.

A variety of resources, including land, energy, water, construction materials, and human resources would be irretrievably committed for the initial construction, infrastructure installation and connection to existing utilities, and its continued maintenance. Construction of the proposed Project would require the commitment of a variety of other non-renewable or slowly renewable natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemicals, and metals.

Additionally, a variety of resources would be committed to the ongoing operation and life of the proposed Project. The introduction of lodging, commercial, and recreational facilities to the Project site will result in an increase in area traffic over existing conditions. Fossil fuels are the principal source of energy and the proposed Project will increase consumption of available supplies, including gasoline and diesel. These energy resource demands relate to initial project construction, project operation and site maintenance and the transport of people and goods to and from the Project site.

### **4.4 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to discuss unavoidable significant environmental effects, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of

insignificance. The following significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project are discussed in Chapters 3.1 through 3.14 and previously in this chapter (cumulative-level). Refer to those discussions for further details and analysis of the significant and unavoidable impact identified below:

- Impact 3.1-1: Project implementation may result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character (Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 3.2-1: The proposed project has the potential to result in the conversion of Farmlands, including Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses. (Significant and Unavoidable)
- Impact 3.3-1: Project operation has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Impact 3.3-2: Project construction has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Impact 3.3-5: The proposed project has the potential for exposure to odors
- Impact 3.14-2: The proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities (short term impact)
- Impact 3.14-6: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would cause significant impacts at intersections
- Impact 3.14-7: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities
- Impact 3.14-11: Under cumulative conditions, proposed project buildout could cause significant impacts at intersections and freeway facilities
- Impact 4.2: Cumulative Degradation of the Existing Visual Character of the Region
- Impact 4.4: Cumulative Impact on Agricultural and Forest Resources
- Impact 4.5: Cumulative Impact on the Region's Air Quality
- Impact 4.20: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would cause significant impacts at intersections
- Impact 4.21: Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project (Phase 1) would result in a significant impact to freeway facilities
- Impact 4.25: Under cumulative conditions, proposed project buildout could cause significant impacts at intersections and freeway facilities

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

## 5.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA requires that an EIR analyze a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that meet most or all project objectives while reducing or avoiding one or more significant environmental effects of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). Where a potential alternative was examined but not chosen as one of the range of alternatives, the CEQA Guidelines require that the EIR briefly discuss the reasons the alternative was dismissed.

## PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As described in Chapter 2, the City of Manteca’s objectives are as follows:

- To expand and improve public and community access to the City’s existing and thriving investments in regional sports facilities to provide additional community-based facilities to extend the City’s position as the primary destination for family-based community recreation, active recreation sports and passive recreation and amenities in Central California.
- To enhance and build upon the regional tourism and visitor serving attractions providing supporting destination facilities such as hotels, indoor waterpark and convention/meeting/exhibition facilities that will facilitate and support the frequency and duration of utilization of the recreation and sports facilities through the FEZ.
- To enhance Manteca’s reputation as “The Family City”.
- To position Manteca to serve what is projected to be a trend toward a younger population in the region by providing an excellent youth sports and entertainment destination with critical mass to ensure its success.
- To provide facilities that support what has been identified as a growing trend toward family vacations being centered on regional youth, adult and master’s tournaments, as well as league sporting events, that require multiple day stays and can be tied to a variety of visitor interests including special events, education seminars, private events such as conferences, weddings, other social and cultural expositions, all of which are available to the public and the visitors/users of the FEZ.
- Specifically, to capitalize on the success of the Big League Dreams’ sports facilities (currently booked weekends, two years in advance), by creating additional critical mass in regional sports and active facilities.
- To provide additional food & beverage facility choices to serve visitors to Manteca and users of the various facilities developed within the boundaries of the FEZ.

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

- To add to the proven regional draw enjoyed by Woodward Soccer Fields, which further helps to define Manteca as a regional tournament sports destination.
- To accentuate the site's strategic location along SR 120, which serves as the primary vehicular corridor from the Bay Area to Yosemite National Park and the Southern Sierra Nevada Mountain Areas.
- To raise the City's visibility in the region, particularly for all residents and citizens driving through the region.
- To create a Yosemite/Southern Sierra Nevada Visitors Information Center for travelers to utilize on their trip to the national park and nearby national forests.
- To create a business center facility that is available to all groups and can utilize and augment utilization of the various active and passive recreation and sports facilities as well as all ancillary concessions and operations such as support retail and dining facilities.
- To expand upon the thriving regional draw of Bass Pro Shops, which lies just across SR 120 to the southeast.
- To provide a walkable, safe, friendly, leisure and recreation environment for the citizens of Manteca and the region.
- To provide quality indoor and outdoor community gathering spaces for socializing, dining and entertainment.
- To expand and install a series of public improvements in support of the FEZ, including but not limited to, the east-west vehicular connection between McKinley Avenue and Airport Way, and public parking facilities throughout the FEZ, extension of Milo Candini Drive from Daniels Street to Yosemite Avenue, to facilitate improvements to the storm water drainage system shared by the City and the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID).
- To facilitate the City's economic development and jobs-creation goals and objectives.

### ALTERNATIVES NOT SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

---

A Notice of Preparation was circulated to the public to solicit recommendations for a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project. Additionally, a public scoping meeting was held during the public review period to solicit recommendations for a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project. No specific alternatives were recommended by commenting agencies or the general public during the NOP public review process.

The City of Manteca considered alternative locations early in the public scoping process. The City's key considerations in identifying an alternative location were as follows:

- Is there an alternative location where significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened?
- Is there a site available within the City's Sphere of Influence with the appropriate size and characteristics such that it would meet the basic project objectives?

The City's consideration of alternative locations for the project included a review of previous land use planning and environmental documents in Manteca including the General Plan. The City found that there are no feasible alternative locations that exist within the City's Sphere of Influence with the appropriate size and characteristics that would meet the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen a significant effect. The City determined that alternative locations outside the Sphere of Influence would not be feasible because an expansion of the Sphere of Influence would induce unplanned growth and cause impacts greater than development on the proposed location. For these reasons, the City of Manteca determined that there are no feasible alternative locations.

## 5.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THIS EIR

Three alternatives to the proposed Project were developed based on input from City staff, the public during the NOP review period, and the technical analysis performed to identify the environmental effects of the proposed Project. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following four alternatives in addition to the proposed Project.

- **No Build Alternative:** Under this alternative, development of the Project site would not occur, and the Project site would remain in its current condition.
- **Reduced Project Alternative:** Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the area utilized for the industrial and commercial uses would be reduced.
- **Agriculture Protection Alternative:** Under this alternative, the proposed Project would be developed in such a way to protect those lands currently identified as prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance.

### NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

---

Under the No Build Alternative development of the Project site would not occur, and the Project site would remain in its current existing condition. It is noted that the No Build Alternative would fail to meet the project objectives identified by the City of Manteca.

### REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

---

Under this alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total acreage dedicated to proposed project would be reduced by approximately 1/3, which would result in smaller building footprints. The total acreage developed would be 126 acres, with 63 acres remaining in its current state. The 63

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

acres that would remain undeveloped would include the wetland areas and agricultural land. This alternative would eliminate the need to obtain 404 permits for the wetlands, but may or may not require permits for undergrounding the French Camp Outlet Canal depending on the regulatory agencies final decision on jurisdiction.

### AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE

---

The reasoning behind this alternative is to present an alternative to protect some of the farmland on the Project site. Development of the proposed Project would result in the permanent conversion of roughly 172 acres of Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Under this alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of ball fields would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land beyond the Reduced Project Alternative. The total acreage dedicated to proposed project would be reduced by approximately 1/2. The total acreage developed would be 94.5 acres, with 94.5 acres remaining in its current state. The 94.5 acres that would remain undeveloped would include the agricultural land only. This alternative would not eliminate the need to obtain 404 permits for the wetlands.

## 5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The alternatives analysis provides a summary of the relative impact level of significance associated with each alternative for each of the environmental issue areas analyzed in this EIR. Following the analysis of each alternative, Table 5.0-1 summarizes the comparative effects of each alternative.

### NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

---

#### **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**

The No Build Alternative would leave the project site in its existing state and would not result in increases in daytime glare or nighttime lighting. The visual character of the project site would not change under this alternative compared to existing conditions.

As described in Section 3.1, although the visual character of the Project site would be significantly altered as a result of project implementation, the guidelines and standards within the proposed Project would ensure consistent development that is in line with the City's vision for the community's identity. Implementation of the design guidelines and standards in the proposed Project would ensure that impacts to visual resources would be less than significant.

Implementation of the lighting and design standards in the proposed Project would ensure that lighting features do not result in light spillage onto adjacent properties and do not significantly impact views of the night sky. Adherence to the design requirements in the proposed Project and the subsequent design review of future projects within the Project site would ensure that excessively reflective building materials are not used, and that the proposed Project would not

result in significant impacts related to daytime glare. As such, impacts related to nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would not result in potentially significant new sources of light and glare. The proposed Project would also not result impacts to the existing visual character or quality of the Project site and its surroundings. However, the No Build Alternative would avoid these impacts altogether and would have less of an impact than the proposed Project on aesthetics and visual resources.

### **Agricultural and Forest Resources**

Currently, the majority of the project is used for agricultural purposes. There are no forest resources in the area. The No Build Alternative would result in no development in on the project site. As such, this alternative would have no impact on agricultural land, no potential for conflicts with existing agricultural resources, and no potential for conflict with regulations and plans intended to protect those resources. This would have less impact to agricultural resources than the proposed Project.

### **Air Quality**

Under buildout conditions in the San Joaquin County, the SJVAB would continue to experience increases in criteria pollutants and efforts to improve air quality throughout the basin would be hindered. As described in Section 3.3, San Joaquin County has a state designation of nonattainment for Ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and is either unclassified or attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of nonattainment for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Table 3.3-2 in Section 3.3 presents the state and federal attainment status for San Joaquin County.

As discussed under Impact 3.3-1 in Section 3.3, the proposed Project would result in increased emissions primarily from vehicle miles travelled associated with project implementation. The SJVAPCD has established operations related emissions thresholds of significance and it was determined that annual emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

Even with basic mitigation incorporated into the model, the proposed Project would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for operations. The proposed Project is subject to the SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Rule), which could result in substantial mitigation of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM emissions. The reductions are accomplished by the incorporation of mitigation measures into projects and/or by the payment of an Indirect Source Rule fee for any required reductions that have not been accomplished through project mitigation commitments. The current fees are \$9,350 per ton of NO<sub>x</sub> and \$9,011 per ton per of PM. The actual calculations will be accomplished by the SJVAPCD and project applicants as individual projects (i.e. portions of the Specific Plan) are brought forward for approval under Rule 9510.

Under the No Build Alternative, the Project site would not be developed, and there would be no net change in emissions and no potential for a conflict with any adopted plans or policies related

to air quality. As such, this impact would be significantly reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Biological Resources**

As described in Section 3.4 Biological Resources, construction on the Project site has the potential to result in impacts to special-status species in the region. There are no known special-status species that have been observed on the Project site although there are protected wetlands and foraging habitat for various special status species. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation with the SJMSCP, which includes fees that will be used to purchase conservation lands for a variety of special status species. The SJMSCP was created and adopted to address both the project and cumulative impacts to biological resources, including special status species. The proposed Project will participate in the SJMSCP, including payment of fees and implementation of all Incidental Take Minimization Measures required by the SJCOG through the authorization of SJMSCP coverage. Additionally, there are mitigation measures that require a permit prior to any disturbance to the protected wetlands. The permit requirements for disturbance to a wetland require no net loss of wetlands, which effectively mitigate the impact to a less than significant level. As such, implementation of the proposed Project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources.

Under the No Build Alternative, the proposed Project would not be constructed, no habitat would be removed, no wetlands disturbed, and no ground disturbing activities would occur. Therefore, potential for impacts to biological resources would be eliminated under the No Build Alternative.

### **Cultural Resources**

As described in Section 3.5, during the field surveys conducted on the Project site there were no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources identified. However, as with most projects in the region that involve ground-disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown cultural and/or historical resource or human remains. Implementation of mitigation measures in Section 3.5 would reduce unknown cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level.

The No Build Alternative would result in no ground disturbing activities related to the proposed Project and would not have the potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation, the No Build Alternative would result in less potential for impacts to cultural resources as the entire Project site would continue to be used for agriculture production.

### **Geology and Soils**

The No Build Alternative would result in the Project site remaining in its existing condition. There are currently no structures on the Project site that are subject to seismic or geologic risks, including earthquakes, liquefaction, subsidence, etc. The No Build Alternative would not involve

new construction that could be subject to seismic, geologic or soils hazards, thus this alternative would have no potential for impact. As such, this alternative would have less impact relative to the proposed Project.

### **Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change**

As stated previously, short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed Project. With mitigation measures, the overall annual GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would be reduced by over 36.9 percent by the year 2020 compared to the business as usual scenario, consistent with applicable standards and thresholds of a 29 percent reduction. Because the proposed Project would meet the City's 29 percent minimum reduction threshold, the proposed Project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target. Overall, the proposed Project would be consistent with the reduction targets established by the Scoping Plan and the APCD. Based on the criteria set forth in the APCD's Climate Change Action Plan, the proposed Project would have an individual and cumulative impact that is less than significant.

Under the No Build Alternative, the Project site would not be developed, and there would be no net change in emissions and no potential for a conflict with any adopted plans or policies related to GHG reductions. As such, this impact would be significantly reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The proposed Project includes components which will likely use a variety of hazardous materials including: paints, cleaners, and cleaning solvents, relatively large quantity of pesticides, fertilizers, and fuel. There will be a risk of release of these materials into the environment if they are not stored and handled in accordance with best management practices approved by San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health.

Under the No Build alternative, no new land uses would be introduced to the Project site, and the potential for hazardous material release on the Project site would be eliminated. As such, this alternative would have less impact relative to the proposed Project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As described in Section 3.9, implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to result in the violation of water quality standards and waste discharge of pollutants into surface waters during both construction and long-term operations. Construction operations could result in temporary increases in runoff, erosion, sedimentation, soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas. The long-term operation of the proposed Project could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff and could enter groundwater or surface water systems. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.9 reduce potential water

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

quality impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed Project would not impact groundwater recharge or place persons or structures in a flood hazard zone.

Under the No Build Alternative, potential water quality impacts from construction and operation of the proposed Project would be eliminated. While groundwater recharge is not considered a significant impact under the proposed Project, under this alternative, the land will be kept in its present state with the majority of the Project site either fallow land or being used for agricultural purposes. The soil on the Project site are composed of sand which has a high rate of groundwater recharge, although the project site is not a major source of groundwater recharge due to the lack of precipitation and the absence of a major water source. The No Build Alternative will have a greater chance of groundwater recharge because it does not introduce large areas of impervious surfaces as would the proposed Project. As such, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be reduced under the No Build Alternative when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Land Use and Population**

The No Build Alternative would result in no changes to land use and would have no development. The proposed Project is not expected to induce substantial population increase that has not already been accounted for as a part of the approved General Plan. The proposed Project does not displace persons or remove housing units. The No Build Alternative would have an equal impact when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Mineral Resources**

The project site is not considered a mineral resource recovery site and there is no evidence of past mining activity. The No Build Alternative would have an equal impact when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Noise**

The proposed Project could increase noise-generating activities associated with the maintenance and operation of the proposed project, as well as from vehicular traffic. The specific businesses that would occupy the Project site are not yet determined; therefore, an actual noise impact from industrial uses may or may not exist in the future. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.12 would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

Under the No Build Alternative, the Project site would not be developed and there would be no potential for new noise sources. As such, this alternative would have less impact relative to the proposed Project.

### **Public Services and Recreation**

Under the No Build Alternative the Project site would remain undeveloped and there would be no increased demand for public services or recreation. The recreational amenities within the proposed project, however, would not be developed for the community. The No Build Alternative would have a slightly less impact when compared to the proposed project because

demand on public services would be reduced with compared to the proposed Project with the possible exception of recreational facilities.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

The No Build Alternative would not introduce additional vehicle trips onto the study area roadways. It was determined that the proposed Project would cause an increase in traffic on roadways or intersections that would cause traffic operations to degrade to an unacceptable level of service. Mitigation was identified to alleviate the impacts; however, certain impacts were deemed to be significant and unavoidable. Under the No Build Alternative, these potential impacts would be avoided, and the No Build Alternative would have less of an overall traffic impact than the proposed Project.

### **Utilities**

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in increased flows to the public wastewater system. The wastewater system is capable of handling the increased flows with their existing permit and infrastructure.

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in increased demand for potable water. The City has adequate water supply to handle the increased demand with their existing supply and infrastructure.

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in increased storm drainage from new impervious surfaces. The City has designed a storm drainage collection system to handle the increased storm drainage.

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in increased generation of solid waste. However the landfill has adequate capacity to dispose the solid waste.

Under the No Build Alternative the Project site would not increase the demand for any utilities, including wastewater services, potable water supplies, or solid waste disposal. There would be no need to construct stormwater drainage infrastructure. Overall, the demand for utilities would be reduced under the No Build Alternative when compared to the proposed Project.

## **REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE**

---

### **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**

As described in Section 3.1, although the visual character of the Project site would be significantly altered as a result of project implementation, the guidelines and standards within the proposed Project would ensure consistent development that is in line with the City's vision for the community's identity. Implementation of the design guidelines and standards in the proposed Project would ensure that impacts to visual resources would be less than significant. Additionally, implementation of the lighting and design standards in the proposed Project would ensure that lighting features do not result in light spillage onto adjacent properties and do not

significantly impact views of the night sky. As such, impacts related to nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant.

These impacts would be similar with the Reduced Project Alternative as this alternative is located on the same site and has similar uses. This alternative would reduce the building square footage, and reduce the acreage by 1/3. The impacts of light and glare would still occur and could be mitigated to a less than significant level. The impacts to the existing visual quality would be similar as the Project site would be developed with the same uses as under the proposed Project, just on a smaller scale and on slightly less acreage. The Reduced Project Alternative would have a slightly less impact on visual resources when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Agricultural and Forest Resources**

Currently, the majority of the Project site is used for agricultural purposes. There are no forest resources on the Project site. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in development on the Project site, but would only utilize 2/3 of the Project site for urban development. The remaining acreage (approximately 63 acres), most of which is agricultural land, will remain undeveloped. As such, this alternative would reduce the impact to agricultural lands when compared to the proposed project by the acreage that remains undeveloped. The loss of the agricultural land, including prime farmland, would be a significant and unavoidable impact under both alternatives. The Reduced Project Alternative would have less impact on agricultural resources when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Air Quality**

Under buildout conditions in San Joaquin County, the SJVAB would continue to experience increases in criteria pollutants and efforts to improve air quality throughout the basin would be hindered. As described in Section 3.3, San Joaquin County has a state designation of nonattainment for Ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and is either unclassified or attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of nonattainment for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Table 3.3-2 in Section 3.3 presents the state and federal attainment status for San Joaquin County.

As discussed under Impact 3.3-1 in Section 3.3, the proposed Project would result in increased emissions primarily from vehicle miles travelled associated with project implementation. The SJVAPCD has established operations related emissions thresholds of significance and it was determined that annual emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

Even with basic mitigation incorporated into the model, the proposed Project would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for operations. The proposed Project is subject to the SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Rule), which could result in substantial mitigation of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The reductions are accomplished by the incorporation of mitigation measures into projects and/or by the payment of an Indirect Source Rule fee for any required reductions that have not been accomplished through project mitigation commitments. The current fees are

\$9,350 per ton of NO<sub>x</sub> and \$9,011 per ton per of PM. The actual calculations will be accomplished by the SJVAPCD and project applicants as individual projects (i.e. portions of the Specific Plan) are brought forward for approval under Rule 9510.

Implementation of the proposed Project would cause an increase in traffic, which is the dominant source of air emissions associated with the proposed Project. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 1/3. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 33.3 percent reduction in the amount of traffic generated from the Project site. Mobile source air emissions are directly correlated to traffic volume; therefore, it is estimated that the reduced trip volume would reduce the mobile source emissions by approximately the same 33.3 percent. Additionally, this alternative would have a reduction in area source emissions proportional to the reduction in square footage.

While uses in the Reduced Protection Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measures as the proposed Project, the decrease in square footage and reduced traffic volumes would result in reductions in air emissions. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in less air emissions when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Biological Resources**

As described in Section 3.4 Biological Resources, construction on the Project site has the potential to result in impacts to special-status species in the region. There are no known special-status species that have been observed on the Project site although there is protected wetlands and foraging habitat for special status species. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation with the SJMSCP, which includes fees that will be used to purchase conservation lands for a variety of special status species. The SJMSCP was created and adopted to address both the project and cumulative impacts to biological resources, including special status species. The proposed Project will participate in the SJMSCP, including payment of fees and implementation of all Incidental Take Minimization Measures required by the SJCOG through the authorization of SJMSCP coverage. Additionally, there are mitigation measures that require a permit prior to any disturbance to the protected wetlands. The permit requirements for disturbance to a wetland require no net loss of wetlands, which effectively mitigate the impact to a less than significant level. As such, implementation of the proposed Project will have a less than significant impact.

The Reduced Project Alternative would result in development on the Project site, but would only utilize 2/3 of the Project site for urban development. The remaining acreage (approximately 63 acres) will remain undeveloped. Under this alternative, there would be approximately 63 more acres of undeveloped land that would provide habitat for a variety of species, including the protected wetlands and the agricultural land that serves as foraging habitat for wildlife. This alternative would eliminate the need to obtain 404 permits for the wetlands, but may or may not require permits for undergrounding the French Camp Outlet Canal depending on the

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

regulatory agencies final decision on jurisdiction. This additional undeveloped land would provide biological benefits even though the remainder of the Project site would be developed. As such, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less impact to biological resources when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Cultural Resources**

As described in Section 3.5, during the field surveys conducted on the Project site there were no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources identified. However, as with most projects in the region that involve ground-disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown cultural and/or historical resource or human remains. Implementation of mitigation measures in Section 3.5 would reduce unknown cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level.

The Reduced Project Alternative would result in development on the Project site, but would only utilize 2/3 of the Project site for development. The remaining acreage would remain undeveloped. Under this alternative, there would be less ground disturbing activities related to development and there would be a reduced potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less potential for impacts to cultural resources as more of the Project site would be used for agriculture production.

### **Geology and Soils**

As described in Section 3.6, implementation of the proposed Project would result in the construction of new structures on the Project site. The new structures would be subject to seismic, geologic, and soils hazards for the life of the project. Mostly notably, the proposed project would be subject to liquefaction due to the relatively high groundwater, combined with the sandy soils. Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.6 would reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative there would be less developed area resulting in less structures that would be subject to geological conditions. This alternative would result in more of the Project site remaining in its existing condition. While the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts from geology and soils with mitigation, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less potential for impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change**

As stated previously, short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed Project. With mitigation measures, the overall annual GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would be reduced by over 36.9 percent by the year 2020 compared to the business as usual scenario, consistent with applicable standards and thresholds of a 29 percent

reduction. Because the proposed Project would meet the City's 29 percent minimum reduction threshold, the proposed Project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target. Overall, the proposed Project would be consistent with the reduction targets established by the Scoping Plan and the APCD. Based on the criteria set forth in the APCD's Climate Change Action Plan, the proposed Project would have an individual and cumulative impact that is less than significant.

Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with the same facilities and amenities as the proposed Project, but the total footprint and square footage would be reduced. While all uses in the Reduced Protection Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measure as the proposed Project, the decrease in square footage decreases the total greenhouse gas emissions. As such, the greenhouse gas emissions impact is less than the proposed Project.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The proposed Project includes components that will likely use a variety of hazardous materials including: paints, cleaners, and cleaning solvents, relatively large quantity of pesticides, fertilizers, and fuel. There will be a risk of release of these materials into the environment if they are not stored and handled in accordance with best management practices approved by San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health.

Under this alternative, all project components would remain the same with the exception of smaller building footprints. This alternative would still use the hazardous materials identified under the proposed Project. This alternative would have the same potential impacts relative to hazardous materials and emergency response plans in the developed area, but there would be less development. As such, this alternative would have less impacts from hazards and hazardous materials impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As described in Section 3.9, implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to result in the violation of water quality standards and waste discharge of pollutants into surface waters during both construction and long-term operations. Construction operations could result in temporary increases in runoff, erosion, sedimentation, soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas. The long-term operation of the proposed Project could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff and could enter groundwater or surface water systems. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.9 reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed Project would not impact groundwater recharge or place persons or structures in a flood hazard zone.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, potential construction related and long-term operational impacts to water quality or waste discharge related to stormwater runoff would be reduced equivalent to the amount of land area that remains undisturbed by construction of the smaller building footprints. The increased areas of undeveloped land will remain pervious to

precipitation. This alternative will still include a stormwater detention/retention, and provide natural BMPs to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff. As such, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less under the Reduced Project Alternative when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Land Use and Population**

The proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan land use requirements and would not result in any significant land use impacts. The proposed Project is not expected to induce population growth that has not already been accounted for as a part of the existing and approved General Plan. The proposed Project does not displace persons or remove housing units.

The Reduced Project Alternative is consistent with the City's General Plan land use requirements and would not result in any significant land use impacts. This alternative is not expected to induce substantial population growth in the area and does not displace persons or remove housing units. As such, this alternative would have a similar impact relative to the proposed Project.

### **Mineral Resources**

The project site is not considered a mineral resource recovery site and there is no evidence of past mining activity. The Reduced Project Alternative would have an equal impact when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Noise**

The proposed Project would increase noise-generating activities associated with the maintenance and operation of the proposed project, as well as vehicular noise. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.12 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. The proposed Project would result in less than significant levels of noise or vibrations impacts due to construction and operational noise.

As this alternative is a reduction in the size of the buildings without eliminating the project components, the noise impacts associated with future industrial uses would be reduced proportionate to the vehicular and operational activities. All noise issues would be mitigated as appropriate through noise attenuation and best management practices; however, under this alternative, noise impacts are less when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Public Services and Recreation**

Development in the proposed Project will pay all applicable fees and assessments required to fund its fair share of public services and recreation. This funding would assist in the development of facilities in order to meet the City's standards. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to fire police, school and recreational facilities.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and

number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 33.3 percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 33.3 percent reduction in the amount of public service needs from the Project site. This reduction would also result in a 33.3 reduction in the anticipated recreational amenities that would be created by the proposed project. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in a greater recreational impact when compared to the proposed Project because of the reduction of recreational amenities for the community.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

As described in Section 3.14, implementation of the proposed Project would cause an increase in traffic on roadways or intersections that would cause traffic operations to degrade to an unacceptable level of service. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 33.3 percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 33.3 percent reduction in the amount of traffic generated from the Project site.

Uses in the Reduced Project Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measures as the proposed Project and the decrease in square footage and reduced traffic volumes would result in reductions traffic congestion. While there would be a decrease in project generated traffic, some cumulative conditions will continue to operate at unacceptable levels of service regardless of the reduction of project traffic. Nevertheless, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in less traffic related impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Utilities**

Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts the public wastewater, water, storm drainage, and solid waste collection and disposal system. However mitigation measures provided in Section 3.15 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Project impacts to wastewater, water, stormwater and solid waste facilities are all less than significant.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 33.3 percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 33.3 percent reduction in the amount of wastewater and solid waste generated from the Project site. This reduction would also reduce water demand by approximately 33.3 percent. There would be approximately 63 more acres of pervious soils, thereby reducing the amount of storm drainage from the project site. While uses in the Reduced Project Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measures as the proposed Project, the decrease in square footage would reduce the utility demands. The Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less demand on utility systems when compared to the proposed Project.

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

Overall, this alternative would have less wastewater treatment demand, less water demand, less solid waste generated, and less storm water runoff when compared to the proposed Project. As such, this alternative would have less impact when compared to the proposed Project.

### AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE

---

#### **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**

As described in Section 3.1, although the visual character of the Project site would be significantly altered as a result of project implementation, the guidelines and standards within the proposed Project would ensure consistent development that is in line with the City's vision for the community's identity. Implementation of the design guidelines and standards in the proposed Project would ensure that impacts to visual resources would be less than significant. Additionally, implementation of the lighting and design standards in the proposed Project would ensure that lighting features do not result in light spillage onto adjacent properties and do not significantly impact views of the night sky. As such, impacts related to nighttime lighting and daytime glare would be less than significant.

A portion of the Project site would remain under agricultural production, and therefore, would retain the existing visual character. However, portions of the Project site that are currently agricultural land would be converted to urban uses. As such, there would still be an impact to the visual character under this alternative. The impact associated with increased light and glare in the developed area would be mitigated through design guidelines. Under this alternative, the changes to the existing visual quality would be similar to the proposed Project, just on a smaller scale. As such, this alternative would have slightly less impact when compared to the proposed Project.

#### **Agricultural and Forest Resources**

Development of the proposed Project would remove approximately 172 acres of Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. This loss results in a significant and unavoidable impact.

The Agriculture Protection Alternative would reduce the amount of converted Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance to approximately 94.5 acres. Provisions for payment of compensatory fees would partially offset conversions of farmland on the portion that would be developed; however, no new farmland would be made available, and the productivity of existing farmland would not be improved as a result of these measures. Therefore, full compensation for losses of Important Farmland under the Agriculture Protection Alternative would not be achieved resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

While this alternative would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact to agriculture, the land lost to urban uses is much less than under the proposed Project. As such, this alternative would have less impact when compared to the proposed Project.

## Air Quality

Under buildout conditions in San Joaquin County, the SJVAB would continue to experience increases in criteria pollutants and efforts to improve air quality throughout the basin would be hindered. As described in Section 3.3, San Joaquin County has a state designation of nonattainment for Ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and is either unclassified or attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of nonattainment for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Table 3.3-2 in Section 3.3 presents the state and federal attainment status for San Joaquin County.

As discussed under Impact 3.3-1 in Section 3.3, the proposed Project would result in increased emissions primarily from vehicle miles travelled associated with project implementation. The SJVAPCD has established operations related emissions thresholds of significance and it was determined that annual emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance.

Even with basic mitigation incorporated into the model, the proposed Project would exceed the SJVAPCD thresholds of significance for operations. The proposed Project is subject to the SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Rule), which could result in substantial mitigation of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The reductions are accomplished by the incorporation of mitigation measures into projects and/or by the payment of an Indirect Source Rule fee for any required reductions that have not been accomplished through project mitigation commitments. The current fees are \$9,350 per ton of NO<sub>x</sub> and \$9,011 per ton per of PM. The actual calculations will be accomplished by the SJVAPCD and project applicants as individual projects (i.e. portions of the Specific Plan) are brought forward for approval under Rule 9510.

Implementation of the proposed Project would cause an increase in traffic, which is the dominant source of air emissions associated with the proposed Project. Under the Agricultural Protection Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 50 percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 50 percent reduction in the amount of traffic generated from the Project site. Mobile source air emissions are directly correlated to traffic volume; therefore, it is estimated that the reduced trip volume would reduce the mobile source emissions by approximately the same 50 percent. Additionally, this alternative would have a reduction in area source emissions proportional to the reduction in square footage.

While uses in the Agricultural Protection Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measures as the proposed Project, the decrease in square footage and reduced traffic volumes would result in reductions in air emissions. The Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less air emissions when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Biological Resources**

As described in Section 3.4 Biological Resources, construction on the Project site has the potential to result in impacts to special-status species in the region. There are no known special-status species that have been observed on the Project site although there is protected wetlands and foraging habitat for special status species. Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 requires participation with the SJMSCP, which includes fees that will be used to purchase conservation lands for a variety of special status species. The SJMSCP was created and adopted to address both the project and cumulative impacts to biological resources, including special status species. The proposed Project will participate in the SJMSCP, including payment of fees and implementation of all Incidental Take Minimization Measures required by the SJCOG through the authorization of SJMSCP coverage. Additionally, there are mitigation measures that require a permit prior to any disturbance to the protected wetlands. The permit requirements for disturbance to a wetland require no net loss of wetlands, which effectively mitigate the impact to a less than significant level. As such, implementation of the proposed Project will have a less than significant impact.

The Agriculture Protection Alternative would result in development on the Project site, but the development would be significantly reduced with 94.5 acres remaining in its current condition. The 94.5 acres that would remain undeveloped would include the agricultural land only. This alternative would not eliminate the need to obtain Section 404 permits for the wetlands. Under this alternative, there would be more acres of agricultural land that would provide open space habitat for a variety of wildlife species, predominately associated with foraging (i.e. protected raptors including Swainson's hawk, migratory birds). This additional agricultural land would provide biological benefits to wildlife in the region even though a portion of the Project site would still be developed. As such, the Agriculture Protection Alternative would result in less impact to biological resources when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Cultural Resources**

As described in Section 3.5, during the field surveys conducted on the Project site there were no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources identified. However, as with most projects in the region that involve ground-disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown cultural and/or historical resource or human remains. Implementation of mitigation measures in Section 3.5 would reduce unknown cultural resources impacts to a less than significant level.

Under this Agricultural Protection Alternative, there would be less ground disturbing activities related to development and there would a reduced the potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation, the Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less potential for impacts to cultural resources as more of the Project site would be used of agriculture production.

## **Geology and Soils**

As described in Section 3.6, implementation of the proposed Project would result in the construction of new structures on the Project site. The new structures would be subject to seismic, geologic, and soils hazards for the life of the project. Mostly notably, the proposed project would be subject to liquefaction due to the relatively high groundwater, combined with the sandy soils. Mitigation measures identified in Section 3.6 would reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Under the Agriculture Protection Alternative there would be less developed area resulting in less structures that would be subject to geological conditions. Agricultural Protection Alternative would result more of the Project site remaining in its existing condition. While the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts from geology and soils with mitigation, the Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less potential for impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

## **Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change**

As stated previously, short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the proposed Project. With mitigation measures, the overall annual GHG emissions associated with the proposed Project would be reduced by over 36.9 percent by the year 2020 compared to the business as usual scenario, consistent with applicable standards and thresholds of a 29 percent reduction. Because the proposed Project would meet the City's 29 percent minimum reduction threshold, the proposed Project would not hinder the State's ability to reach the GHG reduction target. Overall, the proposed Project would be consistent with the reduction targets established by the Scoping Plan and the APCD. Based on the criteria set forth in the APCD's Climate Change Action Plan, the proposed Project would have an individual and cumulative impact that is less than significant.

Under this alternative, the Project site would be developed with the same facilities and amenities as the proposed Project in the developed area, but the total footprint and square footage would be significantly reduced. While uses in the Reduced Protection Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measure as the proposed Project, the significant decrease in square footage would significantly decrease the total greenhouse gas emissions. As such, the greenhouse gas emissions impact is less than the proposed Project.

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The proposed Project includes components that will likely use a variety of hazardous materials including: paints, cleaners, and cleaning solvents, relatively large quantity of pesticides, fertilizers, and fuel. There will be a risk of release of these materials into the environment if they are not stored and handled in accordance with best management practices approved by San Joaquin County Department of Environmental Health.

Under this alternative, all project components would remain the same with the exception of a portion that would remain under agricultural uses. This alternative would still use the hazardous

materials identified under the proposed Project. This alternative would have the same potential impacts relative to hazardous materials and emergency response plans. The farmland may use herbicides and pesticides that would not be used under the proposed project and the industrial uses would be required to adhere to the same hazardous materials regulations as the proposed Project. While the chance of a hazardous material release may be mitigated to a less than significant level for this alternative, the potential for hazards and hazardous materials impacts is reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As described in Section 3.9, implementation of the proposed Project has the potential to result in the violation of water quality standards and waste discharge of pollutants into surface waters during both construction and long-term operations. Construction operations could result in temporary increases in runoff, erosion, sedimentation, soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas. The long-term operation of the proposed Project could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff and could enter groundwater or surface water systems. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.9 reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed Project would not impact groundwater recharge or place persons or structures in a flood hazard zone.

Under the Agricultural Protection Alternative, potential construction related and long-term operational impacts to water quality or waste discharge related to stormwater runoff would be reduced equivalent to the amount of land area that remains undisturbed.

The increased areas of undeveloped land will remain pervious to precipitation and will have have urban pollutants. This alternative will still include a stormwater detention/retention, and provide natural BMPs to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff. As such, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less under the Agricultural Protection Alternative when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Land Use and Population**

The proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan land use requirements and would not result in any significant land use impacts. The proposed Project is not expected to induce population growth that has not already been accounted for as a part of the existing and approved General Plan. The proposed Project does not displace persons or remove housing units.

The Agricultural Protection Alternative is consistent with the City's General Plan land use requirements and would not result in any significant land use impacts. This alternative is not expected to induce substantial population growth in the area and does not displace persons or remove housing units. As such, this alternative would have a similar impact relative to the proposed Project.

## **Mineral Resources**

The project site is not considered a mineral resource recovery site and there is no evidence of past mining activity. The Agriculture Protection Alternative would have an equal impact when compared to the proposed Project.

## **Noise**

The proposed Project would increase noise-generating activities associated with the maintenance and operation of the proposed project, as well as vehicular noise. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.12 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. The proposed Project would result in less than significant levels of noise or vibrations impacts due to construction and operational noise.

As this alternative result in less development, the noise impacts associated with future uses would be less. The agriculture area would involve the use of farming equipment and haul trucks that would cause a noise impact; however, the noises related to the agricultural activities already exist and therefore this would not introduce a new source of noise to the area. All other noise issues would be similar to the proposed Project. Under this alternative, noise impacts are less than those of the proposed Project.

## **Public Services and Recreation**

Development in the proposed Project will pay all applicable fees and assessments required to fund its fair share of public services and recreation. This funding would assist in the development of facilities in order to meet the City's standards. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to fire police, school and recreational facilities.

Under the Agricultural Protection Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 50 percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 50 percent reduction in the amount of public service needs from the Project site. This reduction would also result in a 50 reduction in the anticipated recreational amenities that would be created by the proposed project. The Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in a greater recreational impact when compared to the proposed Project because of the reduction of recreational amenities for the community.

## **Traffic and Circulation**

As described in Section 3.14, implementation of the proposed Project would cause an increase in traffic on roadways or intersections that would cause traffic operations to degrade to an unacceptable level of service. Under the Agricultural Protection Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 50

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

---

percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 50 percent reduction in the amount of traffic generated from the Project site.

Uses in the Agricultural Protection Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measures as the proposed Project and the decrease in square footage and reduced traffic volumes would result in reductions traffic congestion. While there would be a decrease in project generated traffic, some cumulative conditions will continue to operate at unacceptable levels of service regardless of the reduction of project traffic. Nevertheless, the Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less traffic related impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

### **Utilities**

Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts the public wastewater, water, storm drainage, and solid waste collection and disposal system. However mitigation measures provided in Section 3.15 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Project impacts to wastewater, water, stormwater and solid waste facilities are all less than significant.

Under the Agricultural Protection Alternative, the proposed Project would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the size of the buildings and number of recreational amenities would be reduced resulting in an increase of undeveloped land. The total development would be reduced by approximately 50 percent. This reduction in square footage and recreational amenities would represent an approximately 50 percent reduction in the amount of wastewater and solid waste generated from the Project site. This reduction would also reduce water demand by approximately 50 percent. There would be approximately 94.5 more acres of pervious soils, thereby reducing the amount of storm drainage from the project site. While uses in the Agricultural Protection Alternative would be required to adhere to the same mitigation measures as the proposed Project, the decrease in square footage would reduce the utility demands. The Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less demands on utility systems when compared to the proposed Project.

Overall, this alternative would have less wastewater treatment demand, less water demand, less solid waste generated, and less storm water runoff when compared to the proposed Project. As such, this alternative would have less impact when compared to the proposed Project.

### **ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

---

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The environmentally superior alternative is that alternative with the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the proposed Project.

As Table 5.0-1 presents a comparison of the alternative project impacts with those of the proposed Project. As shown in the table, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally

superior alternative; however, the No Project Alternative does not meet the project objectives. As required by CEQA, when the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the environmentally superior alternative among the others must be identified. Therefore, the Reduced Project and Agricultural Alternatives both rank higher than the proposed Project. Comparatively, the Agricultural Protection Alternative would result in less impact than the Reduced Project Alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the proposed Project. It should be noted that the Agricultural Protection Alternative and Reduced Project Alternative do not meet all of the project objectives. The proposed Project meets all of the project objectives.

**TABLE 5.0-1: COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE PROJECT IMPACTS TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

<i>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE</i>	<i>NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE</i>	<i>REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE</i>	<i>AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ALTERNATIVE</i>
Aesthetics and Visual Resources	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Agricultural and Forest Resources	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Air Quality	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Biological Resources	Less (Best)	Less (2nd Best)	Less (3rd Best)
Cultural Resources	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Geology and Soils	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Land Use & Population	Equal (--)	Equal (--)	Equal (--)
Mineral Resources	Equal (--)	Equal (--)	Equal (--)
Noise	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Public Services and Recreation	Greater (Worst)	Greater (3rd Worst)	Greater (2nd Worst)
Transportation and Circulation	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)
Utilities	Less (Best)	Less (3rd Best)	Less (2nd Best)

*GREATER = GREATER IMPACT THAN THAT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT*

*LESS = LESS IMPACT THAN THAT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT*

*EQUAL = NO SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE IN IMPACT FROM THAT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT*

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

REPORT PREPARERS

---

**City of Manteca**

Karen McLaughlin ..... City Manager  
 Frederic Clark ..... Community Development Director  
 Mark Meissner ..... Planning Manager  
 Rochelle Henson ..... Senior Planner  
 Don Smail ..... Economic Development Manager  
 Mark Houghton ..... Director of Public Works  
 Phil Govea ..... Deputy Director of Public Works

**De Novo Planning Group**

Steve McMurtry ..... Principal Planner/Project Manager  
 Ben Ritchie ..... Principal Planner  
 Beth Thompson ..... Principal Planner

**Fehr and Peers**

John Gard ..... Principal  
 Fred Choa ..... Principal

**JC Brennan & Associates – Noise Consultant**

Luke Saxelby, INCE Bd. Cert. .... Senior Consultant

**Peak Associates– Cultural Consultant**

Melinda Peak ..... Principal Investigator

**West Yost– Water Supply Consultant**

Jim Connell, P.E. .... Principal Engineer

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*

---

## REFERENCES

---

- Army Corps of Engineers. 1987. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual.
- Barbour and Major 1988. Terrestrial vegetation of California.
- C Donald Ahrens. 2006. Meteorology Today: An Introduction to Weather, Climate, & the Environment.
- California Air Resources Board. 2013. ARB Databases: Aerometric Data Analysis and Management System (ADAM). Available: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/databases.htm>>.
- California Department of Conservation. 2010. California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act Status Report.
- California Department of Conservation. 2012. California Important Farmlands Map.
- California Department of Education. 2012. 2011-12 School Quality Snapshot. Available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sq/>.
- California Dept. of Fish and Game . "Special Plants List." Natural Diversity Database.
- California Dept. of Fish and Game. "Special Animals List." Natural Diversity Database.
- California Dept. of Fish and Game. "Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List." Natural Diversity Database.
- California Department of Finance (DOF). Reports and Research Papers. Available at: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/>
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR), Bulletin 118, California's Groundwater, 2003 Update.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). January 2002(a). California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). June 2004. Transportation and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual.
- California Department of Transportation. 2013. Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. Available: <<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy1.html>>.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2006. California's Groundwater Bulletin 118. San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin, Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin. January 20, 2006.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2003. Bulletin 118, California's Groundwater, 2003 Update.

- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2013. California Water Plan Update 2013 – Advisory Committee Draft. San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region.
- California Division of Mines and Geology. 1970. Gold Districts of California, Bulletin 193.
- California Energy Commission. 2005. Global Climate Change: In Support of the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report. (CEC-600-2005-007.) June Available: <<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-600-2005-007/CEC-600-3005-007-SF.PDF>>.
- California Energy Commission. 2006. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990 to 2004. (CEC-600-2006-013-SF.) December. Available: <<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-600-2006-013/CEC-600-2006-013-SF.PDF>>.
- California Geological Survey (CGS). 2012. Aggregate Sustainability in California, Map Sheet 52. Sacramento, CA.
- California Water Quality Control Monitoring Council, CalEPA. 2012. Which Lakes, Streams, or Ocean Locations Are Listed By The State As Impaired? Available at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/mywaterquality/safe\\_to\\_eat/impaired\\_waters/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/mywaterquality/safe_to_eat/impaired_waters/).
- CalRecycle. 2013. Solid Waste Information System (SWIS). Available at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx> and <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/Reports/DRS/Destination/JurDspFa.aspx>
- CalRecycle. 2011. Jurisdiction Diversion/Disposal Rate Summary (2007 - Current). Available at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/reports/diversionprogram/JurisdictionDiversionPost2006.aspx>. Accessed 2/27/2013.
- City of Manteca. 2008. Manteca Municipal Services Review. Manteca, CA. June 16, 2008.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). June 1995. Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). January 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model.
- Hickman, James C. 1993. Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policy Makers. (Working Group 1 Fourth Assessment Report.) February. Available: <<http://www.ipcc.ch/SPM2feb07.pdf>>.
- Manteca Unified School District (MUSD). 2013. History of Manteca Unified. Available at: <http://www.mantecausd.net/1IALC727>
- Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority (NSJCGA). 2004. Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan. September 2004.

- San Joaquin County Agricultural Commission. 2011. San Joaquin County Agriculture (Crop) Report.
- San Joaquin River Group Authority (SJRGGA). 2013. East San Joaquin Water Quality Framework website. Accessed: April 9, 2013. Available at: <http://www.sjwatershed.org/default.html>
- Sawyer, John and Todd Keeler-Wolf. 1995. A Manual of California Vegetation.
- Skinner, Mark W. and Bruce M. Pavlik, Eds. 2001. California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California.
- South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID). 1999. South County Surface Water Supply Project EIR. Prepared by Environmental Science Associates. July 1999.
- State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2003. State of California General Plan Guidelines.
- State Water Resources Control Board, CalEPA. 2012. California Lakes and Reservoirs Impaired by Mercury. [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/mercury/reservoirs/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/mercury/reservoirs/).
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2013a. Custom Soils Report for San Joaquin County, California. April 6, 2013.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2013b. Web Soil Survey. Accessed: April 6, 2013. Available at: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm>
- United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT). September 1980. Highway Noise Fundamentals.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety.
- United States Soil Conservation Service. 1978. Procedure to Establish Priorities in Landscape Architecture. (Technical Release 65). Washington, DC.
- West Yost Associates (WYA). 2014. Water Supply Assessment for Manteca Family Enterprise Zone.

*This Page Intentionally Left Blank.*