APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INITIAL STUDY

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. BACKGROUND

1. Project Title: Austin Road Business Park and Residential Community (ARBPRC)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Manteca
1001 W. Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Rochelle Henson, Senior Planner
Erika Durrer, Senior Planner
(209) 456-8500 Office
(209) 923-8949 Fax
rhenson@ci.manteca.ca.us
edurrer@ci.manteca.ca.us

4. Project Location:

The project site is located in San Joaquin County adjacent to the southeast limits of the City of Manteca. The project site is within the ten-year planning horizon of the adopted City of Manteca Sphere of Influence. The area is generally bounded by East Woodward Avenue to the north, Highway 99 to the east, and is bisected by the existing Austin Road.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

AKF Development, LLC
1132 Norman Drive
Manteca, CA 95336
and
Raymus Homes, Inc.
250 Cherry Lane
Manteca, CA 95337

6. General Plan Designation:

San Joaquin County	General Agriculture (A/G), Limited Industrial (I/L)
City of Manteca	Low Density Residential (LDR), Medium Density Residential (MDR), High Density Residential (HDR), General Commercial (GC), Heavy Industrial (HI), Park (P), and Public/Quasi Public

7. Zoning:

San Joaquin County	Agriculture 40-acre minimum parcel area (AG-40) Industrial (I-W)
City of Manteca	N/A

8. Description of Project: See Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: See Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description

10. Project Approvals: See Draft EIR Chapter 2, Project Description

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

■ Aesthetics	■ Agriculture Resources	■ Air Quality
■ Biological Resources	■ Cultural Resources	□ Geology/Soils
□ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	□ Hydrology/Water Quality	■ Land Use/Planning
□ Mineral Resources	■ Noise	□ Population/Housing
■ Public Services	□ Recreation	■ Transportation/Traffic
■ Utilities/Service Systems	■ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

III. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the Proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the Proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

■ I find that the Proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR OR NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

3-31-10

Date

Erika Durrer, Senior Planner

Printed Name

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Introduction

The following Checklist contains the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the proposed project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. Included in each discussion are project-specific mitigation measures recommended as appropriate as part of the proposed project.

For this checklist, the following designations are used:

Potentially Significant Impact: An impact that could be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared.

Potentially Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: An impact that requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less-than significant level.

Less-Than-Significant Impact: Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA relative to existing standards.

No Impact: The project would not have any impact.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
1.	**AESTHETICS.** *Would the project:*				
	a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	■
	b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	■
	c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	■	☐	☐	☐
	d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	■	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

a, b. The project site is not a designated scenic vista and there are no listed State scenic highways in the project vicinity; therefore, there would be ***no impact*** on a scenic vista or State scenic highway. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

c. The project site is flat agricultural land, with some rural residential development. Views from the site are unobstructed by development. Development of the site with urban uses would substantially change its character with the potential to have a negative aesthetic effect, which is considered a ***potentially significant impact***. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

d. The development of the site would introduce new sources light and glare to the area. Because the project site is in an area with few light and glare sources, the addition of these sources is considered a ***potentially significant impact***. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:*				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program in the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	■	☐	☐	☐
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	■	☐	☐	☐
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	■	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

a, b. The project site contains Important Farmland that would be converted to non-agricultural uses. There are Williamson Act contracts in effect on the site, so the project could conflict with a Williamson Act contract. The project site is currently zoned for agricultural use. The conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses is considered a ***potentially significant impact*** and will be addressed in the EIR.

c. The site is designated for agricultural use; therefore, the proposed development of the proposed project would substantially alter the land use of the area. This is considered a ***potentially significant impact***. The change of land use will be addressed in the EIR.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
3.	**AIR QUALITY.** *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations: Would the project:*				
	a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	■	☐	☐	☐
	b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	■	☐	☐	☐
	c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	■	☐	☐	☐
	d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	■	☐	☐	☐
	e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	■	☐

Discussion

a-d. The proposed project would include the construction of residential units and the associated infrastructure as well as commercial and industrial uses, which would generate air emissions. Operation of the project would involve vehicle trips that would also generate air emissions. Because these emissions could have a ***potentially significant impact*** on air quality in the region, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR. In addition, the proposed project would generate emissions of greenhouse gases, which could contribute to global climate change. This issue will also be addressed in the EIR.

e. The project would include residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Typically, residential and commercial development is not considered a major source of odors. Industrial uses proposed would not generate substantial odors that would be detectable at any distance and would be located in areas along the southern portion of the plan area and would not be adjacent to residential uses that would be sensitive to odors. Therefore, impacts associated with odor would be ***less than significant***. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
4.	**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:*				
	a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	■	☐	☐	☐
	b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	■	☐	☐	☐
	c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	■	☐	☐	☐
	d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?	■	☐	☐	☐
	e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	■	☐	☐	☐

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	■	□	□	□

Discussion

a-f. The project site contains agricultural land that could be habitat for species of concern. The proposed project could have a ***potentially significant impact*** on these resources; therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
5.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES.** *Would the project:*				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	■	☐	☐	☐
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	■	☐	☐	☐
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature?	☐	■	☐	☐
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	■	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

a. There are several structures on the project site associated with current and past agricultural uses. Depending upon the age and integrity of the structures, some could be historically significant. The potential for the project to impact historical resources is, therefore, a ***potentially significant impact***. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

b. No known archaeological resources are located on the project site. The most recent use of the site is agriculture. No known religious or sacred uses are associated with the site according to the Native American Heritage Commission. However, undiscovered resources could be present on the site. If undiscovered resources were damaged or destroyed during the development of the project, this would be a ***potentially significant impact***. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

c. Paleontological resources include fossil remains, as well as fossil localities and rock or soil formations that have produced fossil material. Fossils are the remains or traces of prehistoric animals and plants. Fossils are important scientific and educational resources because of their use in documenting the presence and evolutionary history of particular groups of now extinct organisms, reconstructing the environments in which these organisms lived, and determining the relative ages of the strata in which they occur and of the geologic events that resulted in the deposition of the sediments that formed these strata and in their subsequent deformation.

No fossils and no evidence of exposed geomorphological features that typically contain fossils were observed during the pedestrian survey of the project site, but that does not preclude the possibility of their existence at greater depth below the ground surface. Because the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, this is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure CULT-1 would require

discovery procedures for paleontological resources during project construction and requiring a qualified paleontologist to mitigate adverse impacts on any discovered paleontological resources. This impact is therefore considered ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***. This issue will be not be further addressed in the EIR

CULT-1 Should paleontological resources be identified at any project construction sites during any phase of construction, the construction manager shall cease operation at the site of the discovery and immediately notify the City of Manteca Community Development Department. The project applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to provide an evaluation of the find and to prescribe mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting paleontologist, the City of Manteca Community Development Department shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, land use assumptions, and other considerations. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for paleontological resources is carried out.

d. Based upon previous cultural resource surveys and research, the project area has been inhabited by prehistoric and historic-period peoples for thousands of years. While no known archaeological resources are located on the project site. Undiscovered human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, could be present on the site. If human remains were damaged or destroyed during the development of the project, this would be a ***potentially significant impact***. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
6.	**GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** *Would the project:*				
	a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist - Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	■
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	■	☐
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	■	☐
	iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	■	■
	b. Result in substantial soil erosion, or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☐
	c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	■	☐
	d. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-13 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	■	☐
	e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion

The geotechnical characteristics of a project site determine its potential for structural and safety hazards that could occur during construction and/or operation of a proposed project. The following discussion illustrates that the design-controllable aspects of building foundation support, protection from seismic ground motion, and soil or slope instability are governed by existing regulations of the State of California

or the City of Manteca. These regulations require that project designs reduce potential adverse soils, geology, and seismicity effects to less than significant levels. Compliance with these regulations is required, not optional. Compliance must be demonstrated by the project applicant to have been incorporated in the project's design before permits for project construction would be issued.

a. i. The project site is not in a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there are no known active surface fault ruptures located in or adjacent to the project site. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to expose people to potential substantial adverse effects caused by the rupture of a known fault. ***No impact*** would occur.

a. ii-iii, c, d. The closest active fault with a magnitude of 6.5 with a slip rate of 2 millimeters per year is the Greenville Fault, located approximately 25 miles from the project site; the Hayward Fault, with a magnitude of 7.5, is located approximately 41 miles from the project site.[1] Although the project site is not adjacent to active faults, significant earthquakes from regional fault systems have affected San Joaquin County in the past.[2] The geotechnical report for the project performed liquefaction analysis borings on the site and determined that site ranges from low liquefaction potential to high liquefaction potential.[3]

The State of California provides minimum standards for structural design and site development through the California Building Code (CBC – California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, Part 2). Until January 1, 2008, the CBC was based on the then-current Uniform Building Code and contained Additions, Amendments, and Repeals specific to building conditions and structural requirements in the State of California. The 2007 CBC, effective January 1, 2008, is based on the current (2006) International Building Code and contains prominent enhancement of the sections dealing with fire safety, equal access for disabled persons, and environmentally friendly construction.[4] Each jurisdiction in the state may adopt its own building code based on the 2007 CBC. Local codes are permitted to be more stringent than Title 24, but, at a minimum, are required to meet all state standards and to enforce the regulations of the 2007 CBC beginning January 1, 2008. The City of Manteca has adopted the 2007 CBC as the basis for the City Building Code. The City's enforcement of its Building Code ensures the project would be consistent with the CBC.

The Manteca General Plan addresses seismic and geological issues as they relate to public health and safety and natural resources. The City's Department of Public Works regulates construction at the local level based on enforcement of the CBC as adopted by the City.

State and local regulations require design-level geotechnical investigations for the foundations of any structure for human occupancy proposed at the project site, including specific recommendations to reduce or eliminate post-construction settlement. The design-level

1 Neil O. Anderson and Associates, *Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Services report, Austin Road Business Park and Retail Development*, June 3, 2008, p. 2.
2 City of Manteca, *City of Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report*, October 6, 2003, p. 8-13 and Table 8.1-4.
3 Neil O. Anderson and Associates, *Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Services report, Austin Road Business Park and Retail Development*, June 3, 2008, p. 6.
4 California Building Standards Commission, *2007 California Building Code*, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, Volumes 1 and 2, effective January 1, 2008.

geotechnical investigation for the project would be reviewed by the City Department of Public Works for compliance with existing building codes and ordinances. Implementation of the recommended site preparation activities would be inspected by the City.

Before construction of the proposed project, the City Building Code requires a site-specific soils report that identifies any potentially unsuitable soil conditions (such as expansive, liquefiable, or compressive soils) and contains appropriate recommendations for foundation type and design criteria, including provisions to reduce the effects of these soils. The recommendations made in the soils report for ground preparation and earthwork are required to be incorporated in the construction design. The soils evaluations must be conducted by registered soil professionals, and the measures to eliminate inappropriate soil conditions must be applied. The design for soil support of foundations must conform to the analysis and implementation criteria described in the City's Building Code.

In addition, the City of Manteca General Plan 2023 Safety Element provides the following goals and implementation measures to lessen the possible exposure due to ground shaking or ground failure:

Goal S-1. **Prevent loss of lives, injury, and property damage due to geological hazards and seismic activity.**

Goal S-2. **Prevent loss of lives, injury, and property damage due to the collapse of buildings and critical facilities, and to prevent disruption of essential services in the event of an earthquake.**

Policies

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.

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.

The geotechnical report for the proposed project recommends site-specific geotechnical investigations for each development or parcel once building types and locations are determined so that recommendations to reduce potential for damage from liquefaction settlement can be developed.[5] Compliance with the above regulations and City policies and implementation measures, would ensure that the underlying soil conditions are known through geotechnical investigation and that the appropriate design features are included to reduce or eliminate post-construction settlement due to ground shaking or liquefaction. Implementation of these regulations and policies would ensure that impacts related to groundshaking, liquefaction, or subsidence would be ***less than significant***.

a iv. The proposed project site is flat, so the possibility of landslides would be ***less than significant***.

b. The proposed project is not expected to create substantial erosion or loss of topsoil because the project site is nearly level, so the water erosion hazard is considered low. However, construction activities would disturb soils, which could lead to erosion. In addition, post-construction changes to drainage patterns on the project site could also lead to erosion.

The State Regional Water Quality Control Board (SWRCB) permits all regulated construction activities under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (Order No.2009-0009-DWQ, NPDES No. CAR000002) adopted September 2, 2009. Every construction project that disturbs one or more acres of land surface or that is part of a common plan of development or sale that disturbs more than one acre of land surface would require coverage under this Construction General Permit by July 1, 2010. To obtain coverage, the landowner or other applicable entity must file Permit Registration Documents (PRDs) prior to the commencement of construction activity, which include filing a Notice of Intent (NOI), preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), submit other documents required by this Construction

5 Neil O. Anderson and Associates, *Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Services report, Austin Road Business Park and Retail Development*, June 3, 2008, p. 7.

General Permit, and mail the appropriate permit fee to the SWRCB. All development projects in accordance with the proposed project that disturb one or more acres or if the construction activity is part of a larger common plan of development that encompasses one or more acres of soil disturbance, or if there is significant water quality impairment resulting from the activity, would be required to comply with the revised Construction General Permit unless a Notice of Termination is filed prior to July 1, 2010.

The current Construction General Permit differs from the previous one (Order No. 98-08-DWQ) in that it includes specific minimum requirements for construction stormwater quality BMPs, a determination of sediment Risk Level, a Rain Event Action Plan, and monitoring and reporting requirements. Risk levels are based on a matrix of project sediment risk and receiving water risk. Sediment risk is based on estimated soil loss, as calculated by the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). Receiving water risk is based on whether a project drains to a sediment-sensitive waterbody. A sediment-sensitive waterbody is either on the most recent Section 303d list for waterbodies impaired for sediment; has an EPA-approved TMDL implementation plan for sediment; or has the beneficial uses of cold freshwater habitat, fish spawning, and fish migration. Because the City discharges to waters with beneficial uses of fish spawning and fish migration, development in accordance with the proposed project would be at least a Risk Level 2 project subject to Numeric Action Levels and some additional monitoring requirements. If erosion potential is high, it may be a Risk Level 3 project and subject to Numeric Effluent Limits and more rigorous monitoring requirements such as receiving water monitoring and in some cases bioassessment.

Best management Practices (BMPs) are intended to reduce impacts to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP), a standard created by Congress to allow regulators the flexibility necessary to tailor programs to the site-specific nature of municipal stormwater discharges. Regulations do not define a single MEP standard, but reducing impacts to the MEP generally relies on BMPs that emphasize pollution prevention and source control, with additional structural controls, as needed.

The City updated its Storm Drain Master Plan (SDMP) in May 2006.[6] The policies and criteria in the SDMP are designed to set minimum standards for the design of storm drainage conveyance, retention facilities, and drainage pump stations. Storm drain design must comply with the City's SDMP. The SDMP requires drainage studies to be submitted to and accepted by the Public Works Department prior to completion of a tentative subdivision or parcel map.

The SDMP requires all new development to provide drainage plans demonstrating new projects do not adversely affect adjacent properties and that allow all properties in a given watershed an appropriate means of discharging surface runoff. The City's storm drainage design standards require that all development projects, regardless of size, prepare a drainage report, which shall include maps showing drainage basins relative to the project and project sub-basins, with catch inlet locations and calculations of design runoff before and after development. The report must also include hydraulic calculations for depth of flow and quantity of runoff, pipe sizing, pump stations, and detention/retention basins. Compliance with regulations during construction and

6 West Yost Associates, *Storm Drain Master Plan, City of Manteca*, May 2006.

review and implementation of drainage plans would ensure that the proposed project would not result in significant erosion. Consequently, this impact would be ***less than significant***.

e. The proposed project would connect to the City of Manteca wastewater collection system and would not include the use of septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems that would be limited by local soils. There would be ***no impact***.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
7.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** *Would the project:*				
	a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	■	☐
	c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	■
	d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	■	☐	☐
	e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
	f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
	g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	■	☐

Discussion

a, b. Construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable building, health, fire and safety codes. Hazardous materials would be used in varying amounts during construction and occupancy of the project. Construction and maintenance activities would use hazardous materials such as fuels (gasoline and diesel), oils and lubricants; paints and paint thinners; glues; cleaners (which could include solvents and corrosives in addition to soaps and detergents); and possibly pesticides and herbicides. The amount of materials used would be small, so the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, assuming such use complies with applicable federal, state, and local regulations including, but not limited to, Titles 8 and 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code.

Hazardous materials regulations, which are codified in Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the CCR, and their enabling legislation set forth in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, were established at the state level to ensure compliance with federal regulations to reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine use of hazardous substances. These regulations must be implemented by employers/businesses, as appropriate, and are monitored by the state (e.g., Cal OSHA in the workplace or Department of Toxic Substance Control [DTSC] for hazardous waste) and/or local jurisdictions (e.g., the City of Manteca Fire Department).

By ensuring that businesses in or adjacent to the project site comply with the above regulations, the City would reduce impacts associated with the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials during occupancy of the proposed project that would result in increased risk of exposure to accidental release of hazardous materials, and the potential for an increased demand for incident emergency response. This would be accomplished by ensuring that regulated activities (e.g., businesses) are managed in accordance with applicable regulations such as Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventories (Business Plans), the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program, and the California Uniform Fire Code: Hazardous Material Management Plans and Hazardous Material Inventory Statements.

Compliance with Title 26, Division 6, of the CCR, which would be monitored by the City, would reduce impacts associated with potential for accidental release during construction or occupancy of the project site and the potential for an increased demand for incident emergency response. Compliance with this regulation would ensure that businesses and public facilities where hazardous materials are used or stored adhere to regulations designed to prevent leakage and

spills of material in transit and provide detailed information to clean-up crews in the event of an accident.

Workplace regulations addressing the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials in Title 8 of the CCR would apply to businesses and public facilities in and adjacent to the project site. Compliance with these regulations would be monitored by the City of Manteca Fire Department when they perform inspections for flammable and hazardous materials storage. Other mechanisms in place to enforce the Title 8 regulations include compliance audits and reporting to local and State agencies. Implementation of the workplace regulations would further reduce the potential for hazardous materials releases.

Implementation of Title 49, Parts 171-180, of the Code of Federal Regulations would reduce any impacts associated with the potential for accidental release during construction or occupancy of the proposed project or by transporters delivering hazardous materials to the project site or picking up hazardous waste. These regulations establish standards by which hazardous materials would be transported, within and adjacent to the proposed project. Where transport of these materials occurs on roads, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) is the responsible agency for enforcement of regulations.

Implementation of and compliance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations that are administered and enforced by City of Manteca Fire Department standards would reduce impacts associated with the routine use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials in the proposed project to a ***less-than-significant level***. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

c. The school nearest the project site is the Walter Woodward Elementary School, approximately 1 mile west of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to affect any schools within one-quarter mile of the site. There would be ***no impact*** and this topic will not be further addressed in the EIR.

d. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List).[7] The nearest site is located at 1085 South Union Road, approximately 2 miles from the project site. Two cases were found on the list of Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites from the GeoTracker database.[8] One is a leaking underground storage tank at Lathrop Gas and Food Mart (4800 West Frontage Road, Case #: 0001507), for which the site has been cleaned and the case closed. The status of the other case, a land disposal site at the Southwest Hide Company at 11651 Palm Lane, is still open. In addition, the Phase 1 Site Assessment for the project,[9] identified a number of above-ground storage tanks (ASTs), 55-gallon drums of agricultural chemicals, oil, and wine-making chemicals, a waste pond, stained soil/pavement, organic waste piles, irrigation and monitoring

7 Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, <www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList>, (July 16, 2009).
8 Geotracker database, <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map>, (July 16, 2009).
9 Advanced GeoEnvironmental, Inc., Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Austin Business Park, January 15, 2008.

wells, and a septic field (associated with Southwest Hide Company at 11651 Palm Lane). From these observations, the Phase 1 noted the following items of environmental concern:[10]

- Two monitoring wells that are part of an on-going environmental investigation at the former Southwest Hide Company on APN 228-090-05;
- Spillage of hydrocarbons beneath ASTs at APNs 224-050-18, 224-050-17, 228-090-08, 228-090-06, and 226-140-16;
- Moderately stained soil beneath an irrigation pump at APN 228-090-08;
- Used motor oil containers with spillage and oil-stained soil and cement at APN 224-050-018;
- Presence of agricultural chemicals on various properties; and
- Animal liquid waste ponds and solid waste piles on APN 224-050-17.

The Phase 1 also identified the following recognized environmental conditions:

- The presence of an active landfill at the Southwest Hide Company property; and
- Former underground storage tanks on APN 228-090-05 with the potential for petroleum hydrocarbon spills or leaks.

The project site has historically been used for agricultural purposes, so there is potential for contamination from historic use of pesticides and areas where storage, mixing, rinsing or disposal of environmentally persistent pesticides has occurred could contain relatively high concentrations of these chemicals. Because hazards related to past use of the project site could present safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, this impact is considered potentially significant. The following mitigation would ensure any known hazards due to past use of the site are cleaned up prior to site preparation and, if any evidence of soil contamination or other hazards are discovered during construction, appropriate controls are implemented to ensure the risk to people and the environment from hazardous materials or wastes are minimized. This impact is therefore considered ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated***. This issue will be not be further addressed in the EIR.

HAZ-1 a) *The applicant shall ensure that recommendations for subsurface investigations in areas near existing and former USTs, areas for oil storage, and in the vicinity of leaking irrigation pumps are implemented prior to site preparation. The applicant shall ensure any contaminated sites are remediated to meet State and County regulations and any required remediation shall be completed prior to construction.*

b) *If, during site preparation, visual or olfactory evidence of contamination is observed when soils are disturbed during construction, the applicant shall ensure the location is investigated and remediated to meet State and County regulations and any required remediation shall be completed prior to resuming construction.*

c) *Prior to submittal of a small lot tentative subdivision map or plans for residential or other sensitive development, properties not previously evaluated with a current*

10 Advanced GeoEnvironmental, Inc., Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Austin Business Park, January 15, 2008, p. 36.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified professional. If past commercial agricultural uses are disclosed that could have resulted in persistent contamination, soil sampling shall be conducted within former commercial agriculture areas. In these instances, prior to setting conditions for subdivision development, soil investigation shall be conducted according to guidelines developed by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and contained in the DTSC August 2002 "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Fields for School Sites", or equivalent protocol. Sampling and site investigation shall be conducted by a California registered environmental professional with applicable permits.

As a result of soil investigation, a limited and confined area of contamination may be identified and found to be suitable for simple removal. If this is the case, remediation will be required to meet State and County regulations and be completed prior to recordation of the final small lot subdivision map or equivalent final approval for residential projects.

As a result of soil investigation, unconfined and/or widespread residual concentrations of agricultural chemicals may be identified at levels where they individually or in combination meet or exceed US EPA, CalEPA Preliminary Remediation Goals, or equivalent screening levels, thereby indicating the need for risk assessment. Any indicated risk assessment shall be completed prior to improvement plans or equivalent approval. Risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent.

Any remedial action indicated by a risk assessment shall be completed and certified prior to recordation of the small lot tentative subdivision final map or equivalent final approval. Remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Workplan, or equivalent, and can include a range of activities, including restrictions on use, soil excavation and disposal off-site, or encapsulation in appropriate areas away from sensitive receptors in the project area.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would reduce impacts to a ***less-than-significant level***.

e, f. The Stockton Metropolitan Airport is located approximately 8 miles north of the project site. The project site is not within the land use plan for the Stockton Metropolitan Airport and future occupants of the project site would not be subject to substantial risk due to operations of the airport. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. There would be ***no impact***.

g. The project would be subject to the requirements contained within the City's emergency response and evacuation plans; therefore, impacts related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan are considered ***less than significant*** and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

h. The project site is located adjacent to a developed, urban environment and agricultural areas. The project site is not intermixed with wildlands; therefore, impacts related to increased fire hazard are considered ***less than significant*** and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
8.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** *Would the project:*				
	a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	■	☐
	b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	■	☐
	c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	■	☐
	d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	■	☐
	e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	■	☐
	f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	■	☐
	g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	■
	h. Place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	■

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	■	☐
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	■

Discussion

a,c,f. City of Manteca storm drain facilities currently exist in Woodward Avenue at the north end of the project site. South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) facilities, primarily "laterals" utilized to deliver irrigation water to specific properties, exist throughout the project site. However, some facilities serve a dual purpose and are also used to convey stormwater runoff from development projects to the San Joaquin River.

Construction activities on-site are regulated by the City's NPDES General Permit (General Construction Permit) for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff, provided that the total amount of ground disturbance during construction occurs on one acre or more.[11] These requirements would apply to the proposed project because it would involve ground disturbance on more than 1 acre. Coverage under a General Construction Permit requires the preparation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and Notice of Intent (NOI) to request coverage under the General Permit. The NOI includes site-specific information and the certification of compliance with the terms of the General Construction Permit. The SWPPP includes pollution prevention measures (erosion and sediment control measures and measures to control non-stormwater discharges and hazardous spills), demonstration of compliance with all applicable local and regional erosion and sediment control standards, identification of responsible parties, a detailed construction timeline, and best management practices (BMPs) monitoring and maintenance schedule to determine quantities of pollutants leaving the site. SWPPP BMPs are recognized as effective methods to prevent or minimize the potential releases of pollutants into drainages, surface waters, or groundwater. Strict SWPPP compliance coupled with using the appropriate BMPs would reduce potential water quality impacts during construction activities.

The project would include the construction of storm drain facilities to serve the project. The drainage system would consist of gravity lines, detention basins, pump stations, and a gravity outfall line that would lead from the basins to an existing downstream gravity system. The facilities would be required to comply with the provisions of the City's Stormwater Quality Standards, which require that development minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants from site runoff, which would require the incorporation of BMPs.

11 The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Act) established the provisions of water quality control within California. Additionally, the Act authorizes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which established effluent limitations and water quality requirements for discharges to waters of the state. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB) is the regulatory agency charged with administering the NPDES program for San Joaquin County. These activities include administering permits, performing water quality planning and providing local enforcement for water quality violations.

Among the BMPs listed in the Stormwater Quality Standards are those from the *California Stormwater Quality Association Best Management Practices Handbook*. The Standards also require proof of ongoing BMP maintenance. Compliance with the City's Stormwater Quality Standards, including the provision of operational BMPs, would ensure that the proposed project would not contribute substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area such that it would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact.

b. The City of Manteca's water is supplied from groundwater pumped from 16 wells located throughout the City, and treated surface water, from Woodward Reservoir, which is purchased from South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID). The *Manteca 2005 Urban Water Management Plan* estimates the groundwater demand in the City in 2004 at 14,933 acre-feet annually (AFA).[12] Historically, Manteca had been extracting groundwater at a rate of 2.4 acre-feet per acre per year, but to reduce Manteca's contribution to potential overdraft of the aquifer, the City obtained surface water and reduced its groundwater extraction to the safe yield of 1 acre-foot per acre per year.[13] During the summer of 2005, the City began receiving up to 11,500 acre feet/year of treated surface water from SSJID.[14] The City of Manteca will continue to supply both groundwater and surface water. In the future, the amount of surface water the City receives may increase by 7,000 acre feet/year and the City will continue to install new groundwater wells. By using surface water to augment groundwater supplies and by reducing groundwater withdrawals to the safe yield of 1 acre-foot per acre per year, the City would ensure that there would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact on the groundwater basin.

d. The drainage system for the proposed project would consist of gravity lines, detention basins, pump stations, and a gravity outfall line that would lead from the basins to an existing downstream gravity system. The detention basins would be sized to hold a 10-year, 48-hour storm event and would be designed to empty within a maximum 96-hour period, which establishes the minimum discharge rate. The outfall pipes would be designed to restrict the flow out of the development areas to minimize the offsite runoff rate, but at the same time allow the basins to empty within a maximum of 96 hours. Because there would be a continuous discharge from the basins throughout the storm event along with percolation and evaporation, in most cases, the basins would empty faster than 96-hours.

At this time, because specific site plans have not been submitted for the project site, a site-specific drainage plan cannot be completed. However, the City's Storm Drain Master Plan[15] includes Design Criteria that present guidelines and minimum standards for design of storm drain conveyance, retention facilities, and pump stations in the City. Prior to a final subdivision or parcel map, the project applicant must submit to the Public Works Department a drainage plan that includes:

12 City of Manteca, *Manteca 2005 Urban Water Management Plan*, December 2005, p. 12.
13 City of Manteca, *Austin Road Business Park Water Supply Assessment/Verification Draft*, November 2009, p. 8.
14 City of Manteca, <www.ci.manteca.ca.us/pwt/wdiv/waterreport.asp>, (September 3, 2009).
15 City of Manteca, *Storm Drain Master Plan*, prepared by West Yost Associates, May 2006.

- A topographic map of the drainage shed and adjacent areas showing existing and proposed ground elevations and sub-shed areas,
- 10-year and 100-year design flows at key locations,
- Preliminary pipe sizes and typical drainage channel geometry with hydraulic grade lines, inverts, and proposed ground elevations,
- Map showing analysis points, proposed street grades, and storm drain facilities,
- Configuration and elevations of proposed retention basins, including a preliminary grading plan,
- Information on proposed pumps, and stage, storage, and discharge information for retention basins under design conditions,
- Requirements for stormwater quality BMPs, and
- Preliminary site plan for each basin and site and equipment layout for the pump station.

Compliance with the City's Storm Drain Master Plan, which would be verified by the Public Works Department prior to approval of a final map, would ensure that project-related drainage facilities would be properly sized and designed to accommodate flows from the project site and would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact.

e. As discussed above, the proposed project would be required to prepare a drainage plan that demonstrates compliance with the City's Storm Drain Master Plan. The plan would be required to demonstrate that the proposed improvements would accommodate the water volumes from the site and must include water quality BMPs in the design to minimize pollutants from the site. Compliance with the Storm Drain Master Plan, which would be verified by the Public Works Department prior to approval of a final map, would ensure that project-related drainage facilities would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. This would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact.

g,h. The primary flood hazard in the City of Manteca is the San Joaquin River and its tributaries, west of the City; the 100-year and 500-year areas of potential inundation are located on the western portion of the City.[16] The project site is outside the 100-year and 500-year areas of potential inundation. Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** related to placing structures that would impede or redirect flood flows or placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

i. The project site is located in the inundation area for the Tulloch Dam (approximately 36 miles east) and New Melones Dam. However, the risk of dams inundating portions of San Joaquin County is low.[17] Nonetheless, California Government Code (Section 8589.5) requires local jurisdictions to adopt emergency evacuation procedures for populated inundation areas. The

16 City of Manteca, *City of Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report*, October 6, 2003, pp. 10-1 and 10-2; Figure 10-1.

17 City of Manteca, *City of Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report*, October 6, 2003, p. 10-2.

local Office of Emergency Services has prepared a Dam Failure Plan that includes a description of dams, direction of floodwaters, responsibilities of local jurisdictions, and evacuation plans. Because such a plan exists in case of a dam failure, future occupants of the site would not be exposed to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding from a dam failure. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact*** and will not be discussed in the EIR.

j. The project site is not located near an open body of water and, therefore, would not be subject to adverse effects associated with seiche or tsunami. The site is relatively flat and would not be subject to effects of mudflow. Therefore, there would be ***no impact*** and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:*				
a. Physically divide an established community?	■	☐	☐	☐
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating on environmental effect?	■	☐	☐	☐
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	■	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

a. The project site is located south of existing residential uses. Other land surrounding the project site is primarily undeveloped; therefore, the proposed project would not disrupt or divide an established community. However, development of the project could disrupt the agricultural community, which would be considered a ***potentially significant impact*** and will be addressed in the EIR.

b, c. The proposed project could conflict with existing land uses in the vicinity, environmental plans, policies, and zoning. The relationship of the project to plans and policies will be discussed in the EIR.

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

Discussion

a, b. The State of California identified sand deposits near the San Joaquin River, as areas of significant mineral resources; these areas are considered to be of regional significance.[18] However, the proposed project site is not an area of significant mineral resources. Therefore, there would be ***no impact***.

18 City of Manteca, *City of Manteca General Plan 2023*, adopted October 6, 2003, p. 8-14.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
11.	**NOISE.** *Would the project result in:*				
	a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	■	□	□	□
	b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	■	□	□	□
	c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	■	□	□	□
	d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	■	□	□	□
	e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	□	□	■	□
	f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	□	□	■	□

Discussion

a-d. The proposed project would include a variety of urban uses that would increase noise levels in the area, which could exceed applicable standards. Construction would result in temporary increases in noise levels and groundborne vibration. This would be considered a ***potentially significant impact*** and will be addressed in the EIR.

e, f. The Stockton Metropolitan Airport is 8 miles north of the project site. The project site is not within the land use plan for the Stockton Metropolitan Airport and the project site would not be

subject to substantial noise from aircraft from this source. This would be considered a ***less-than-significant impact*** and will not be addressed in the EIR.

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

Discussion

a. The proposed project includes residential development, which would directly increase the population in the region and could induce further growth in the area. The physical impacts associated with the development of the project will be addressed in the appropriate technical sections of the EIR. The growth inducing effects of the project will also be addressed in the EIR.

b, c. As previously noted, the project site is predominately used for agricultural purposes, with associated residential structures. Although some housing would be displaced as a result of the project, the proposed project includes the development of additional housing. Consequently, the proposed project would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact*** and this issue will not be discussed in the EIR.

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

Discussion

a-e. The proposed project would include the residential, commercial, and industrial development. The increased population associated with the development would increase the need for a variety of government services including fire protection, police protection, schools, and public facilities. This is considered a ***potentially significant impact*** and will be addressed in the EIR.

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

Discussion

a, b. The proposed project would include residential uses that would increase population and the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The proposed project includes up to 3,832 residential units, which, at 3.11 residents per units, could generate 11,918 new residents. Based on a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents, the project would require approximately 60 acres of parks. The proposed project includes a 30.5-acre detention basin/park facility, 19.4 acres of dual use parks/basins, and 10.8 acres of pocket parks. Consequently, the proposed project includes sufficient parkland to accommodate the project. The physical effects of development of the parks are assumed as part of the project and analyzed in the EIR. There would be no additional effects associated with development of additional parks. Because the proposed project includes the development of parks, future residents would not result in substantial physical deterioration of existing parks. This would be a ***less-than-significant impact***.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
15.	**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** *Would the project:*				
a.	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	■	☐	☐	☐
b.	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	■	☐	☐	☐
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	■
d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	■	☐	☐	☐
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	■	☐	☐	☐
f.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	■	☐
g.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	■	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

a, b, d, e, g. The proposed project would include traffic generating uses that could result in congestion on existing roads. The project would include a new internal roadway system to accommodate the proposed uses. The details of this roadway plan are unknown at this time and could create a hazard, inadequate access, or conflict with adopted policies. This is a ***potentially significant impact*** and will be addressed in the EIR.

c. The proposed project is not located such that it would interfere in any way with air traffic. ***No impact*** would occur.

f. The proposed project would include uses that generate demand for parking. The proposed project does not include a request for specific development projects, so an evaluation of parking cannot be made at this time. However, any future development proposal would be reviewed by the Planning Department to determine whether the development would include adequate parking, as defined in Manteca Municipal Code section 17.015.020. Compliance with the existing code would ensure that impacts related to parking would be ***less than significant***.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
16.	**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** *Would the project:*				
	a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	■	☐	☐	☐
	b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	■	☐	☐	☐
	c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	■	☐	☐	☐
	d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	■	☐	☐	☐
	e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	■	☐	☐	☐
	f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	■	☐	☐	☐
	g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes, and regulations related to solid waste?	■	☐	☐	☐

Discussion

a.-e. The proposed project would include the development of residential, commercial, and industrial uses, which would create an increased need for utilities and other service systems in the area, and could require the construction of new or expanded facilities. The proposed project would require water service from the City of Manteca. Wastewater collection and treatment would be

provided by the City of Manteca. It is proposed that natural gas and electrical service be provided by PG&E. The provision of these services could result in ***potentially significant impacts*** and will be addressed in the EIR.

f, g. The proposed project would generate solid waste that would require disposal at a landfill. This is a ***potentially significant impact***. The EIR will quantify the estimated solid waste generated by the proposed project compared to the capacity of the landfill(s) serving the City of Manteca.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	■	□	□	□
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	■	□	□	□
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	■	□	□	□

Discussion

a-c. The proposed project has the potential to cause ***significant impacts*** related to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, Public Utilities and Service Systems, Transportation/Circulation, and global climate change. Each of these issues will be addressed in the EIR.