Final Environmental Impact Report
for the
Evans Estates–Pillsbury Estates Project

State Clearinghouse #2007112019

Prepared for:

City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 W. Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337
Contact: Erika E. Durrer
209/456-8522

Prepared by:

ICF Jones & Stokes
630 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814
Contact: Bonnie Chiu or Sally Zeff
916/737-3000

August 2009

ICF Jones & Stokes. 2009. *Final Environmental Impact Report for the Evans Estates–Pillsbury Estates Project*. SCH #2007112019. August. (ICF J&S 00939.07.) Sacramento, CA. Prepared for: City of Manteca, CA.

Contents

Page

Tables iii
Acronyms and Abbreviations iv

Chapter 1 Introduction 1-1
Purpose of this Document 1-1
Public Review Process 1-1
California Environmental Quality Act Requirements 1-2
Use of this Document 1-2

Chapter 2 Text Changes to Draft EIR 2-1
Executive Summary 2-1
Chapter 11, *Transportation and Traffic* 2-2
Chapter 12, *Utilities and Service Systems* 2-3

Chapter 3 Comments on Draft EIR and Responses to Comments 3-1
Responses to Comment Letter 1—California Department of Transportation, May 5, 2009 3-7
Response to Comment 1-1 3-7
Responses to Comment Letter 2—California Department of Transportation, May 18, 2009 3-13
Response to Comment 2-1 3-13
Response to Comment 2-2 3-13
Response to Comment 2-3 3-13
Response to Comment 2-4 3-14
Response to Comment 2-5 3-14
Response to Comment 2-6 3-15
Response to Comment 2-7 3-15
Responses to Comment Letter 3—California Department of Transportation, 6/1/2009 3-19
Response to Comment 3-1 3-19
Response to Comment 3-2 3-19
Response to Comment 3-3 3-19
Response to Comment 3-4 3-19
Responses to Comment Letter 4—California Public Utilities Commission, 5/18/2009 3-23
Response to Comment 4-1 3-23
Response to Comment 4-2 3-23
Response to Comment 4-3 3-23

Responses to Comment Letter 5—San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, 4/28/2009....3-27
Response to Comment 5-1....3-27
Response to Comment 5-2....3-27
Response to Comment 5-3....3-27
Responses to Comment Letter 6—San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department, 5/11/2009....3-31
Response to Comment 6-1....3-31
Response to Comment 6-2....3-31
Response to Comment 6-3....3-32
Responses to Comment Letter 7—Ripon Unified School District, 5/25/2009....3-35
Response to Comment 7-1....3-35
Response to Comment 7-2....3-35
Response to Comment 7-3....3-36
Response to Comment 7-4....3-36
Responses to Comment Letter 8a—PG&E, 7/14/09....3-39
Response to Comment 8a-1....3-39
Response to Comment 8a-2....3-39
Response to Comment 8a-3....3-40
Response to Comment Letter 8b—PG&E, 5/26/09....3-43
Response to Comment 8b-1....3-43
Responses to Comment Letter 9—Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, 5/19/09....3-51
Response to Comment 9-1....3-51
Response to Comment 9-2....3-51
Response to Comment Letter 10—Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, 6/2/09....3-57
Response to Comment 10-1....3-57
Responses to Comment 11—Georgiana Reichelt, 5/12/09....3-61
Response to Comment 11-1....3-61
Response to Comment 11-2....3-61
Response to Comment 11-3....3-62

Chapter 4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program....4-1
Purpose of and Need for Monitoring....4-1
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program....4-2

Appendix A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates Project

Tables

Page

12-1. Summary of Public Service, Utility, and Recreation Providers Serving the Project Site 2-3

12-2. Projected Increases in School Enrollment Resulting from the Proposed Project (by School District and Development) 2-4

3-1. Comments Received on Draft EIR 3-2

4-1 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan—Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates Development Project ..... follows 4-2

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
City	City of Manteca
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
EB	eastbound
EHD	Environmental Health Department
EIR	environmental impact report
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
IS	initial study
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
LOS	level of service
LSA	limited soils assessment
mgd	million gallons per day
MMRP	mitigation monitoring and reporting program
MUSD	Manteca Unified School District
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NB	northbound
NOx	oxides of nitrogen
PFIP	Public Facilities Implementation Plan
proposed project	Evans Estates–Pillsbury Estates Project
ROG	reactive organic gases
RUSD	Ripon Unified School District
SB	southbound
SJCOG	San Joaquin Council of Governments
SJVAPD	San Joquiam Valley Air Pollution District
SR	State Route
WB	westbound
WQCF	Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility

Chapter 1
Introduction

Purpose of this Document

This document, together with the draft environmental impact report (EIR) for the Evans Estates–Pillsbury Estates Project (proposed project) that was circulated in April 2009, constitutes the final EIR for the proposed project. The information presented in this document has been provided in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and includes the chapters listed below.

- Chapter 1, "Introduction," discusses the purpose of this document, public review process, requirements under CEQA, and uses of this document.
- Chapter 2, "Text Changes to Draft EIR," contains changes to the text of the draft EIR made in response to comments received during the public review period for the draft EIR.
- Chapter 3, "Comments on Draft EIR and Responses to Comments," contains comments received during the public review period for the draft EIR and the responses by the City of Manteca (City) to those comments.
- Chapter 4, "Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program," contains the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) for the proposed project.

Public Review Process

The draft EIR was distributed to various public agencies, citizen groups, and interested individuals for a 45-day public review period, from April 2, 2009, through May 18, 2009. The draft EIR was circulated to state agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Copies of the draft EIR were available for public review during normal business hours at Manteca City Hall and Manteca Library. On May 12, 2009, the City held a public meeting at Manteca City Hall to receive oral and written comments on the draft EIR. During the review period and at the public meeting, written comments were received from members of the public and agencies.

California Environmental Quality Act Requirements

As the lead agency under CEQA, the City must provide each public agency that commented on the draft EIR with a copy of its responses to comments at least 10 days before certifying the final EIR.

Use of this Document

A final EIR allows the public and public agencies to review revisions to the draft EIR; comments on the draft EIR; responses to comments; and other components of the EIR, such as the MMRP, before approval of the project. This final EIR, including the draft EIR incorporated by reference, will serve as the environmental document used by the City when considering approval of the proposed project.

After completing the final EIR and before approving the project, the lead agency must make the following three certifications (CEQA Guidelines Section 15090).

- The final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA.
- The final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the final EIR before approving the project.
- The final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

In addition, if an EIR that has been certified for a project identifies one or more significant environmental impacts, the lead agency must adopt findings of fact (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[a]) in connection with approval of the project. For each significant impact, the lead agency must make one of the following findings.

- Changes or alterations that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact as identified in the EIR have been required in or incorporated into the project.
- Such changes or alterations are the responsibility and within the jurisdiction of another public agency, not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Each finding must be accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for the finding. In addition, the lead agency must adopt, in conjunction with the findings, a program for reporting or monitoring the changes that it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially

lessen impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091[d]). These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. This is the program referred to above as the MMRP.

In addition, when a lead agency approves a project that would result in significant and unavoidable impacts that are disclosed in the final EIR, the agency must state in writing its reasons for supporting the approved action (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[b]). This statement of overriding considerations must be supported by substantial information in the record, including the final EIR. Because the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts, the City is required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations if it approves the project. The statement of overriding considerations is not a substitute for the findings of fact described above.

The certifications, findings of fact, and statement of overriding considerations are included in a separate findings document that will accompany the City's staff report if and when the City approves the proposed project. The draft EIR (incorporated by reference), final EIR, findings of fact, and statement of overriding considerations are submitted to the City for consideration of the proposed project.

Chapter 2
Text Changes to Draft EIR

This chapter contains revisions to the text of the draft EIR. Text changes are intended to clarify or correct information in the draft EIR in response to comments received on the document or to correct typographical errors. Revisions are shown with strikethrough text for deletions (~~strikethrough~~) and underlined text for additions (<u>underline</u>). No text changes were identified for those sections or chapters not listed below.

Executive Summary

The following corrections are made to Table ES-1 in order to make it consistent with the conclusions presented in the draft EIR.

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Impact CR-3: Disturbance or Destruction of Significant and Historic Resources	~~Significant~~ No Impact	—	~~No Impact~~ —
Impact LU-3: Conflict with an Applicable Local Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan	~~Less than~~ Significant ~~with Mitigation~~	Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Compensate for Loss of Foraging Habitat for Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl as Outline in the SJMSCP	Less than Significant
Impact TRA-6a: Degradation of Intersection Operations from Increased Traffic at Main Street/SR 120 WB Ramps, Main Street/SR 120 EB Ramps, Main Street/Atherton Drive, Main Street/Woodward Avenue, Union Road/SR 120 WB Ramps, Union Road/SR 120 EB Ramps, Union Road/Atherton Drive, Union Road/Woodward Avenue, Airport Way/Daniels Street, Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps, Airport	Significant	<u>Mitigation Measure TRA-6i: Woodward Avenue/Van Ryn Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements</u> ~~Mitigation Measure TRA-6g: Woodward Avenue/Moffat Boulevard—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of~~	Less than Significant

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
Way/SR 120 EB Ramps, Airport Way/Atherton Drive, Airport Way/Woodward Avenue, ~~and Woodward Avenue/Moffat Boulevard,~~ and Woodward Avenue/Van Ryn Avenue		~~Intersection Improvements~~	
Impact TRA-6b: Degradation of Intersection Operations from Increased Traffic at Woodward Avenue/Moffat Boulevard, Moffat Boulevard/SR 99 SB Off-Ramp, Moffat Boulevard/Austin Road/SR 99 SB On-Ramps, Austin Road/SR 99 NB Ramps, and Main Street/Yosemite Avenue	Significant	Mitigation Measure TRA-6g: Woodward Avenue/Moffat Boulevard—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements ~~Mitigation Measure TRA-6i: Woodward Avenue/Van Ryn Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements~~	Significant and Unavoidable

Chapter 11, *Transportation and Traffic*

The following changes are made to the "Analysis Locations" section on page 11-10 of the draft EIR.

Intersections

- SR 120 westbound (WB) ramps and Main Street
- SR 120 ~~WB~~ eastbound (EB) ramps and Main Street
- Atherton Drive and Main Street (future intersection)
- Woodward Avenue and Manteca Road
- SR 120 WB ramps and Union Road
- SR 120 ~~WB~~ EB ramps and Union Road
- Atherton Drive and Union Road
- Daniels Street and Airport Way
- SR 120 WB ramps and Airport Way
- SR 120 ~~eastbound (~~EB~~)~~ ramps and Airport Way
- Atherton Road and Airport Way

- Woodward Avenue and Airport Way
- Woodward Avenue and Moffat Boulevard
- SR 99 southbound (SB) off-ramp and Moffat Boulevard
- SR 99 SB on-ramp, Moffat Boulevard, and Austin Road
- SR 99 northbound (NB) ramps and Austin Road
- Woodward Avenue and Pillsbury Avenue
- North Project Road and South Manteca Road (only with Evans Estates)
- South Project Road and South Manteca Road (only with Evans Estates)

Chapter 12, *Utilities and Service Systems*

The following changes are made to "Existing Conditions" on pages 12-6 and 12-8 of the draft EIR.

Information about existing conditions was compiled by reviewing relevant technical reports, conducting research on the Internet, and receiving personal communication. Table 12-1 identifies the public service, utility, and recreation providers that serve the project site.

Table 12-1. Summary of Public Service, Utility, and Recreation Providers Serving the Project Site

Public Service or Utility	Provider
Police	Manteca Police Department
Fire	Lathrop-Manteca Fire Protection District
Education	Manteca Unified School District (Evans Estates) Ripon Unified School District (Pillsbury Estates)
Parks	City of Manteca Parks and Recreation Department
Solid waste	City of Manteca Solid Waste Division; and Forward, Inc.
Wastewater	City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility
Electricity and natural gas	PG&E
Communication services	Verizon and Comcast

The following revisions are made to the "Impact USS-4" on page 12-13 of the draft EIR.

Impact USS-4: Inadequate Service Ratios at Schools Serving the Project Site (Less than Significant)

The closest high school to the project area is Manteca High School, located 2.3 miles northeast. Woodward Elementary School is located 0.5 mile northeast of the proposed project site. Additionally, construction of another high school,

Lathrop High School, is currently underway, and scheduled to open for the 2008/2009 school year.

As described previously, the Manteca Unified School District would serve the Evans Estates site, while the Ripon Unified School District would serve the Pillsbury Estates site. Based on the number of new homes associated with each development, ~~The~~ projected increases in enrollment at ~~these schools~~ each school district are provided in Table 12-2, based on the pupil yield factor (average number of students per residential unit) for each school district.~~ on the project site, as shown in Table 12-2.~~

Table 12-2 is replaced by the following table:

Table 12-2. Projected Increases in School Enrollment Resulting from the Proposed Project (by School District and Development)

Grade Level	Calculation	Number of Students
Manteca Unified School District (Evans Estates Development)		
Kindergarten–6	0.534 students x 586 single-family residences =	313
7–8	0.147 students x 586 single-family residences =	86
9–12	0.267 students x 586 single-family residences =	156
	Total:	**555**
Ripon Unified School District (Pillsbury Estates Development)		
Kindergarten–6	0.370 students* x 275 single-family residences =	102
7–8	0.091 students* x 275 single-family residences =	25
9–12	0.168 students* x 275 single-family residences =	46
	Total:	**173**

Note: Because the subtotals are rounded, the total does not precisely match the sum of the calculations.

* RUSD Pupil Yield Factors provided in RUSD Letter from Louise Nan, Ed.D. to Erika Hollander, City of Manteca (Dated May 25, 2009)

Impact PFS-6 in Chapter 14 of the General Plan EIR found that impacts on schools as a result of General Plan buildout would be less than significant with implementation of General Plan goal PF-13, policies PF-P-32 through PF-P-38, and policies PF-I-18 through PF-I-21.

Because the proposed project would result in an increase of approximately 728 ~~817~~ students in project area schools (555 new students in the MUSD and 173 in the RUSD), impacts on school service ratios are considered significant. Developer fees paid through the building permit process would be used to cover the cost of new school facilities. The payment of school impact fees, in accordance with California Government Code 65995, would reduce potential impacts on these schools to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Chapter 3
Comments on Draft EIR and Responses to Comments

As described in Chapter 1, "Introduction," the draft environmental impact report (EIR) for the Evans Estates–Pillsbury Estates Project (proposed project) was circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, by agencies that commented on the initial study (IS) and notice of preparation of the EIR, and by surrounding jurisdictions. Comment letters on the draft EIR were received from individuals and agencies. The letters received are listed in Table 3-1; copies of the letters, with each individual comment marked and numbered, followed by a response to each comment, are provided in this chapter.

As stated in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088(a) and 15088(b), comments that raise environmental issues must be provided with responses. This chapter contains the City's responses to comments received on the draft EIR. Reasoned, factual responses have been provided for all comments received, focusing specifically on the environmental issues raised. In general, the responses provide explanation or amplification of information contained in the draft EIR. Comments that are outside the scope of CEQA review will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration as part of the proposed project's approval process. Those comments are answered with a general response.

The comment letters and comments within each letter are numbered consecutively. For example, Letter 1 is the first letter, and Comment 1-1 is the first comment in Letter 1. Revisions made to the draft EIR in response to comments are identified as text to be deleted (~~strikethrough~~) and text to be added (<u>underline</u>). All text changes are also indicated in Chapter 2, "Text Changes to Draft EIR."

Table 3-1. Comments Received on Draft EIR

Letter	Date	Commenter	Address
Comment Letters			
1	May 5, 2009	California Department of Transportation	P.O. Box 2048 Stockton, CA 95201
2	May 18, 2009	California Department of Transportation	P.O. Box 2048 Stockton, CA 95201
3	June 1, 2009	California Department of Transportation	P.O. Box 2048 Stockton, CA 95201
4	May 18, 2009	State of California Public Utilities Commission	505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
5	April 28, 2009	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	4800 Enterprise Way, Modesto, CA 95356-8718
6	May 11, 2009	San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department	600 East main Street Stockton, CA 95202-3029
7	May 25, 2009	Ripon Unified School District	304 North Acacia Avenue Ripon, CA 95366
8	May 26, 2009	PG&E	4040 West Lane Stockton, CA 95204
9	May 19, 2009	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	1400 10th Street Sacramento, CA 95812
10	June 2, 2009	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit	1400 10th Street Sacramento, CA 95812
Draft EIR Public Meeting Comment			
11	May 12, 2009	Georgiana Reichelt	—

May. 5. 2009 10:32AM No. 0486 P. 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O. BOX 2048 STOCKTON, CA 95201
(1976 E. CHARTER WAY/1976 E. DR. MARTIN
LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. 95205)
TTY: California Relay Service (800) 735-2929
PHONE (209) 941-1921
FAX (209) 948-7194

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

Letter 1

May 5, 2009

10-SJ-120-PM-5.0
SCH#2007112019
Evans Estates-
Pillsbury Estates

Erika Hollander
City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Dear Ms. Hollander:

Thank you for your letter to the California Department of Transportation, District 10 Planning, requesting us to review the Draft Environmental Report (DEIR) for the construction of two subdivisions known as Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates. The Evans Estate site is located at 21010 S. Manteca Road and the Pillsbury Estate site is located at 21017 Pillsbury Road. The project sites are adjacent and the sites are collectively bounded by S. Manteca Road on the west and Pillsbury Road on the east. In order for the Department to provide a through review of this project please provide the following information using Synchro/Slim version 7.0. 1-1

- Existing Plus Evans Estates Conditions
- Existing Plus Pillsbury Estates Conditions
- Existing Plus both Project Conditions
- Cumulative No Project Conditions
- Cumulative Plus Evans Estates Conditions
- Cumulative Plus Pillsbury Estates Conditions

The Department will have additional comments upon receiving this information.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

May. 5. 2009 10:32AM No. 0486 P. 3

Ms. Hollander
May 5, 2009
Page 2

If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments in more detail, please contact Kathy Selsor at (209) 948-7190 (e-mail: kathy_selsor@dot.ca.gov) or me at (209) 941-1921.

Sincerely,

Kathy Selsor for

TOM DUMAS, CHIEF
OFFICE OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING

c: SMorgan State Clearinghouse

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

May. 5. 2009 10:32AM No. 0486 P. 4

Ms. Hollander
May 5, 2009
Page 3

bc: TDumas IGR
MOmar Traf Ops

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

May. 5. 2009 10:32AM No. 0486 P. 1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FACSIMILE COVER
10-2A-0049 (NEW 10/92)

ATTENTION:	FROM:	
Erika Hollander	**Kathy Selsor** **Department of Transportation** **1976 East Charter Way** **Stockton, CA 95205**	
UNIT/COMPANY: City of Manteca Public Works Department	DATE: **5/5/09**	TOTAL PAGES (Including Cover Page)
	FAX # (Include Area Code) (209) 948-7164	ATSS FAX 8-423-7164
DISTRICT/CITY 1001 West Center Street Manteca, CA 95337	PHONE # (& Area Code) (209) 948-7190	ATSS 8-423-7190
PHONE # (& Area Code) (209) 239-8463	FAX # (& Area Code) 825-2307 (209) ~~239-8495~~	ORIGINAL DISPOSITION: Destroy ☐ Return ☐ Call for Pickup ☐

Comments:

SJ-120-PM 5.0
SCH#2007112019 (DEIR)
Evans Estate-Pillsbury Estates

Responses to Comment Letter 1—California Department of Transportation, May 5, 2009

Response to Comment 1-1

The commenter requested the following information in Synchro/Slim 7.0 format:

- Existing Plus Evans Estates Conditions
- Existing Plus Pillsbury Estates Conditions
- Existing Plus both Project Conditions
- Cumulative No Project Conditions
- Cumulative Plus Evans Estates Conditions

The City provided this information to the commenter on May 12, 2009.

This page intentionally left blank.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201
(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. 95205)
PHONE (209) 948-7906
FAX (209) 948-3670
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

Letter 2

May 18, 2009

10-SJ-120-PM-5.0
SCH#2007112019
Evans Estates-
Pillsbury Estates

Erika Hollander
City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Dear Ms. Hollander:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed the Draft Environmental Report (DEIR) for the construction of the two proposed subdivisions known as Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates. The Evans Estate site is located at 21010 S. Manteca Road and the Pillsbury Estate site is located at 21017 Pillsbury Road. The project sites are adjacent and the sites are collectively bounded by S. Manteca Road on the west and Pillsbury Road on the east. Our Travel Forecasting section has the following comments:

1. Are the traffic volumes shown actual counts or estimates? If the counts were taken in 2008 as stated in the DEIR, please explain why they were lower than the Caltrans 2007 traffic volumes. 2-1

2. Page 11-9, states SR120 has an existing average daily traffic (2008 ADT) volume of 60,000 vehicles in the vicinity of the Airport Way interchange. This is lower than Caltrans 2007 traffic volume book value of 63,000 vehicles. In addition, the traffic volumes (Main line, ramps and peak hour) shown for the existing conditions, existing plus project conditions, existing plus both project conditions, cum conditions and no project conditions are lower than traffic volumes shown in Caltrans 2007 traffic volumes book. Please explain why they were lower. 2-2

3. Page 11-10 "Analysis Location Intersections" lists SR120 westbound (WB) ramps 2-3

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

and Main Street, and SR 120 WB ramps and Union Road are listed twice. SR 120 eastbound (EB) ramps with Main Street as well as Union Road were missing. These eastbound ramps should be added in the analysis for a thorough evaluation. 2-3 cont'd

4. The proposed project will impact Highways 5, 99 and 120, but no mitigation measures were proposed to reduce impacts to the mainline system. The project proposed the installation of traffic signals at some ramp junctions, however this is inadequate. Based on the traffic information provided in the DEIR additional mitigation measures such as installation of ramp meters and other ramp improvements at SR 120 and Main Street, SR 120 and Airport Way, SR 120 and Union Road and SR 99 and Austin Road would be more appropriate to help reduce congestion. 2-4

6. It appears the trip generation and distributions vary from the traffic model. Please justify the reason for this variance. 2-5

Caltrans encourages contacting the Native American Heritage Commission: 915 Capitol Mall, Room 364, Sacramento, California, 95814, Telephone (916) 653-4082, Fax (916) 657-5390 for advice on consulting with Native Americans regarding any cultural concerns within the project area. 2-6

The transit branch requests that transit and pedestrian friendly designs and amenities in the proposed development be utilized to encourage the use of public transit and alternative modes of transit. Roadways should be designed to provide for bus stops/pull outs at major intersections and sidewalks should accommodate the installation of signs, benches and shelters. Bicycle paths and storage areas should also be incorporated to encourage bicycling to work which reduces the number of single occupancy vehicles on the road. Promoting the use of car and van pools should be encouraged by providing incentives such as preferred parking for car pool and green vehicles and charging stations for batter powered vehicles. 2-7

The department will be forwarding additional comments regarding the DEIR as soon as the Synchro Files forwarded by your office on May 12, 2009, have been thoroughly reviewed.

Please forward a copy of all Final Conditions of Approval including any mitigation measures that are being proposed as well as any other documents and reports (i.e. all forms of environmental documents, Traffic Impact Study Reports, site and location maps, etc.) on this proposed project for our review, comment, and records.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of our comments in more detail, please contact Barbara Hempstead at (209) 948-3909 (e-mail: barbara_hempstead@dot.ca.gov) or me at (209) 941-1921.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Sincerely,

TOM DUMAS, Chief
Office of Intermodal Planning

Cc: Tom Dumas
PS Venkataramanujam

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

M. Omar

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Responses to Comment Letter 2—California Department of Transportation, May 18, 2009

Response to Comment 2-1

The commenter asked whether traffic volumes shown are actual counts or estimates; and if counts were taken in 2008, why they were lower than Caltrans' 2007 traffic volumes.

As described in the draft EIR, the traffic volumes presented in the report are based on counts taken in January 2008. The weather on the days the counts were collected was dry and overcast; no incidents were reported. The counts collected for the project may be lower than the Caltrans 2007 traffic volumes because Caltrans volumes are often estimated based on a previous year's count adjusted by a growth factor. Throughout 2008, Fehr & Peers has noticed that traffic volumes have been consistently lower than in previous years, particularly in fast growing areas like Manteca where construction activity has decreased significantly due to the economic slowdown.

Response to Comment 2-2

The commenter states that the draft EIR reported traffic volume was lower than the Caltrans 2007 traffic volumes. Please refer to Response to Comment 2-1. The traffic counts collected for the draft EIR may be lower than the 2007 Caltrans estimates because of the nationwide economic slowdown.

Response to Comment 2-3

The commenter notes that the State Route (SR) 120 eastbound ramp terminal intersections at Main Street and Union Road are missing, and that the SR 120 westbound ramp at Union Road is listed twice on page 11-10 of the draft EIR.

The omission of the eastbound SR 120 ramps at Union Road and Main Street is a typographical error. The duplicate westbound intersections should read "eastbound." These changes have been made in the draft EIR, and are shown in Chapter 2, "Text Changes to Draft EIR," of this final EIR. The intersection level of service (LOS) analysis was performed for both eastbound and westbound ramp terminal intersections at Main Street and Union Road. The results are presented in tables throughout the draft EIR.

Response to Comment 2-4

The commenter noted that the draft EIR did not propose mitigation measures to reduce impacts to the mainline system, and proposed additional mitigation measures and improvements.

The draft EIR identified mitigation measures to improve mainline operations on SR 120 and SR 99. For SR 120, the project applicant will be required to pay the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) regional traffic impact fee, which will fund the widening of SR 120 between I-5 and SR 99. This mitigation will reduce the significance of the project's impact; however, mainline operations are expected to remain at a cumulatively unacceptable LOS even with the widening. The draft EIR notes that adding a fourth eastbound and westbound lane on SR 120 would provide acceptable operations, but this mitigation measure is not feasible since Caltrans has no plans to widen the freeway to eight lanes.

In addition, the draft EIR identifies Mitigation Measures TRA-5a, 5c, 5f, and 6d, which require that the project proponent pay Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP)/fair-share fees to reconstruct the following interchanges:

- SR 120/Airport Way
- SR 120/Union Road
- SR 120/Main Street
- SR 99/Austin Road

While a Project Study Report has been completed for the SR 120/Union Road interchange, it is likely that all of the reconstructed interchanges will include ramp meters. The Airport Way, Main Street, and Austin Road interchanges will likely have auxiliary lanes. All of the proposed interchange improvements described above will reduce the significance of the project impact on interchange and mainline projects. However, some impacts will remain significant and unavoidable since implementation of the mitigation measures cannot be guaranteed due to environmental and funding constraints. Additionally, mainline/ramp merge/ramp diverge LOS will continue to be unacceptable even with the proposed improvements at some locations.

Response to Comment 2-5

The commenter requested a justification for the variance of the trip generation and distributions from the traffic model.

The trip generation estimate for the proposed project was based on trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* publication. The ITE rates are commonly used to analyze traffic impacts in San Joaquin County. The project trip distribution estimate was based on model output, but was adjusted to account for the location of adjacent

complementary land uses (shopping centers, employment centers) and observations of existing travel patterns from similar developments in southern Manteca.

Response to Comment 2-6

The commenter encouraged contacting the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for advice on consultation with Native Americans and cultural issues in the project area.

As described in Chapter 6, "Cultural Resources," of the draft EIR, a search of the NAHC sacred lands database was conducted and a list of potentially interested Native American representatives was requested on August 30, 2005. NAHC responded on September 2, 2005, stating that the search of its sacred lands database had failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and provided a list of one Native American representative. A contact letter describing the proposed project and indicating the project location was sent to the Native American representative on September 6, 2005. A telephone call was made to the Native American representative on April 9, 2007, and a message was left asking for a return call if there were any issues or concerns about the proposed project. To date, no response has been received.

Response to Comment 2-7

The commenter requests that transit- and pedestrian-friendly amenities be included to encourage public transit and alternative modes of transit.

The draft EIR addresses the pedestrian and bicycle system in the project area. The neighborhood immediately north of the project site has a well-established pedestrian and bicycle system including sidewalks and bike lanes that access parks and schools. The sections of Manteca Road and Woodward Avenue north of the project site also have sidewalks on at least one side of the street. The City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan shows proposed Class II bike lanes along Manteca Road near the project site, which would be accessible to future residents of the proposed project. However, due to the rural character of the project area, currently no bike lanes or sidewalks are immediately adjacent to the project site. The draft EIR also recognizes that no existing transit systems serve the project site, but that several transit agencies provide service in Manteca (described in more detail on page 11-10 of the draft EIR).

Further, implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-2 (Construct Class II Bicycle Lanes) would alleviate the increased demand for bicycle facilities as a result of the proposed project, and Mitigation Measure TRA-4 (Coordinate with City and Manteca Transit to Facilitate Future Transit Service in the Area) would help satisfy transit demands generated by the proposed project.

This page intentionally left blank.

Jun. 1. 2009 1:19PM No. 0017 P. 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201
(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. 95205)
PHONE (209) 941-1921
FAX (209) 948-7194
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

Letter 3

June 1, 2009

10-SJ-120-PM5.0
SCH#2007112019
Evans Estates/Pillsbury Estates

Ms. Erika Hollander
City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Dear Ms. Hollander:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed the Synchro files pertaining to the subdivisions known as Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates. Our Traffic Operations section has the following comments:

1. What year/years did you base your assumed cumulative condition of traffic report? 3-1

2. What is the opening date of the proposed projects? 3-2

3. The SimTraffic output shows the northbound left turn lane at the westbound ramp intersection for State Route 120/Main Street needing to be increased. The 95% queue under "Existing +project condition PM peak hour" shows a queue of 152 feet. Increasing the channelization will help reduce the queue for the northbound through traffic. 3-3

4. An Encroachment Permit will be required for work (if any) done within the Department's right of way. This work is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. Therefore, environmental studies may be required as part of the encroachment permits application. 3-4

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Jun. 1. 2009 1:19PM No. 0017 P. 3

Ms. Erika Hollander
June 1, 2009
Page One

If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of our comments in more detail, please contact Barbara Hempstead at (209) 948-3909 (e-mail Barbara_hempstead@dot.ca.gov) or me at (209) 948-1921.

Sincerely,

for TOM DUMAS, Chief
Office of Intermodal Planning

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Responses to Comment Letter 3—California Department of Transportation, 6/1/2009

Response to Comment 3-1

The commenter asked what year(s) the assumed cumulative condition of traffic report was based on. The cumulative conditions analysis was based on 2025 conditions.

Response to Comment 3-2

The commenter asked about the opening date of the proposed project. The opening date of the project is not known and will depend on market conditions. The analysis of Existing Plus Both Projects Conditions assumes that the project would be constructed and occupied immediately (2008 conditions).

Response to Comment 3-3

The commenter suggests increasing the channelization of the northbound left-turn lane at the westbound ramp intersection for SR 120/Main Street to reduce the queue for northbound through traffic.

The northbound left-turn pocket at the Main Street/Westbound SR 120 ramp intersection is 275 feet long. This turn pocket will accommodate the 150-foot "Existing + project condition PM peak hour" queue identified by the commenter. Any additional lengthening of the turn pocket would be difficult since it may require widening of the SR 120 overcrossing structure.

Response to Comment 3-4

The commenter notes that an Encroachment Permit will be required if any work is done within the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way. The proposed project includes the development of the Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates subdivisions, and does not include any improvements to areas within the Caltrans right-of-way (i.e., SR 120 or SR 99). However, several impacts addressed in the Draft EIR require the project proponent to pay its fair-share towards mitigating transportation impacts at various locations including facilities within the Caltrans right-of-way, which would require an Encroachment Permit.

This page intentionally left blank.

Letter 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — Arnold Schwarzenegger, *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

May 18, 2009

Erika Hollander, Senior Planner
City of Manteca
1001 W. center Street
Manteca, CA 95336

Re: Notice of Completion, Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)
Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates
SCH# 2007112019

Dear Ms. Hollander:

As the state agency responsible for rail safety within California, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) recommends that development projects proposed near rail corridors be planned with the safety of these corridors in mind. New developments and improvements to existing facilities may increase vehicular traffic volumes, not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade highway-rail crossings. In addition, projects may increase pedestrian traffic at crossings, and elsewhere along rail corridor rights-of-way. Working with CPUC staff early in project planning will help project proponents, agency staff, and other reviewers to identify potential project impacts and appropriate mitigation measures, and thereby improve the safety of motorists, pedestrians, railroad personnel, and railroad passengers.

The DEIR appears to have excluded the analysis of the following at-grade rail crossings; Moffat Blvd. (CPUC #001B-98.30C), Woodward Road (CPUC #001B-99.20) and Austin Road (CPUC # 001B-99.50). The proposed project will generate over 8,230 ADT and will have significant impacts to the local roadway system including the at-grade rail crossings. The Commission recommends that your agency include potential project-related rail safety impacts, and measures to reduce adverse impacts to these crossings in the DEIR. In general, the major types of impacts to consider are collisions between trains and vehicles, and between trains and pedestrians. General categories of measures to reduce potential adverse impacts on rail safety include:

- Installation of grade separations at crossings, i.e., physically separating roads and railroad track by constructing overpasses or underpasses
- Improvements to warning devices at existing highway-rail crossings
- Installation of additional warning signage
- Improvements to traffic signaling at intersections adjacent to crossings, e.g., traffic preemption
- Installation of median separation to prevent vehicles from driving around railroad crossing gates
- Where soundwalls, landscaping, buildings, etc. would be installed near crossings, maintaining the visibility of warning devices and approaching trains

4-1

Erika Hollander
City of Manteca
May 18, 2009
SCH #2007112019
Page 2 of 2

- Prohibition of parking within 100 feet of crossings to improve the visibility of warning devices and approaching trains
- Installation of pedestrian-specific warning devices and channelization
- Construction of pull-out lanes for buses and vehicles transporting hazardous materials
- Installation of vandal-resistant fencing or walls to limit the access of pedestrians onto the railroad right-of-way
- Elimination of driveways near crossings
- Increased enforcement of traffic laws at crossings
- Rail safety awareness programs to educate the public about the hazards of highway-rail grade crossings

4-1 cont'd

Commission approval is required to modify an existing highway-rail crossing or to construct a new crossing.

4-2

Please forward any additional information that addresses our concerns so we may complete our review of the DEIR traffic/circulation section. The mitigation monitoring section will need to be amended to include any mitigation measures based on project impacts for opening day and buildout scenarios.

4-3

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions in this matter, please contact me at (415) 713-0092 or email at ms2@cpuc.ca.gov.
.

Sincerely,

Moses Stites
Rail Corridor Safety specialist
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
Rail Transit and Crossings Branch
515 L Street, Suite 1119
Sacramento, CA 95814

2

Responses to Comment Letter 4—California Public Utilities Commission, 5/18/2009

Response to Comment 4-1

The commenter recommends including analysis of the at-grade rail crossings on Moffat Boulevard, Woodward Road, and Austin Road. The commenter also recommends measures to reduce potential impacts on these crossings.

The proposed project would not add a significant amount of traffic to the crossings at Moffat Boulevard and Austin Road. However, the proposed project would result in queuing that could spill over onto the Woodward Road crossing. These rail crossings, including the Woodward Road facility, are currently equipped with standard rail crossing safety devices, including advanced signage to warn drivers of the crossing, and automatic warning devices (i.e., gates and bells). Therefore, although the proposed project would result in queuing at the Woodward crossing, standard safety devices already exist at this crossing to reduce the potential impact on rail safety.

Response to Comment 4-2

The commenter noted that California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approval is required if a highway-rail crossing were to be modified or newly constructed. The proposed project does not include the construction or modification of a highway-rail crossing. Therefore, no approvals from the CPUC for modification or construction of a crossing are necessary.

Response to Comment 4-3

The commenter noted that the mitigation monitoring section will need to be amended to include any mitigation measures for impacts to at-grade rail crossings. No significant impacts to at-grade rail crossings would occur as a result of the proposed project; therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts related to rail crossings (see Response to Comment 4-1).

This page intentionally left blank.

San Joaquin Valley
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

Letter 5

RECEIVED

APR 30 2009

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

April 28, 2009

Erika Hollander
Community Development Department
City of Manteca
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Subject: Comments on Proposed Project

Project: DEIR for the Evans Estates – Pillsbury Estates

District Reference No: 20090246

Dear Ms. Hollander:

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (District) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Evans Estates – Pillsbury Estates project. Evans Estates will be located at 21010 South Manteca Road and the Pillsbury Estates site will be located at 21017 Pillsbury Road adjacent to the Evans Estates. The proposed project would include a total of 861 new single-family homes. The District offers the following comments: 5-1

District Comments

1. The District concurs with the Draft EIR that the project emissions for Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) can be mitigated to less than significant levels. To achieve less than significant levels the District recommends all mitigation measures be made conditions of approval to avoid significant effects.

2. The District strongly recommends the mitigation measure in section AQ-1d used to reduce the projects overall emissions impact be made a condition of project approval. The District has entered into several Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreements (VERA) and has demonstrated that a VERA can effectively mitigate project related emissions to less than significant. Entering into a VERA requires

Seyed Sadredin
Executive Director/Air Pollution Control Officer

Northern Region
4800 Enterprise Way
Modesto, CA 95356-8718
Tel: (209) 557-6400 FAX: (209) 557-6475

Central Region (Main Office)
1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue
Fresno, CA 93726-0244
Tel: (559) 230-6000 FAX: (559) 230-6061
www.valleyair.org

Southern Region
2700 M Street, Suite 275
Bakersfield, CA 93301-2373
Tel: (661) 326-6900 FAX: (661) 326-6985

Printed on recycled paper.

District Board approval. To avoid potential delays it is recommended that a VERA be submitted to the District as soon as practicable. 5-1 cont'd

3. At full build-out the proposed project would be greater than 50 residential dwelling units and would be subject to District Rule 9510 (Indirect Source Review).

   District Rule 9510 is intended to mitigate a project's impact on air quality through project design elements or by payment of applicable off-site mitigation fees. Any applicant subject to District Rule 9510 is required to submit an Air Impact Assessment (AIA) application to the District no later than seeking final discretionary approval, and to pay any applicable off-site mitigation fees before issuance of the first building permit. If approval of the subject project constitutes the last discretionary approval by your agency, the District recommends that demonstration of compliance with District Rule 9510, including payment of all applicable fees, be made a condition of the project's approval. 5-2

The proposed project may be subject to the following District rules: Regulation VIII, (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions), Rule 4102 (Nuisance), Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings), and Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving and Maintenance Operations). In the event an existing building will be renovated, partially demolished or removed, the project may be subject to District Rule 4002 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants). 5-3

The above list of rules is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. To identify other District rules or regulations that apply to this project or to obtain information about District permit requirements, the applicant is strongly encouraged to contact the District's Small Business Assistance Office at (559) 230-5888. Current District rules can be found online at: www.valleyair.org/rules/1ruleslist.htm.

District staff is available to meet with you and/or the applicant to further discuss the regulatory requirements that are associated with this project. If you have any questions or require further information, please call David McDonough at (559) 230-5920 and provide the reference number at the top of this letter.

Sincerely,

David Warner
Director of Permit Services

David McDonough for

Arnaud Marjollet
Permit Services Manager

DW: dm

Responses to Comment Letter 5—San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, 4/28/2009

Response to Comment 5-1

The commenter recommends that all air quality mitigation measures be made conditions of project approval to ensure less-than-significant impacts resulting from project emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The commenter further recommends that Mitigation Measure AQ-1d, specifically, be made a condition of approval to reduce the project's overall emissions impact.

The City typically adopts mitigation measures that would reduce project impacts as conditions of project approval. Therefore, the City will include all mitigation measures, adopted as part of the EIR, in a single condition of approval. In doing so, all air quality mitigation measures, including Mitigation Measure AQ-1d specifically, would become part of a single condition of project approval.

Response to Comment 5-2

The commenter noted that the proposed project at complete build-out will be subject to District Rule 9510.

As described in the draft EIR, compliance with Rule 9510 is separate from the CEQA process, though the control measures used to comply with Rule 9510 may be used to mitigate impacts under CEQA (page 4-19 of the draft EIR). However, Mitigation Measure AQ-1c and Mitigation Measure AQ-1d, found on pages 4-35 and 4-36, Chapter 4, "Air Quality," of the draft EIR, have been identified to reduce project emissions and to comply with Rule 9510.

Response to Comment 5-3

The commenter noted that the proposed project may be subject to San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) rules: Regulation VIII, Rule 4102, Rule 4601, Rule 4641 and possibly Rule 4002.

The draft EIR acknowledges that the proposed project may be subject to SJVAPCD rules, including, but not limited to, the rules identified by the commenter. Specifically, Chapter 4, "Air Quality," of the draft EIR addresses the following SJVAPCD rules:

- SJVAPCD Rule 2201 (New and Modified Stationary-Source Review Rule);
- SJVAPCD Rule 2020 (Exemptions, Permits);

- SJVAPCD Rule 3110 (Air Toxic Fees);
- SJVAPCD Rule 3135 (Dust Control Plan Fees);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4002 (National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4101 (Visible Emissions);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4102 (Nuisance);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4103 (Open Burning);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4306 (Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters—Phase 3);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4601 (Architectural Coatings);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4641 (Cutback, Slow-Cure, and Emulsified Asphalt, Paving, and Maintenance Operations);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4663 (Organic Solvent Cleaning, Storage, and Disposal);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4701 (Internal Combustion Engines—Phase 1);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4702 (Internal Combustion Engines—Phase 2);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4901 (Wood-Burning Fireplaces and Wood-Burning Heaters);
- SJVAPCD Rule 4902 (Residential Water Heaters);
- SJVAPCD Rule 9510 (Indirect-Source Review); and
- SJVAPCD Regulation VIII (Fugitive PM10 Prohibitions).

Letter 6

San Joaquin County
Environmental Health Department
600 East Main Street
Stockton, California 95202-3029

Website: www.sjgov.org/ehd
Phone: (209) 468-3420
Fax: (209) 464-0138

DIRECTOR
Donna Heran, REHS
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
Laurie Cotulla, REHS
PROGRAM COORDINATORS
Mike Huggins, REHS, RDI
Margaret Lagorio, REHS
Robert McClellon, REHS
Jeff Carruesco, REHS, RDI
Kasey Foley, REHS

RECEIVED
MAY 13 2009
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

May 11, 2009

Erika Hollander, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
Planning Division
City of Manteca
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, California 95337

Subject: Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates SCH#200 7112019

The San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department (EHD) is supportive of this project in regards to the provision of full public services. The EHD requests the following comments be added to the above project for consideration:

The existing homes are being served by onsite sewage disposal systems and individual wells for domestic and irrigation purposes. The EHD recommends that as a part of developing these properties, the existing wells and septic systems shall be destroyed under permit and inspection with the EHD. 6-1

The EHD has reviewed the document described above that proposes rezoning agricultural property that is actively farmed to allow for a variety of low, medium, and high density residential projects. EHD recommends that additional research be conducted to determine whether pesticides were used on the proposed development site(s). The site(s) should be evaluated to determine if and where storage, mixing, rinsing and disposal of pesticides may have occurred and whether contamination exists. 6-2

In addition, although EHD does not regulate pesticides legally applied to crops, if pesticides have historically been used on the property, we strongly recommend that these areas be tested for environmentally persistent pesticides such as organic pesticides and metals prior to development. The results of any testing should be evaluated to determine if concentrations present in soils will be protective of residents and workers. 6-3

If you have any questions, please call Rodney Estrada, Lead Senior Registered Environmental Health Specialist, at (209) 468-0331.

Rodney Estrada, REHS
Lead Senior

RE:ej

This page intentionally left blank.

Responses to Comment Letter 6—San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department, 5/11/2009

Response to Comment 6-1

The commenter acknowledges that existing homes on the project site are served by onsite sewage disposal systems and individual wells for domestic and irrigation purposes, and states that existing wells and septic systems should be destroyed under permit and inspections with San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department (EHD).

As stated on page 8-17 of Chapter 8, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," of the draft EIR, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2e requires that onsite septic systems be properly abandoned according to applicable procedures, including, but not limited to, California Health and Safety Code Sections 117415-117420 and Ordinance Code of San Joaquin County Section 9-1110. The measure further requires the project proponent to obtain a permit from the County EHD and to hire licensed sewage haulers to pump and remove the sewage. The County EHD will inspect the site to ensure that the septic systems have been properly abandoned. Future development on the project site will be served by City wastewater facilities.

Response to Comment 6-2

The commenter recommends that sites proposed for rezoning from agricultural to residential be tested to determine whether pesticides were used on the proposed development sites, and whether contamination still exists.

No visual indicators of contaminated soil were detected on the Evans Estates site during the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA). However, indications of soil contamination on the Pillsbury Estates site led to a Phase II limited soils assessment (LSA). The Phase II LSA concluded that further assessment of the site for organochlorine pesticides is not warranted. Although a Phase II LSA was not recommended for the Evans Estates site, the draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a, found on page 8-16, Chapter 8, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," which requires surface soils screening requirements prior to development of the Evans Estates site.

Response to Comment 6-3

The commenter recommends testing of sites that have been known to be subject to sprayed pesticides.

Please refer to Response to Comment 6-2.

Letter 7

Ripon Unified School District
304 North Acacia Avenue • Ripon CA 95366 • (209) 599-2131 • Fax (209) 599-6271

Louise Nan Ed. D., *Superintendent*
Kathy Coleman, *Educational Services*
Camille Taylor, *Special Education*

May 25, 2009

Ericka E. Hollander, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
City of Manteca
1001 W. Center St.
Manteca, CA 95337

Dear Ms. Hollander:

Re: Draft EIR for Evans Estates – Pillsbury Estates SCH# 2007112019

Thank you for allowing me additional time to respond to the Draft EIR for the Evans Estates – Pillsbury Estates project since the Ripon Unified School District was omitted from the original distribution list on April 2, 2009 and the documents arrived in my office only 3 days before the close of the comment period. I have reviewed the document and supplementary materials and have the following comments:

The project description and material does not clearly indicated which portion of the proposed projects lie within the boundaries of the Manteca Unified School District and which within the boundaries of the Ripon Unified School District. The materials indicate that at least some portion of the projects lie within RUSD boundaries. I am using the information on page 12-13 to make an assumption about the proportion based on the following facts and inferences. 7-1

a. At full build out, both projects include 861 new single family homes.
b. The chart on page 12-13 indicates an expectation of 575 new homes for MUSD.
c. 681 – 575 = 286, which I am assuming would fall within the boundaries of RUSD. I recognize that this may be a faulty inference without clear delineation of the expected homes within the boundaries of each school district in the document. 7-2

Ripon USD pupil yield factors in our latest study are somewhat different from the MUSD pupil yield factors cited in the document on page 12 – 13. Since this development is under the auspices of the City of Manteca, the MUSD pupil yield

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Jack DeLiddo • Donna Parks • Larry J. Stewart • Ernest Tyhurst • Mike Fisher

factors may be more appropriate so I am showing both here, based upon the assumption in item (c) above:

286 RUSD Homes	RUSD Pupil Yield Factor	# New Students to RUSD	MUSD Pupil Yield Factor	# New Students to RUSD
K – 6	0.370	106	0.534	153
7 – 8	0.091	26	0.147	42
9 – 12	0.168	48	0.267	76
Total		180		271

7-2 cont'd

The assumed pupil yields would necessitate the addition of 7 – 11 new classrooms as well as 3 – 4 new school buses for RUSD. This impact is not "insignificant not requiring mitigation" as stated in the draft EIR.

The proposed EIR relies heavily on language contained within the City of Manteca general plan to address school impacts. The draft EIR completely ignores the Ripon Unified School District as evidenced by the policies delineated on pages 12 – 5 and 12 – 6 as well as the discussion of impacts on pages 12 – 8 and 12 – 13.

7-3

I sincerely appreciate you catching the error of leaving the Ripon Unified School District out of the distribution list and your consideration of our comments. We will expect that the developer will be made fully aware of the portions of the development within the boundaries of the Ripon Unified School District and advised of the responsibility to pay appropriate developer fees to the RUSD as well as to the MUSD as indicated in the policies on pages 12-5 and 12-6.

7-4

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Louise Nan, Ed.D.
Superintendent
Ripon Unified School District

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Jack DeLiddo • Donna Parks • Larry J. Stewart • Ernest Tyhurst • Mike Fisher

Responses to Comment Letter 7—Ripon Unified School District, 5/25/2009

Response to Comment 7-1

The commenter noted that the draft EIR does not clearly state which portions of the project lie in the Manteca Unified School District (MUSD) and which lie in the Ripon Unified School District (RUSD).

Chapter 12, "Utilities and Public Services," of the draft EIR incorrectly lists MUSD as the only school district that would serve the project site. The commenter is correct in that a portion of the project site lies within the RUSD boundaries. A review of current boundary maps for MUSD and RUSD indicates that the Pillsbury Estates site would be served by RUSD, while the Evans Estates site would be served by MUSD. The draft EIR has been revised to reflect that both RUSD and MUSD serve the project site. These changes are also reflected in Chapter 2, "Text Changes to Draft EIR."

Response to Comment 7-2

The commenter makes certain assumptions and inferences from the draft EIR, notes that the RUSD pupil yield factors differ from the MUSD, and uses those RUSD factors to calculate projected increases in school enrollment levels.

At full buildout, the proposed project would result in 861 new homes. As described in the project description, the Evans Estates site would result in 586 new homes, while the Pillsbury Estates site would result in 275 new homes. Table 12-2 of the draft EIR shows the calculation of projected increases in school enrollment from the proposed project. Please note that Table 12-2 includes a typographical error (i.e., the last row shows a total calculation of 0.948 students x 575 single-family residences, an incorrect number of single-family residences). However, this error does not change the total number of new students (i.e., 817), based on the MUSD pupil yield factors.

Based on the new information that RUSD would serve the Pillsbury Estates site and MUSD would serve the Evans Estates site, the draft EIR has been revised to reflect the increases in enrollment by school district resulting from the proposed project . The new calculations, provided in Chapter 2, "Text Changes to Draft EIR") show that the proposed project would result in an increase of approximately 728 students in project area schools (555 new students in MUSD and 173 in RUSD), which would result in a significant impact on education services. However, developer fees paid through the building permit process would be used to cover the cost of new school facilities. The payment of school impact fees, in accordance with California Government Code 65995, would reduce potential project impacts on these schools to less-than-significant levels and no mitigation is required. The draft EIR has been revised to reflect the

school districts that would serve the project site, and include the RUSD, and to show the projected increases in school enrollment resulting from the proposed project by school district and development. All text changes are shown in Chapter 2, "Text Changes to Draft EIR."

Response to Comment 7-3

The commenter states that since the proposed project will create the need for new classrooms and buses, the impact is not "insignificant not requiring mitigation." Please see Response to Comment 7-2.

Response to Comment 7-4

The commenter states that RUSD expects the project proponent to be notified of those portions of the development that are within the RUSD boundary and for the project proponent to pay appropriate developer fees to RUSD.

The project proponents will be advised of the school district boundaries. In particular, the developers of Pillsbury Estates will be notified that the Pillsbury Estates site is within the RUSD boundaries. Developer fees, including school impact fees, will be paid through the building permit process.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Evan Stewart
Land Agent

Technical & Land
Services
4040 West Lane
Stockton, CA 95204
Office: (209) 942-1436
Fax: (209) 942-1485
E-mail: erse@pge.com

July 14, 2009

Letter 8a

City of Manteca
Community Development Department
Planning Division
Attn: Erika Hollander
1001 W. Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

RE: Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates in the City of Manteca.

Dear Mrs. Hollander:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above mentioned document for this project. Upon further review of the tentative subdivision maps, Pacific Gas and Electric would like to revise the letter dated May 26, 2009 and replace it with the following comments:

PG&E presently owns and operates electric and gas facilities within and adjacent to the proposed project area. Issues which may create conflict due to their impact on our easements and facilities may include, but are not limited to, the permanent or temporary change in grade, the planting of certain types of vegetation, and the construction of structures.

To promote the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of utility facilities, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has mandated specific clearance requirements between utility facilities and surrounding objects or construction activities. Any proposed development plans should provide for unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments that might impair the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of PG&E's facilities. 8a-1

Continued development consistent with the City of Manteca General Plans will have a direct or cumulative impact on PG&E's electric and gas systems and may require on-site and off-site additions and improvements to the facilities which supply these services. The proposed project as described in the DEIR will result in upgrades to PG&E distribution circuits and require reconductoring of existing facilities. Because utility facilities are operated as an integrated system, the presence of an existing electric and gas transmission or distribution facility may not necessarily mean the facility has capacity to connect new loads. 8a-2

As required by law, the environmental documents for proposed development projects should include adequate evaluation of direct and cumulative impacts to utility systems, the utility facilities needed to serve those developments and any potential environmental issues associated

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Evan Stewart
Land Agent

Technical & Land Services
4040 West Lane
Stockton, CA 95204
Office: (209) 942-1436
Fax: (209) 942-1485
E-mail: erse@pge.com

with extending utility service to the proposed project. This will assure the project's compliance with CEQA and reduce potential delays to the project schedule. 8a-2 cont'd

In order to ensure that all PG&E issues are addressed, the Project Coordinator should be encouraged to coordinate with PG&E in the early stages of planning. This is especially important if there is any possibility that we would need to relocate our facilities or provide new service to the area. 8a-3

The California Constitution vests in the CPUC exclusive power and sole authority with respect to the regulation of privately owned or investor owned public utilities such as PG&E. This exclusive power extends to all aspects of the location, design, construction, maintenance and operation of public utility facilities. Nevertheless, the CPUC has provisions for regulated utilities to work closely with local governments and give due consideration to their concerns. PG&E must balance our commitment to provide due consideration to local concerns with our obligation to provide the public with a safe, reliable, cost-effective energy supply in compliance with the rules and tariffs of the CPUC.

PG&E remains committed to working with the City of Manteca and local developers to provide timely, reliable and cost effective Electric and Gas service to the area. PG&E would appreciate being copied on future correspondence as the project develops to ensure the quickest response for service.

Thank you for allowing us the ability to comment. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Evan Stewart
Land Agent

Responses to Comment Letter 8a—PG&E, 7/14/09

Response to Comment 8a-1

The commenter states that development plans should provide for unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments. As discussed in the draft EIR, project development plans would provide unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments that might impair the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of PG&E's facilities. Further, if improvements to PG&E's facilities are needed for the proposed project, the project proponent would coordinate with PG&E to ensure that the improvements are formally requested from and approved by CPUC prior to project development.

Response to Comment 8a-2

The commenter states that the draft EIR must evaluate electric and gas service needs created by the proposed project, including cumulative impacts.

Impact PFS-7 of the City's General Plan EIR states that the General Plan 2023 would require expanded energy sources and infrastructure for the urban development it anticipates. As discussed in the draft EIR, Impact USS-7 (Inadequate Energy Sources and Infrastructure), the City General Plan's Public Facilities and Services Element and Resource Conservation Element provide measures to reduce electricity demand and infrastructure expansion, including support of conservation measures, alternative-energy use, and land use and circulation improvements. Specifically, General Plan 2023 Goal PF-10 and Policies PF-P-28, PF-I-14, PF-I-15, and PF-I-16 would reduce energy provision related impacts using conservation measures and expanding services throughout the city. General Plan 2023 Goal RC-3 and Policies RC-I-6, RC-I-8, RC-P-8, RC-I-10, and RC-I-11 would reduce impacts related to electricity and infrastructure expansion using energy conservation practices, conservation-minded building orientation and design, energy source alternatives (e.g., solar), land use and circulation improvements (e.g., reduction in length of vehicle trips), and interagency and interjurisdictional cooperation.

Further, as stated in the draft EIR, if improvements to PG&E's facilities are needed for the proposed project, the project proponent would coordinate with PG&E to ensure that the improvements are formally requested from and approved by CPUC prior to project development. Mindful of PG&E's comment that the approval process for improvements could take up to 2 years, the project proponents will be advised to coordinate and consult with PG&E early regarding any proposed improvements.

Response to Comment 8a-3

The commenter recommends early coordination with PG&E. PG&E will be added to the list of interested parties requesting communications related to the proposed project. Further, the project proponents will be advised to coordinate and consult early with PG&E regarding any proposed improvements.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Evan Stewart
Land Agent
Technical & Land Services
4040 West Lane
Stockton, CA 95204
Office: (209) 942-1436
Fax: (209) 942-1485
E-mail: erse@pge.com

May 26, 2009

Letter 8b

City of Manteca
Community Development Department
Planning Division
Attn: Erika Hollander
1001 W. Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

RE: Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates.

Dear Mrs. Hollander:

Thank you for providing Pacific Gas and Electric ("PG&E") the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft EIR for Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates ("DEIR"). PG&E's primary concern is that the DEIR incorrectly concludes that the impacts to PG&E's electrical system serving the areas discussed in the report are not significant. PG&E believes that, in fact, the development described in the report will result in significant impacts to the overall electrical system.

The proposed project as described in the DEIR will result in upgrades to PG&E distribution circuits and would require extensive reconductoring of existing facilities. In order to be legally adequate, the City's EIR must evaluate the electric and gas service needs created by the proposed project. Cumulative impacts on electric and gas utilities must also be analyzed. Any local decisions that increase the demand for electricity must incorporate plans for the concurrent construction of related power lines. 8b-1

Of course, should the proposed development require relocation of existing PG&E facilities, those facilities should be covered by the environmental review for the proposed development and would be relocated at the requesting party's expense. The relocation of certain PG&E facilities may require formal approval from the CPUC. If required, this approval process could take up to two years to complete. Please note that it is not always feasible to relocate our facilities, so it is essential to design the project attempting to avoid the existing utilities if possible.

Additional issues which may create conflict due to their impact on our easements and facilities include, but are not limited to, the permanent or temporary change in grade, the planting of certain types of vegetation, and the construction of structures.

To promote the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of utility facilities, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has mandated specific clearance requirements between

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Evan Stewart
Land Agent
Technical & Land Services
4040 West Lane
Stockton, CA 95204
Office: (209) 942-1436
Fax: (209) 942-1485
E-mail: ers e@pge.com

utility facilities and surrounding objects or construction activities. Any proposed development plans should provide for unrestricted utility access and prevent easement encroachments that might impair the safe and reliable maintenance and operation of PG&E's facilities.

We would also like to note that continued development consistent with the City of Manteca General Plans will have a direct or cumulative impact on PG&E's electric and gas systems and may require on-site and off-site additions and improvements to the facilities which supply these services. Because utility facilities are operated as an integrated system, the presence of an existing electric and gas transmission or distribution facility does not necessarily mean the facility has capacity to connect new loads.

In order to ensure that all PG&E issues are addressed, the Project Coordinator should be encouraged to coordinate with PG&E in the early stages of planning. This is especially important if there is any possibility that we would need to relocate our facilities or provide new service to the area due to the lengthy duration of these processes.

8b-1 cont'd

The California Constitution vests in the CPUC exclusive power and sole authority with respect to the regulation of privately owned or investor owned public utilities such as PG&E. This exclusive power extends to all aspects of the location, design, construction, maintenance and operation of public utility facilities. Nevertheless, the CPUC has provisions for regulated utilities to work closely with local governments and give due consideration to their concerns. PG&E must balance our commitment to provide due consideration to local concerns with our obligation to provide the public with a safe, reliable, cost-effective energy supply in compliance with the rules and tariffs of the CPUC.

PG&E remains committed to working with the City of Manteca to provide timely, reliable and cost effective Electric and Gas service to the area by planning significant projects to meet the demands being made on our electrical system. Please call me at (209) 942-1436 if you have any questions or would like further information. Thank you again for the opportunity to review and comment on your DEIR.

Sincerely,

Evan Stewart
Land Agent

Response to Comment Letter 8b—PG&E, 5/26/09

Response to Comment 8b-1

This May 26, 2009 letter is revised by PG&E's letter dated July 14, 2009, as stated by the commenter in its July 14, 2009 letter. Please refer to "Responses to Comment Letter 8a," above. \

This page intentionally left blank.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
GOVERNOR

CYNTHIA BRYANT
DIRECTOR

May 19, 2009

Letter 9

RECEIVED
MAY 21 2009
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

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

Subject: Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates
SCH#: 2007112019

Dear Erika Hollander:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on May 18, 2009, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that: 9-1

> "A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. 9-2

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2007112019
Project Title Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates
Lead Agency Manteca, City of

Type EIR Draft EIR

Description The proposed project includes annexation, prezoning, development agreement, tentative subdivision map, and construction of two subdivisions known as Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates. In addition, development of Pillsbury Estates would also require a General Plan amendment to designate 16.4 acres of the project site as LDR (low-density residential) from MDR and HDR (medium- and high-density residential). The Evans Estates development proposes to subdivide 160 acres into 587 single-family lots. The Pillsbury Estates development would subdivide 80 acres into 276 lots, which includes 276 single-family residential lots.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Erika Hollander
Agency City of Manteca
Phone 209-239-3156 **Fax**
email
Address 1001 W. Center Street
City Manteca **State** CA **Zip** 95337

Project Location

County San Joaquin
City Manteca
Region
Lat / Long
Cross Streets South Manteca Road//Woodward Ave and Pillsbury Road/Woodward Avenue
Parcel No. 226-120-01 to -04; -07 to -09 & -27
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways SR-120
Airports
Railways UPRR
Waterways
Schools Sierra High, Veritas Elementary
Land Use Zoning: AG-40 (General Agriculture, 40 acre minimum)
City GP: LDR, MDR, HDR (Low-, Medium- and High-Density Residential) & Park

Project Issues Air Quality; Agricultural Land; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Cumulative Effects; Drainage/Absorption; Geologic/Seismic; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Noise; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 10; Department of Housing and Community Development; Department of Health Services; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission

Date Received 04/02/2009 **Start of Review** 04/02/2009 **End of Review** 05/18/2009

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

May. 18. 2009 3:17PM NO. 0329 P. 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201
(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. 95205)
PHONE (209) 948-7906
FAX (209) 948-3670
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

RECEIVED
MAY 18 2009
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Clear
5-18-09
e

May 18, 2009

10-SJ-120-PM-5.0
SCH#2007112019
Evans Estates-
Pillsbury Estates

Erika Hollander
City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Dear Ms. Hollander:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed the Draft Environmental Report (DEIR) for the construction of the two proposed subdivisions known as Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates. The Evans Estate site is located at 21010 S. Manteca Road and the Pillsbury Estate site is located at 21017 Pillsbury Road. The project sites are adjacent and the sites are collectively bounded by S. Manteca Road on the west and Pillsbury Road on the east. Our Travel Forecasting section has the following comments:

1. Are the traffic volumes shown actual counts or estimates? If the counts were taken in 2008 as stated in the DEIR, please explain why they were lower than the Caltrans 2007 traffic volumes.

2. Page 11-9, states SR120 has an existing average daily traffic (2008 ADT) volume of 60,000 vehicles in the vicinity of the Airport Way interchange. This is lower than Caltrans 2007 traffic volume book value of 63,000 vehicles. In addition, the traffic volumes (Main line, ramps and peak hour) shown for the existing conditions, existing plus project conditions, existing plus both project conditions, cumulative conditions and no project conditions are lower than traffic volumes shown in Caltrans 2007 traffic volumes book. Please explain why they were lower.

3. Page 11-10 "Analysis Location Intersections" lists SR120 westbound (WB) ramps

and Main Street, and SR 120 WB ramps and Union Road are listed twice. SR 120 eastbound (EB) ramps with Main Street as well as Union Road were missing. These eastbound ramps should be added in the analysis for a thorough evaluation.

4. The proposed project will impact Highways 5, 99 and 120, but no mitigation measures were proposed to reduce impacts to the mainline system. The project proposed the installation of traffic signals at some ramp junctions, however this is inadequate. Based on the traffic information provided in the DEIR additional mitigation measures such as installation of ramp meters and other ramp improvements at SR 120 and Main Street, SR 120 and Airport Way, SR 120 and Union Road and SR 99 and Austin Road would be more appropriate to help reduce congestion.

6. It appears the trip generation and distributions vary from the traffic model. Please justify the reason for this variance.

Caltrans encourages contacting the Native American Heritage Commission: 915 Capitol Mall, Room 364, Sacramento, California, 95814, Telephone (916) 653-4082, Fax (916) 657-5390 for advice on consulting with Native Americans regarding any cultural concerns within the project area.

The transit branch requests that transit and pedestrian friendly designs and amenities in the proposed development be utilized to encourage the use of public transit and alternative modes of transit. Roadways should be designed to provide for bus stops/pull outs at major intersections and sidewalks should accommodate the installation of signs, benches and shelters. Bicycle paths and storage areas should also be incorporated to encourage bicycling to work which reduces the number of single occupancy vehicles on the road. Promoting the use of car and van pools should be encouraged by providing incentives such as preferred parking for car pool and green vehicles and charging stations for batter powered vehicles.

The department will be forwarding additional comments regarding the DEIR as soon as the Synchro Files forwarded by your office on May 12, 2009, have been thoroughly reviewed.

Please forward a copy of all Final Conditions of Approval including any mitigation measures that are being proposed as well as any other documents and reports (i.e. all forms of environmental documents, Traffic Impact Study Reports, site and location maps, etc.) on this proposed project for our review, comment, and records.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of our comments in more detail, please contact Barbara Hempstead at (209) 948-3909 (e-mail: barbara_hempstead@dot.ca.gov) or me at (209) 941-1921.

Sincerely,

for TOM DUMAS, Chief
Office of Intermodal Planning

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

This page intentionally left blank.

Responses to Comment Letter 9—Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, 5/19/09

Response to Comment 9-1

The commenter notes that the review period for the draft EIR has closed and outlines project information that the State Clearinghouse forwarded to other reviewing agencies. No response is required in this EIR.

Response to Comment 9-2

The commenter notes that the City has complied with the draft environmental document reviewing process under CEQA for the proposed project. No response is required in this EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
GOVERNOR

CYNTHIA BRYANT
DIRECTOR

June 2, 2009

RECEIVED
JUN 08 2009
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

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

Letter 10

Subject: Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates
SCH#: 2007112019

Dear Erika Hollander:

The enclosed comment (s) on your Draft EIR was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on May 18, 2009. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document. 10-1

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2007112019) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts

Terry Roberts
Senior Planner, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Jun. 1. 2009 1:30PM No. 0018 P. 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O. BOX 2048, STOCKTON, CA 95201
(1976 E. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BLVD. 95205)
PHONE (209) 941-1921
FAX (209) 948-7194
TTY 711

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

RECEIVED
JUN 0 1 2009
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

clear 5-18-09 late e

June 1, 2009

10-SJ-120-PM5.0
SCH#2007112019
Evans Estates/Pillsbury Estates

Ms. Erika Hollander
City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Dear Ms. Hollander:

The California Department of Transportation (Department) appreciates the opportunity to have reviewed the Synchro files pertaining to the subdivisions known as Evans Estates and Pillsbury Estates. Our Traffic Operations section has the following comments:

1. What year/years did you base your assumed cumulative condition of traffic report?

2. What is the opening date of the proposed projects?

3. The SimTraffic output shows the northbound left turn lane at the westbound ramp intersection for State Route 120/Main Street needing to be increased. The 95% queue under "Existing +project condition PM peak hour" shows a queue of 152 feet. Increasing the channelization will help reduce the queue for the northbound through traffic.

4. An Encroachment Permit will be required for work (if any) done within the Department's right of way. This work is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. Therefore, environmental studies may be required as part of the encroachment permits application.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

Jun. 1. 2009 1:31PM No. 0018 P. 3

Ms. Erika Hollander
June 1, 2009
Page One

If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of our comments in more detail, please contact Barbara Hempstead at (209) 948-3909 (e-mail Barbara_hempstead@dot.ca.gov) or me at (209) 948-1921.

Sincerely,

for TOM DUMAS, Chief
Office of Intermodal Planning

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

This page intentionally left blank.

Response to Comment Letter 10—Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, 6/2/09

Response to Comment 10-1

The commenter forwarded a comment letter from Caltrans that was received on June 1, 2009, after the end of the review period for the draft EIR. Although CEQA does not require lead agencies to respond to late comments, the commenter encourages incorporation of these comments in the final EIR. This letter was also sent under separate cover to the City, and has been incorporated into this final EIR. Please refer to "Responses to Comment Letter 3," above.

This page intentionally left blank.

Letter 11

Bonnie Chiu

Subject: FW: Evans-Pills DEIR comments

From: Hollander, Erika [mailto:ehollander@ci.manteca.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 5:09 PM
To: Bonnie Chiu
Subject: Evans-Pills DEIR comments

At the public comment meeting we received comments from Georgiana Reichelt:
Concern the project was proposing an island annexation (unrelated comment) | 11-1
Concern of lack of sewer and water supply for the project area | 11-2
Concern of lack of police and fire service to the project area. | 11-3

So please let me know if you have any questions, thanks!

Erika Hollander
Senior Planner
City of Manteca
Community Development Department, Planning Division
1001 W. Center Street, Manteca, CA 95337
(209) 239-3156 FAX: (209) 825-2349

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

1

This page intentionally left blank.

Responses to Comment 11—Georgiana Reichelt, 5/12/09

Response to Comment 11-1

The commenter states that the proposed project constitutes island annexation. The project site is located immediately south of and adjacent to existing development that is within the City's limits, as described and shown in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of the draft EIR. Therefore, the proposed project would not constitute island annexation.

Response to Comment 11-2

The commenter states that the proposed project will create a lack of sewer and water supply in the project area.

Sewer capacity was addressed in Chapter 12, "Utilities and Service Systems," of the draft EIR. The Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) currently treats approximately 6.5 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater. The WQCF has capacity for 9.87 mgd. The connection-fee analysis used to calculate the number of gallons per day per dwelling unit contained in the City's *Draft Sewer Rate Study* (Ecologic 2008) assumed 250 gallons per day per dwelling unit. Based on this assumption, the proposed project's 861 new residential units would contribute 215,250 gallons per day of wastewater to the system, bringing the total amount of treated wastewater in Manteca to approximately 6.72 mgd, still well within the current capacity for treatment. In addition, payment for sewer connection fees will be paid for by the project proponents. The draft EIR found that Impact USS-6 (Expansion or Construction of New Wastewater Collection, Conveyance, or Treatment Facilities) would be less than significant.

The draft EIR also addressed water supply impacts in Chapter 9, "Hydrology and Water Quality." The draft EIR concluded that existing water supply is insufficient to meet project demand, requiring the construction of a new well and expansion of the water distribution system. This would result in a significant impact. Mitigation Measure HYD-8, on page 9-21 of the draft EIR, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, by ensuring that specific sources of water supply (i.e., the Well 26 storage tank and booster pump station or a new onsite well to be constructed on the project site) are constructed and operational prior to issuance of any building permit for any lot on the project site.

Response to Comment 11-3

The commenter states that the proposed project will create a lack of police and fire service to the project area.

The draft EIR addressed temporary construction-related and operational impacts of the project on fire and police services. According to the analysis provided in Chapter 12, "Utilities and Service Systems," of the draft EIR, the proposed project's contribution to population in Manteca would not result in an inadequate officer-to-resident service ratio or inadequate response times for police services; nor would the proposed project result in impacts on fire service, including adequate service ratios, response times, and water supply for fire suppression.

Chapter 4

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Purpose of and Need for Monitoring

In compliance with CEQA, an EIR has been prepared for the proposed project. The EIR identified potentially significant impacts in the resource areas listed below, along with mitigation measures to reduce those impacts.

Mitigation measures are identified in the EIR to address significant impacts pertaining to the following resource areas:

- agricultural resources;
- air quality;
- biological resources;
- climate change;
- cultural resources;
- energy;
- geology, soils, and paleontology;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- hydrology and water quality;
- noise;
- traffic; and
- utilities and service systems.

CEQA requires that a lead agency adopt an MMRP for the measures the agency has proposed to avoid or mitigate significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15097). The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the EIR are implemented and to identify who is responsible for their implementation.

Table 4-1 identifies the mitigation measures for the proposed project, the parties responsible for implementing and monitoring the measures, the timing of each measure, and a summary of the actions necessary to implement and monitor each measure.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 specifies that when a public agency makes findings required by paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 21081, it "shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 further specifies that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) "ensure compliance during project implementation."

An MMRP (Appendix A) has been prepared for the proposed project which identifies mitigation measures, the parties responsible for implementing and monitoring the measures, the timing of each measure, and a summary of the actions necessary to implement and monitor each measure. This MMRP is intended to ensure the effective implementation of mitigation measures that are within the City's authority to implement, including monitoring where identified, throughout all phases of development and operation of the proposed project.

Appendix A

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the Evans Estates-Pillsbury Estates Project

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Agricultural Resources				
Mitigation Measure AG-1: Pay Agricultural Mitigation Fee The project proponent shall pay the agricultural mitigation fee as required by Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 13.42.	Prior to issuance of building permit	Project sponsor	City of Manteca Building and Planning Divisions of the Community Development Department (Building) (Planning)	Verify before issuance of building permit
Air Quality				
Mitigation Measure AQ-1a: Prepare and Implement a Dust Control Plan To control the generation of construction-related PM10 emissions, the City of Manteca (City) will require construction contractors to prepare a dust control plan and submit it to SJVAPCD at least 48 hours before any earthmoving or construction activities. As previously indicated, implementation of a dust control plan would satisfy the requirements of Regulation VIII (Cadrett pers. comm.). The requirements of the dust control plan are described in Appendix D [of the DEIR].	Prior to project site grading	Project sponsor	City of Manteca Engineering Division of the Public Works Department (Engineering)	Require prior to issuing grading permit Verify implementation of dust control plan periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure AQ-1b: Implement Measures to Reduce Construction Emissions The City will require construction contractors to implement measures to reduce construction-related emissions. Such measures will include the following: ■ Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity to one activity or phase at a time. ■ Limit the hours of operation of heavy-duty equipment to a maximum of 8 hours per day 5 days per week, or limit the amount of equipment operated concurrently. ■ Require that all diesel engines be shut off when not in use to reduce emissions from idling.	Prior to site grading and during project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify implementation of measures to reduce construction emissions periodically during construction activities

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ Implement activity management (e.g., rescheduling activities to reduce short-term impacts) to minimize concurrent operation of construction equipment and concurrent construction of project phases. ■ During the smog season (May through October), lengthen the construction period to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. During periods of high ambient pollutant concentrations, such as "Spare the Air Days" declared by SJVAPCD, curtail or cease construction. ■ Minimize the obstruction of traffic on adjacent roadways. ■ Power construction equipment with diesel engines that are fueled by alternative diesel fuel blends or ultra-low-sulfur diesel (ULSD), or replace fossil-fueled construction equipment with electrically driven equivalents (provided they are not run via a portable generator). Only fuels that have been certified by ARB will be used. ARB has verified specific alternative diesel fuel blends for NOx and particulate matter emissions reductions. The applicant will also use ARB-certified alternative-fueled (compressed natural gas [CNG], liquid propane gas [LPG], electric motors, or other ARB-certified off-road technologies) engines in construction equipment where practicable. ■ Use construction equipment that meets the current off-road engine emissions standard (as certified by ARB) or is "repowered" with an engine that meets this standard. Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III engines have significantly less NOx and PM emissions compared with uncontrolled engines. Off-road trucks will be equipped with on-road engines when possible.				
Mitigation Measure AQ-1c: Implement Measures to Comply with SJVAPCD Rule 9510, Indirect Source Review The project applicant will enter into a developer agreement with SJVAPCD and conduct an air impact assessment, as required by SJVAPCD Rule 9510. Required emissions control measures and off-site emissions reduction fees (if necessary) will be calculated by the project applicant through the permitting process, as dictated by Rule 9510, to reduce construction-related NO_x emissions by 20% and PM10 emissions by 45% compared with the statewide fleet average.	As required by San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Rule 9510	Project sponsor	Planning	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure AQ-1d: Enter into a Development Mitigation Contract The project applicant will enter into a development mitigation contract with SJVAPCD to mitigate or reduce project emissions beyond the requirements of Rule 9510 through the payment of fees (on a per-ton basis) to SJVAPCD. The payment of fees will be made to SJVAPCD based on the fee schedule in the development mitigation contract and the amount of reduction necessary to offset project NO_x and ROG emissions below SJVAPCD thresholds.	As required by SJVAPCD	Project sponsor	Planning	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits
Mitigation Measure AQ-1e: Incorporate Additional Innovative Measures to Reduce Air Quality Impacts SJVAPCD will encourage innovation in measures to reduce air quality impacts. Several applicable measures will be incorporated into the design and operation of the proposed project to provide additional reductions in the overall level of emissions where feasible. These measures will include the following: ■ Energy-efficient design will be provided for homes and buildings, including automated control systems for heating and air-conditioning and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements, lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting in buildings, increased insulation beyond Title 24 requirements, and light-colored roof materials to reflect heat. ■ Large canopy trees will be carefully selected and located to protect buildings from energy-consuming environmental conditions. ■ If transit service is available to the project site, improvements shall be made to encourage its use. If transit service is not currently available but is planned for the area in the future, easements will be reserved to provide for future improvements. These include bus turnouts, loading areas, route signs, and shade structures. Appropriations made to facilitate public or mass transit will help mitigate trips generated by the project. ■ Sidewalks and bicycle paths will be provided throughout as much of the project as possible and connect to any nearby open space areas, parks, schools, and commercial areas to encourage walking and bicycling. Connections to nearby public uses and commercial areas will be made as direct as possible to promote walking for some trips.	During project design and construction	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Review measures during final map improvement plan check and during individual home plan check

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Sidewalks and bikeways will be designed to separate pedestrian and bicycle pathways from vehicle paths. Sidewalks and bikeways will be designed to be accommodating and appropriately sized for anticipated future pedestrian and bicycle use. Such pathways will be easy to navigate and designed to facilitate pedestrian movement through the project and create a safe and inviting environment for all potential users (pedestrian, bicycle, and disabled) from obstacles and automobiles. Sidewalks will be designed for high visibility (brightly painted, different colors for concrete, etc.) when crossing parking lots, streets, and similar vehicle paths.				
■ Exits to adjoining streets will be designed to reduce time to reenter traffic from the project site.				
■ Measures will be implemented to reduce the amount of vehicle traffic to and from the residential area(s) that further reduce air pollution in the SJVAB. This could include providing an information center for residents to coordinate carpooling.				
■ As many energy-conserving features as possible will be incorporated into the design and operation of the proposed project. These include:				
❑ increased energy efficiency;				
❑ increased wall and ceiling insulation (beyond building code requirements);				
❑ energy-efficient windows (double-paned or Low-E);				
❑ radiant heat barriers;				
❑ energy-efficient lighting, appliances, and heating and cooling systems;				
❑ solar water-heating systems;				
❑ low NOx-emitting or high-efficiency, energy-efficient water heaters;				
❑ clean-energy features that promote energy self-sufficiency (e.g., photovoltaic cells, solar thermal electricity systems, small wind turbines);				
❑ geothermal heat pump systems;				
❑ programmable thermostats for all heating and cooling systems;				

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
❑ awnings or other shading mechanisms for windows; ❑ porch, patio, and walkway overhangs; ❑ ceiling fans or whole-house fans; ❑ passive solar cooling and heating designs (e.g., natural convection, thermal flywheels); ❑ daylighting (natural lighting) systems such as skylights, light shelves, and interior transom windows; ❑ electrical outlets around the exterior of units to encourage the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment; ❑ use of low- and no-VOC coatings and paints; and ❑ natural gas fireplaces (instead of wood-burning fireplaces or heathers) and natural gas lines (if available to the project area) in backyard or patio areas to encourage the use of gas barbecues.				
Biological Resources				
Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Avoid the Dispersal of Noxious Weeds into Uninfested Areas To avoid the introduction or spread of noxious weeds into uninfested areas, the following measures will be incorporated into project construction plans and specifications: ■ Use certified, weed-free, imported erosion-control materials (or rice straw in upland areas). ■ Educate construction supervisors and managers about weed identification and the importance of controlling and preventing the spread of noxious weeds. ■ Include the noxious weed avoidance measures in contract documents and ensure that they are implemented by the program contractor.	Prior to and during project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading permits Review measures during review of SWPPP Monitor onsite during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Conduct Tree Removal and Barn Demolition Activities during Nonbreeding Season for Swainson's Hawk and Non-Special-Status Migratory Birds and Raptors, or Conduct Nesting Bird Survey Prior to Tree and Barn Removal Activities To avoid removing any active Swainson's hawk or non-special-status migratory bird and raptor nests protected under the MBTA and the CFGC, tree removal and barn demolition activities will be conducted during the nonbreeding season for these species (generally August 16 through February 28) or after a qualified biologist determines that fledglings have left the nest, as described in the SJMSCP (Sections 5.2.3.1[G], 5.2.4.11, 5.2.4.18, and 5.2.4.19). If tree removal or barn demolition activities will be conducted before August 16 or after February 28, a qualified biologist will be retained to survey for nesting birds in all trees and the barn that will be removed and any tree (or barn) located within 500 feet (or 0.25 mile for Swainson's hawk) of construction activities, including grading. The nesting bird survey will be conducted no more than 48 hours before tree removal or barn demolition activities. If the biologist determines that the area surveyed does not contain any active nests, tree removal and barn demolition activities can commence without any further mitigation. If active nests are found, the activities will not occur until nesting activities have ceased (after a qualified biologist determines that fledglings have left the nest).	Prior to project construction, outside of Swainson's hawk and raptor breeding season (generally August 16 to February 28)	Project sponsor	Planning	Verify prior demolition permit
Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Compensate for Loss of Foraging Habitat for Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl as Outlined in the SJMSCP The project proponent will provide compensation for the conversion of approximately 233 acres of agricultural habitat lands (i.e., fund acquisition of preserve lands) at a ratio of 1:1 (acres acquired to acres lost), as outlined in the SJMSCP (Section 4.1.2[A]). Compensation for agricultural habitat lands will be determined based on mitigation fees adopted by the SJCOG Board; these fees are adjusted annually pursuant to the SJMSCP (San Joaquin Council of Governments 2000). The final cost to fulfill project compensation requirements will be determined during coordination with SJCOG. Compensation fees must be paid at the time of building permit issuance for each single-family dwelling.	Prior to building permit issuance of each individual home	Project sponsor	Planning and Building	Verify prior to issuing building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure BIO-5a: Conduct Preconstruction Survey and Adhere to CDFG Guidelines CDFG (1995) recommends that preconstruction surveys be conducted to locate active burrowing owl burrows in the construction work area and within a 250-foot-wide buffer zone around the construction area. The project proponent or its contractor will retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for active burrows according to CDFG's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (California Department of Fish and Game 1995). The preconstruction surveys will include a breeding season survey and wintering season survey. If no active burrows are detected, no further mitigation is required.	During burrowing owl breeding season (February 1–August 31) and wintering season (December 1—January 31) as required by the California Department of Fish and Game	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to grading permits
Mitigation Measure BIO-5b: Avoid and Minimize Impacts on Nesting Burrowing Owl If active burrowing owl burrows are detected, the project proponent will implement the following measures. ■ Active burrows will not be disturbed during the breeding season (February 1–August 31). ■ If active burrows must be disturbed during the nonbreeding season, passive relocation techniques (e.g., installing one-way doors at burrow entrances) will be used instead of trapping, as described in CDFG guidelines. At least 1 week will be necessary to complete passive relocation and allow owls to acclimate to alternate burrows.	Prior to project grading and during burrowing owl nonbreeding season	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading permits
Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct Preconstruction Survey and Remove Barn during Non-breeding Season To avoid destruction of active roosts, the project proponent will conduct a preconstruction survey of the barn to determine whether it is being used for roosting by bats. If no bats or bat signs are observed, all barn crevices or openings will be sealed to prevent bats from moving into barn structure. If roosts or evidence of roosting bats are identified, the project proponents will follow the impact avoidance measures described in the SJMSCP (Section 5.2.4281[A-C]), and excerpted below. ■ Prior to the nursery season (generally April through August) nursery sites shall be sealed. ■ Seal hibernation sites, prior to the hibernation season (November through March) when hibernation sites are identified on the project site.	Prior to project grading (survey) Outside of breeding season (generally September through March) (barn removal)	Project sponsor	Planning	Verify prior to grading (survey) Verify prior to demolition permit (barn removal)

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Alternatively grating may be installed as described in 5.5.9(E)(1) of the SJMSCP. ■ When colonial roosting sites, which are located in trees or structures must be removed, removal shall occur outside of the nursery and/or hibernation season, and shall occur during dusk and/or evening hours after bats have left the roosting site unless otherwise approved pursuant to Section 5.2.3.2 of the SJMSCP.				
Cultural Resources				
Mitigation Measure CR-1: Stop Work in Case of Accidental Discovery of Buried Archaeological Resources If buried cultural resources, such as chipped or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or human bone, are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work will stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the City and other appropriate agencies. (See also Implementation Measure RC-I-46 of the City General Plan [City of Manteca 2003]).	During project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Require in grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure CR-2: Stop Work in Case of Accidental Discovery of Buried Human Remains If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, it is necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of NAHC (PRC 5097). If any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: ■ the county coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and ■ if the remains are of Native American origin, ❑ the descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work for means of treating or disposing of, with	During project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Require in grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC 5097.98, or ❑ NAHC was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission. According to California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that construction or excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC.				
Geology and Soils				
Mitigation Measure GEO-5: Stockpile Excavated Topsoil for Onsite Reuse The proponent will require the contractor(s) retained for project construction and landscaping to stockpile excavated topsoil so it can be reused for revegetation and landscaping.	During project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify this measure in project plans prior to issuing grading permit Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure GEO-8a: Evaluate Site-Specific Impact Potential The project proponent will retain appropriately qualified and licensed personnel (e.g., qualified paleontologist as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology or California-licensed professional geologist with appropriate experience and expertise) to delineate the portions of the project (project area and/or specific project activities) for which Mitigation Measures GEO-8b and -8c are required. The evaluation will be based on available geologic and geotechnical information; detailed project design; proposed construction methods, including anticipated depth of disturbance; and existing site conditions, including pre-existing disturbance, if any. Mitigation Measure GEO-8b will be required in areas where project construction, staging, or access will affect highly sensitive (Pleistocene) strata exposed at the surface. In areas where highly sensitive strata would be involved in project-related ground disturbance, Mitigation Measure GEO-8c will also be required.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering and Planning	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure GEO-8b: Conduct Preconstruction Survey, Salvage, and Protection in Areas of Exposed Pleistocene Substrate Before site preparation (including vegetation clearing) and project earthwork begin, the project proponent will retain a qualified professional paleontologist as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines Committee (1995) to conduct a surface survey and salvage operation covering any potentially affected surface exposures of deposits of Pleistocene age. The goal of the operation will be to ensure that any paleontological materials exposed at the surface in project work, staging, and access route areas are recovered and properly prepared and curated, or protected from damage using exclusion fencing or other appropriate means. Protection will be designed and installed in consultation with the City and the project engineering consultant to ensure that it is appropriate and effective but does not unduly impede construction activities.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering and Planning	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure GEO-8c: Retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist to Monitor during Ground-Disturbing Activities The project proponent will retain a qualified professional paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines Committee (1995), to monitor during any ground-disturbing activities affecting the Modesto Formation or underlying strata of Pleistocene age. Tasks requiring monitoring would include clearing, grubbing, excavation/grading, and any other ground-disturbing activities involving the Modesto Formation or other strata of Pleistocene age.	During project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure GEO-8d: Stop Work if Vertebrate Remains are Encountered during Construction If vertebrate fossils are discovered during construction or other project activities, all work on the site will stop immediately until a qualified professional paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Conformable Impact Mitigation Guidelines Committee (1995), can assess the nature and importance of the find and recommend appropriate treatment. Treatment may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials so that they can be housed in an appropriate museum or university collection, and may also include preparation of a report for publication describing the finds. All such work will be carried out by a qualified professional paleontologist. The project proponent will be	During project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering and Planning	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
responsible for ensuring that the recommendations of the paleontological monitor regarding treatment and reporting are implemented.				
Hazardous Materials				
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2a: Screen Surface Soils on Evans Estates Site for Residuals from Agricultural Chemicals and Other Hazardous Materials To reduce the potential for human exposure to potentially harmful pesticide, fertilizer, and other chemical residues, the project proponent will retain a qualified hazardous materials consultant to take a sample of field screen surface soils for residuals from agricultural chemicals prior to construction. Additionally, the structure dripline soils around existing buildings and any remaining foundations of former buildings will be tested for lead, asbestos, and pesticides prior to construction. The County EHD will review the results of soils sampling or screening. If results indicate the presence of hazardous concentrations of agricultural chemicals and other hazards, the project proponent will ensure that soils are excavated and properly disposed of prior to construction.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor for Evans Estates	Engineering and Planning	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2b: Properly Remove Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Material Containers from the Project Site The project proponent will remove any containers of known hazardous substances from the project site. If a UST is found during project construction, the project proponent will obtain a permit from the County EHD for proper removal. Containers of known hazardous substances will be removed and recycled in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. In addition, debris piles, including the green waste pile, will be properly disposed of prior to grading. If any hazardous materials are discovered, a qualified environmental health and safety specialist will be retained by the project proponent to assess the situation and determine proper removal and disposal procedures.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2c: Prepare an Asbestos and Lead Paint Survey Report and Properly Dispose of Asbestos and Lead Paint by Certified Asbestos Abatement Contractor and Certified Lead Inspector/Assessor The project proponent will hire a certified asbestos abatement contractor and certified lead inspector/assessor to prepare an Asbestos and Lead Paint Survey Report. If asbestos or lead paint is located during the survey, an abatement work plan will be prepared by County EHD in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations for removal of such materials. The abatement work plan will ensure that any lead paint or asbestos-containing materials (from the structures or any underground pipes) are removed and disposed of prior to grading, excavation, construction, or any other activities that would disturb the material.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2d: Notify Contractors of Presence of Asbestos and Lead Paint The project proponent will notify contractors working on the project site of the potential presence of any asbestos and lead paint prior to work. The contractors will be provided with a copy of the Asbestos and Lead Paint Survey Reports and a list of asbestos removed by the asbestos abatement contractor during abatement activities, to be prepared by the project proponent. The contractors will be instructed not to disturb asbestos during their work. Contractors will be responsible for informing the landfill of the contractor's intent to dispose of lead paint and asbestos waste and for segregating and characterizing waste streams prior to disposal.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits
Mitigation Measure HAZ-2e: Properly Abandon Septic Systems The project proponent will abandon the onsite septic systems according to applicable procedures, including, but not limited to, California Health and Safety Code Sections 117415-117420 and Ordinance Code of San Joaquin County Section 9-1110. The project proponent will obtain a permit from the County EHD and hire licensed sewage haulers to pump and remove the sewage. The County EHD will inspect the site to ensure that the septic systems have been properly abandoned.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	SJCEHD	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Develop and Implement Plans to Reduce Exposure to Hazardous Conditions A site-specific safety plan and operations and maintenance plan will be prepared by the project proponent for review and approval by the Manteca Fire Department (MFD). A fire safety plan will also be prepared by the project proponent for review and approval by MFD. The proponent will also develop and implement a hazardous materials management plan that addresses public health and safety issues by providing safety measures including release-prevention measures; employee training, notification, and evacuation procedures; and adequate emergency-response protocols and cleanup procedures. The hazardous materials management plan will be consistent with relevant regulations and guidelines, including those recommended and enforced by MFD, and include procedures in the event of a spill of hazardous materials in an amount reportable to MFD (as established by MFD guidelines). This plan will be submitted prior to the approval of grading permits for review and approval by MFD.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	MFD	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Mitigation Measure HYD-1a: Comply with NPDES Requirements To reduce or eliminate construction-related turbidity or sediment water quality effects, the City will require the project proponent to comply with the Storm Drain Master Plan (West Yost and Associates 2006), including, but not limited to, Chapter 6, "B. Design Standards," and Chapter 3, "4.5.2 Flow Based Treatment." In addition, the City will require the project contractors to obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit before the onset of any construction activities, where the disturbed area is 1 acre or greater in size. A SWPPP will be developed by a qualified engineer or erosion-control specialist, in accordance with the Central Valley RWQCB requirements for NPDES compliance, reviewed by the City Public Works Department, and implemented prior to the issuance of any grading permit. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB. Compliance and coverage by the SWMP and General Construction Permit will require controls of pollutant discharges that utilize BMPs and technology to reduce erosion and sediments to meet water quality standards. BMPs may consist of a wide variety of measures taken to reduce pollutants in stormwater and other non-point-source runoff.	As required by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Measures range from source control, such as reduced surface disturbance, to the treatment of polluted runoff, such as detention basins. BMPs to be implemented as part of the *Stormwater Management Program* and General Construction Permit (and SWPPP) may include the following. ■ Implement 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) to control erosion from disturbed areas. ■ Use a dry detention basin (which is typically dry except after a major rainstorm, when it will temporarily fill with stormwater), designed to decrease runoff during storm events, prevent flooding, and allow for off-peak discharge. Basin features will include maintenance schedules for the periodic removal of sediments, excessive vegetation, and debris that may clog basin inlets and outlets. ■ Cover, or apply nontoxic soil stabilizers to, inactive construction areas (i.e., previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more) that could contribute sediment to waterways. ■ Enclose and cover exposed stockpiles of dirt or other loose, granular construction materials that could contribute sediment to waterways. ■ Ensure that no earth or organic material will be deposited or placed where it may be directly carried into a stream, marsh, slough, lagoon, or body of standing water. ■ Prohibit the following types of materials from being rinsed or washed into the streets, shoulder areas, or gutters: concrete, solvents and adhesives, thinners, paints, fuels, sawdust, dirt, gasoline, asphalt and concrete saw slurry, and heavily chlorinated water. ■ Ensure that grass or other vegetative cover will be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance. The project contractors will select a combination of BMPs that is expected to minimize runoff and remove contaminants from stormwater discharges. The final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by the RWQCB. The City will verify that an NOI has been filed with the SWRCB and that a SWPPP has been developed before allowing construction to begin. The City will perform inspections of the construction area, to verify that the				

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
BMPs specified in the SWPPP are properly implemented and maintained. The City will notify contractors immediately if there is a noncompliance issue and will require compliance. If necessary, the City will require that additional BMPs be designed and implemented if those originally constructed do not achieve the identified performance standard.				
Mitigation Measure HYD-1b: Clean Paved Areas with Street Sweeping Equipment To minimize the amount of pollutants entering the storm-drain system during construction, the project proponent will ensure that project roadways and other paved areas are cleaned regularly using street-sweeping equipment. Additionally, litter and debris that may accumulate on the streets around the project site will be regularly collected and properly disposed of. These measures will be carried out at least monthly, if construction occurs during the rainy season (October–April). These activities will be subject to review by the City.	Prior to and during project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure HYD-2: Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program In compliance with the NPDES General Construction Permit, the project proponent will develop and implement a spill prevention and control program to minimize the potential for, and effects from, spills of hazardous, toxic, or petroleum-based substances during construction activities. The spill prevention and control program must undergo City review and receive City approval prior to the onset of construction activities. The City will inspect the construction area routinely to verify that the measures specified in the spill prevention and control program are properly implemented and maintained. The City will notify contractors immediately if there is a noncompliance issue and will require compliance. The federal reportable spill quantity for petroleum products, as defined in 40 CFR 110, is any oil spill that: ■ violates applicable water quality standards, ■ causes a film or sheen upon or discoloration of the water surface or adjoining shoreline, or	Prior to and during project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ causes a sludge or emulsion to be deposited beneath the surface of the water or adjoining shorelines.				
Mitigation Measure HYD-3: Implement Provisions for Dewatering Dewatering effluent will be discharged to the SSJID drainage system and will be subject to the SSJID–City of Manteca storm drainage agreement (Environmental Science Associates 1999). Before discharging any substance that could reach surface waters, the project proponent will obtain an NPDES permit and waste discharge requirements from the Central Valley RWQCB. Depending on the volume and characteristics of the discharge, it may be covered under the RWQCB's General Construction Permit or General Dewatering Permit. As part of the permit, the contractors will design and implement measures as necessary to meet the discharge limits identified in the relevant permit. As a performance standard, these measures will be selected to achieve the maximum sediment removal and represent the best available technology (BAT) that is economically achievable. Implemented measures may include the retention of dewatering effluent until particulate matter has settled before it is discharged, the use of infiltration areas, and other BMPs. The final selection of water quality control measures will be subject to review by the City. The City will verify that compliance with the appropriate NPDES permit has been achieved before allowing dewatering activities to begin. The City or its agent will perform routine inspections of the construction area to verify that the water quality control measures are properly implemented and maintained. The City will notify the contractors immediately if there is a noncompliance issue and will require compliance.	During project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction
Mitigation Measure HYD-4: Prepare a Master Drainage Plan Prior to the commencement of construction, the project proponent will develop and implement a master drainage plan, subject to prior City review and approval. This plan will address the following requirements: ■ refined calculations of predevelopment runoff conditions and post-development runoff scenarios, using appropriate engineering methods, to evaluate potential changes to runoff through specific design criteria and account for increased surface runoff;	Prior to and during project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ a refined assessment of existing drainage facilities on the project site and an inventory of necessary upgrades, replacements, redesigns, and rehabilitation; ■ a proposed maintenance program for the onsite drainage system; ■ phasing standards for drainage systems to be installed on a project-/parcel-specific basis; and ■ payment of fair share cost to construct FCOC downstream improvements identified in the Storm Drain Master Plan, unless such items are included in the PFIP Storm Drainage fee, in which case payment of the PFIP is mitigation. Drainage systems, including any possible detention basin(s), will be designed in accordance with the City's and other applicable flood-control design criteria. As a performance standard, measures to be implemented from the master drainage plan will provide for no net increase in peak stormwater discharge relative to current conditions, ensure that 100-year flooding and its potential impacts are maintained at or below current levels, and ensure that people and structures are not exposed to additional flood risk. Prior to issuing a grading permit, the City will require the project proponent to demonstrate that the portion of the project site subject to the grading permit is consistent with the recommendations and conclusions of the master drainage plan and to implement the measures identified in the plan.				
Mitigation Measure HYD-5: Implement Best Management Practices to Maximize Stormwater Quality To reduce or eliminate water quality effects from polluted runoff from the proposed project, the project proponent will implement multiple BMPs in areas where runoff could drain to storm drainage systems or surface waters. The BMPs may include a combination of source control, structural elements, and treatment systems to ensure compliance with the applicable CWA regulations, including the following. ■ Dry detention basins will be created and designed to decrease runoff during storm events, prevent flooding, and allow for off-peak discharge. Basin features will include maintenance schedules for the	Prior to and during project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuing grading and building permits Verify periodically during construction

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
periodic removal of sedimentation, excessive vegetation, and debris that may clog basin inlets and outlets. ■ Physical devices will be placed at outlets of pipes and channels to reduce the velocity or the energy of exiting water. Outlet protection helps to prevent scour and minimize the potential for downstream erosion by reducing the velocity or energy of concentrated stormwater flows. The City will select a combination of BMPs that is expected to remove contaminants from stormwater discharges. The final selection and design of BMPs will provide maximum contaminant removal, represent the BAT that is economically achievable, and explicitly identify the expected level of effectiveness at contaminant removal. The City will conduct inspections following construction to ensure that all identified BMPs have been properly installed. The project will adopt a regular maintenance and monitoring schedule to ensure that these BMPs function properly during project operations. If necessary, the City will require that additional BMPs be designed and implemented if those originally constructed do not achieve the identified performance standard.				
Mitigation Measure HYD-8: Impose Condition Requiring Water Supply Improvements Tied to Number of Building Permits The following will be made a condition of approval of the Tentative Maps for the proposed project: Per the water supply assessment approved by the City Council on March 3, 2008, if the Well 26 storage tank and booster pump station are constructed and operational, up to 402 gpm of water supply would be available for these subdivisions. As such, if the storage tank and booster pump station are constructed, up to 263 lots may be constructed within the subdivisions. Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 264th lot, an additional well shall be constructed onsite within the subdivision to supply the additional 912 gpm of water needed for a total water supply of 1314 gpm needed for the 861 lots. However, if the Well 26 storage tank and booster pump station are not constructed and operational, no building permit for any lot within the subdivisions may be issued until such time as a well is constructed onsite within the subdivision to supply the entire 1314 gpm required by the 861 lots, or an alternative water supply is identified and the required environmental screening is conducted.	Prior to tentative map approval (include condition of approval for tentative maps) Prior to issuance of building permit for 264th lot (construction of well)	City of Manteca (include condition of approval on tentative maps) Project sponsor (construction of well)	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to tentative map approval (include condition of approval on tentative maps) Verify prior to issuance of building permit for 264th lot (construction of well)

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Transportation/Traffic				
Mitigation Measure TRA-1a: Main Street/Woodward Avenue—Install a Traffic Signal As shown in Tables 11-38 and 11-40, the installation of a traffic signal improves traffic operations to LOS C conditions during both the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is considered less than significant with mitigation.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits
Mitigation Measure TRA-1b: Union Road/SR 120 WB Ramps—Install a Traffic Signal and Add WB Right-Turn Lane As shown in Tables 11-38 through 11-40, the installation of a traffic signal and WB right-turn lane improves traffic operations to LOS B conditions during both the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is considered less than significant with mitigation. Note that this mitigation measure has also been identified as a required improvement for Phase 1 of the Promenade Shops at Orchard Valley shopping center. Based on information from the City, this traffic signal should be operational by spring of 2009.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits
Mitigation Measure TRA-1c: Union Road/SR 120 EB Ramps—Install a Traffic Signal and EB Right-Turn Lane As shown in Tables 11-38 through 11-40, the installation of a traffic signal and EB right-turn lane improves traffic operations to LOS B conditions during the AM peak hour and LOS C conditions during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is considered less than significant with mitigation. Note that this mitigation measure has also been identified as a required improvement for Phase 1 of the Promenade Shops at Orchard Valley shopping center. Based on information from the City, this traffic signal should be operational by spring of 2009.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure TRA-1d: Airport Way/SR 120 WB Ramps—Install a Traffic Signal and WB Right-Turn Lane As shown in Tables 11-38 through 11-40, the installation of a traffic signal and WB right-turn lane improves traffic operations to LOS B conditions during both the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is considered less than significant with mitigation. Note that at the time the Notice of Preparation was released, plans existed to install traffic signals at this location, consistent with mitigation measures identified for several other projects in the area. Based on information from the City, these signals were projected to be in operation by fall of 2008.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits
Mitigation Measure TRA-1e: Airport Way/SR 120 EB Ramps—Install a Traffic Signal and EB Right-Turn Lane As shown in Tables 11-38 through 11-40, the installation of a traffic signal and EB right-turn lane improves traffic operations to LOS B conditions during the AM peak hour and LOS C conditions during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the impact at this intersection is considered less than significant with mitigation. Note that at the time the notice of preparation was released, plans existed to install traffic signals at this location, consistent with mitigation measures identified for several other projects in the area. Based on information from the City, these signals were projected to be in operation by fall of 2008.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits
Mitigation Measure TRA-1f: Main Street/Yosemite Avenue—Amend City General Plan to Exempt the Intersection from the City LOS Threshold or Pay City to Retime Traffic Signal and Monitor Intersection Operations Adding a second SB through lane would reduce the project impact to a less-than-significant level by reducing the overall average intersection delay. However, the additional SB through lane would require the removal of on-street parking and landscaping improvements on Main Street north of Yosemite Avenue. Considering the limited parking supply within downtown Manteca, this improvement is deemed to be infeasible. Implementation of either of the following two mitigation measures would reduce the significance of the project-related impact:	Prior to building permit (general plan amendment) Prior to building permit (retiming of traffic signals)	Planning (general plan amendment) Engineering (retiming of traffic signals)	Planning (general plan amendment) Engineering (retiming of traffic signals)	Verify prior to issuance of building permits (general plan amendment) Verify prior to issuance of building permits (retiming of traffic signals)

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Because of the historic and pedestrian-friendly nature of Downtown Manteca, the City could exempt this intersection from the City LOS standard by amending the City General Plan. This amendment would acknowledge that the degraded peak-hour intersection operations are acceptable in order to protect the historic buildings, maintain on-street parking, and keep the area pedestrian-scaled by minimizing street crossing distances. As shown in Tables 11-38 and 11-40, retiming the traffic signals at this intersection reduces the overall delay to or **less** than the Existing No-Project Condition. While the intersection still operates at an unacceptable LOS E, the incremental project impact is mitigated. With either of the above mitigation measures **adopted**, this impact at this intersection is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Construct Class II Bicycle Lanes on Selected Streets The *City of Manteca Bicycle Master Plan* does not extend into the project site, but the plan calls for Class II bicycle lanes on Manteca Road/Main Street and Buena Vista Drive that terminate just north of the project site (Fehrs & Peers 2003). In order to connect the project site to the existing and planned bicycle facilities to the north, the Evans Estates proponent will construct Class II bicycle lanes along the project site's Manteca Road frontage. The Pillsbury Estates proponent will construct Class II bicycle lanes along Buena Vista Drive through the project site. In addition, the Pillsbury Estates proponent will coordinate with the City to ensure that Class II bike lanes are striped on Buena Vista Drive between Tannehill Drive and the northern border of the project site. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior during review of improvement plans
Mitigation Measure TRA-4: Coordinate with City and Manteca Transit to Facilitate Future Transit Service in the Area The project proponents will coordinate with the City and Manteca Transit regarding the construction of transit facilities to serve the project site. Example transit facilities would include bus turnouts on Manteca Road/Main Street, McKinley Avenue, or Pillsbury Road; benches; or shelters. While these improvements will facilitate future transit service, they will not guarantee that transit demands generated by the proposed	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
project are satisfied. Therefore, this impact remains significant and unavoidable.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-5a: Main Street between the SR 120 EB Ramps and SR 120 EB Ramps—Pay Fair-Share Contribution toward the Construction of a New Interchange at Main Street/SR 120 The SJCOG RTP lists the Main Street/SR 120 interchange reconstruction as a Tier I project; however, a PSR has not been prepared for these improvements. As part of the PSR process, it is expected that an interchange design will be chosen to provide acceptable LOS D or better operations under 2025 conditions. Given the similarities between Main Street and Union Road, the future interchange design is expected to be very similar to the Union Road/SR 120 interchange[1], which has the following design: ■ An overpass with two SB through lanes and three NB through lanes; ■ At the WB ramp terminal intersection: ❑ NB approach: two through lanes and a single right-turn lane (trap lane) to the north-to-west loop on-ramp; ❑ SB approach: two through lanes and a single right-turn lane; ❑ WB approach: dual left-turn lanes and a single right-turn lane; ■ At the EB ramp terminal intersection: ❑ NB approach: three through lanes and a single right-turn lane; ❑ SB approach: two through lanes and a single right-turn lane to the south-to-east loop on-ramp; ❑ EB approach: dual left-turn lanes and dual right-turn lanes. Table 11-41 shows that with these improvements, this segment of Main Street will operate at an acceptable LOS D. As described previously, full funding of this interchange improvement is dependent on the adoption of the updated PFIP by the City Council. Since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, project impacts could be mitigated as follows:	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

1 The Union Road/SR 120 interchange is also listed as a Tier I project in the SJCOG RTP and a PSR is currently being prepared.

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the interchange improvements, the project proponent will also pay its fair-share of the unfunded portion of the interchange improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the proposed project will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-5b: Main Street between SR 120 EB Ramps and Woodward Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Widen Main Street to Six Lanes By widening this roadway segment to six lanes, the project impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and roadway operations would improve to LOS C conditions (see Table 11-41). In addition, this mitigation measure would be consistent with the updated PFIP project list. To implement this improvement, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair share contribution by paying the updated PFIP, assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-5c: Union Road between SR 120 WB Ramps and SR 120 EB Ramps—Pay Fair-Share Contribution toward the Construction of a New Interchange at Union Road/SR 120 The City and Caltrans are currently preparing a PSR for future interchange improvements at Union Road/SR 120 interchange. As part of the improvements, the Union Road overpass and ramp terminal intersections would be designed to provide acceptable LOS D or better operations under 2025 conditions. The future design of the interchange is not yet finalized, but will probably be a partial cloverleaf design with a north-to-west loop on-ramp and a south-to-east loop on-ramp or dual SB left-turn lanes. The overpass would include two SB through lanes and three NB through lanes. This improvement is considered a Tier 1 funded improvement in the SJCOG RTP; however, it is dependent on the adoption of the PFIP by the City Council. Since the PFIP has not yet been adopted, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the current PFIP fee in place at time of building permit approval. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit approval is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the interchange improvements, the project proponent will also pay his fair-share of the unfunded portion of the interchange improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
Mitigation Measure TRA-5d: Union Road between SR 120 EB Ramps and Woodward Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Widen Union Road to Six Lanes By widening this roadway segment to six lanes, the project impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and roadway operations would improve to LOS C conditions (see Table 11-41). In addition, this mitigation measure would be consistent with the updated PFIP project list. To implement this improvement, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP, assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impact could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits
Mitigation Measure TRA-5e: Woodward Avenue between Union Road and Main Street—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Widen Woodward Avenue to Four Lanes By widening this roadway segment to **four** lanes, the project impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level and roadway operations would improve to LOS C conditions (Table 11-41). In addition, this mitigation measure would be consistent with the updated PFIP project list.	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
To implement this improvement, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP, assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-5f: Moffat Boulevard between Woodward Avenue and Austin Road—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Reconstruct the SR 99/Austin Road Interchange By widening this roadway segment to four lanes, the project impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level when measured against the City's roadway segment LOS thresholds. However, because of the closely spaced SR 99 SB off-ramp and Austin Road intersections, roadway segment operations at this location will be dominated by intersection operations. The antiquated design of the current SR 99/Austin Road interchange is inadequate to serve traffic demand under cumulative conditions. Minor ramp widening, intersection widening, and signalization can improve conditions over the existing geometries but they will not reduce the significance of the project impacts. To improve the interchange operations, the City and Caltrans are currently preparing a PSR to reconstruct the interchange approximately 1.2 miles south of the current location. This relocated interchange would remove the majority of the cumulative conditions and project traffic from this	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
segment of Moffat Boulevard, since it would no longer provide access to SR 99. Therefore, this improvement would reduce the project impact to a less-than-significant level. To implement the relocated SR 99/Austin Road interchange, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. The most recent cost estimate for the SR 99/Austin Road interchange was $144 million. Due to the high cost of this improvement, the City is debating whether to include the full cost of this interchange in the updated PFIP fee. Given the uncertainty of funding at this location, a fair-share payment that is beyond the adopted PFIP fee is likely financially infeasible. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6a: Main Street/Atherton Drive—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Improve the Intersection Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-5b will increase capacity at this intersection, which will reduce the significance of the project impact at this location. However, in conjunction with the Main Street widening, the following intersection improvements from the PFIP project list should be included in order to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level: ■ signalize intersection, and ■ construct dual left-turn lanes and single right-turn lanes on all approaches. With these mitigation measures in place the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 11-41. To implement the widening and intersection improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP, assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. With implementation of Mitigation Measures TRA-5b and TRA-6a, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location, and the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6b: Main Street/Woodward Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Improve the Intersection Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-5b will increase capacity at this intersection, which will reduce the significance of the project impact at this location. However, in conjunction with the Main Street widening, the following intersection improvements from the PFIP project list should be included in order to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level: ■ signalize intersection; ■ construct dual left-turn lanes on NB, SB, and EB approaches; and ■ construct right-turn lanes on WB and SB approaches. With these mitigation measures, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 11-41. To implement the widening and intersection improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP, assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows: ■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. With implementation of Mitigation Measures TRA-5b and TRA-6b, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location, and the impact will be reduced to a less-than-significant level.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6c: Union Road/Woodward Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution to Improve the Intersection The widening projects included in Mitigation Measures TRA-5d and TRA-5e will increase capacity at this intersection, which will reduce project impact at this location. However, in conjunction with the Union Road and Woodward Avenue widening, the following intersection improvements from the PFIP project list should be included in order to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level: ■ signalize intersection, ■ construct second NB and EB through lane, and ■ construct dual left-turn lanes and right-turn lanes on all approaches. With these mitigation measures in place, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 11-41. To implement the widening and intersection improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project could mitigate its impact as follows: ■ Pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance; ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, then the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. With implementation of TRA-5d, TRA-5e, and TRA-6c, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location, and the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6d: Airport Way/Daniels Street—Pay Fair-Share Contribution for the Construction of a New Interchange at Airport Way/SR 120 The impact analysis indicated that poor operations at this intersection are related to queues spilling back from the Airport Way/SR 120 interchange. Therefore, by improving interchange operations, the project impacts at this intersection can be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The City and Caltrans are currently preparing a PSR for future interchange improvements at Airport Way/SR 120. As part of the improvements, the Airport Way overpass and ramp terminal intersections would be designed to provide acceptable LOS D or better operations under 2025 conditions. The future design of the interchange is not yet finalized, but based on the PSR for the Union Road/SR 120 interchange (which is similar), and the PFIP project list, the Airport Way/SR 120 interchange would likely have a partial cloverleaf design. The overpass would include three through lanes in each direction. The design for the ramp terminal intersections would include dual left-turn lanes and dedicated right-turn lanes. This new interchange is listed as a Tier 1 improvement in the SJCOG RTP; however, it is dependent on the adoption of the PFIP by the City Council. Since the PFIP has not yet been adopted, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows:	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6e: Airport Way/Atherton Drive—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements The impact at this location could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by constructing the following intersection improvements identified in the PFIP projects list: ■ signalize the intersection; ■ construct three NB and SB through lanes (identified as part of a separate Airport Way widening project); ■ construct second through lane on EB and WB approach; ■ construct dual left-turn lanes on the SB, EB, and WB approaches; and ■ construct right-turn lanes on all approaches. With these mitigation measures, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 11-41. To implement the widening and intersection improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows:	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6f: Airport Way/Woodward Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements The impact at this location could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by constructing the following intersection improvements identified in the PFIP projects list: ■ signalize the intersection, ■ widen the intersection approaches to include three NB and SB through lanes and two EB and WB through lanes (identified as part of separate widening projects), and ■ construct dual left-turn lanes and right-turn lanes on all approaches. With these mitigation measures, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 11-41. To implement the widening and intersection improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will cover the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows:	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6g: Woodward Avenue/Moffat Boulevard—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements Intersection improvements at the Moffat Boulevard/Woodward Avenue intersection are not included in the PFIP because of uncertainty surrounding the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) crossing. With the implementation of the proposed Austin Road Business Park and Residential Community project, the opportunity exists to realign Woodward Avenue south of the UPRR tracks and avoid some rail crossing conflicts. However, since it is unknown when and if the Austin Road Business Park and Residential Community project would realign Woodward Avenue, the following Moffat Boulevard/Woodward Avenue intersection improvement is recommended: ■ signalize the intersection and coordinate the signal with the UPRR crossing arms, and ■ construct a separate NB left-turn lane. With the installation of the signal, the LOS analysis indicates that the Moffat Boulevard and Woodward Avenue intersection will operate at LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours. Table 11-41 presents the intersection LOS results under Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigation Conditions. To implement these improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. Since this project is not in the PFIP fee, a separate fair-share payment will be required. While the improvement will provide	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
adequate operations under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions, it is unknown if UPRR or the California Public Utilities Commission will allow the interconnection of the traffic signal and railroad crossing arms. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.				
Mitigation Measure TRA-6h: Main Street/Yosemite Avenue—Amend City General Plan to Exempt Intersection from LOS Standards The PFIP project list does not contain any improvements for the Main Street/Yosemite Avenue intersection because of limited right-of-way and the desire to maintain the character of Downtown Manteca. Without improvements to this intersection, the addition of project traffic would exacerbate unacceptable LOS under Cumulative No-Project Conditions. Exempting this intersection from the City's LOS standards would not improve operations at this location, but it would acknowledge that the City is willing to accept unacceptable vehicle operations during the AM and PM peak hours to preserve the pedestrian-oriented and historic character of Downtown Manteca. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable.	Prior to construction	Planning	Planning and Engineering	Verify prior to construction
Mitigation Measure TRA-6i: Woodward Avenue/Van Ryn Avenue—Pay Fair-Share Contribution of Intersection Improvements The impact at this location could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by constructing the following intersection improvements identified in the PFIP projects list: ■ signalize the intersection. With these mitigation measures, the **intersection** would operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours, as shown in Table 11-41. To implement the widening and intersection improvements, the project proponent will pay a fair-share contribution. As described above, the City Council is considering an update to the PFIP that will **cover** the cost of the improvements. The project proponent can pay its fair-share contribution by paying the updated PFIP assuming that the full PFIP is adopted by the City Council. However, since the PFIP update has not yet been adopted, and is not guaranteed to fully cover the costs of the improvements, the project impacts could be mitigated as follows:	Prior to building permit	Project sponsor	Engineering and Building	Verify prior to issuance of building permits

Description of Measure	Timing	Implementing Party	Monitoring Party	Monitoring Actions
■ The project proponent will pay the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance. ■ If the PFIP fee in place at time of building permit issuance is known by the City to not fully fund the cost of the roadway and intersection improvements, the project proponent will also pay their fair-share of the unfunded portion of the roadway and intersection improvements at the time of building permit issuance. By completing the mitigations described above, the project proponent will be contributing its fair-share toward mitigating the project's cumulative impact at this location. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.				
Utilities And Service Systems				
Mitigation Measure USS-8: Identify and Relocate Existing Utilities Where Necessary Project design and specifications will identify all underground utilities in the areas of proposed excavations. Underground Service Alert will be contacted to identify underground utilities. Where possible, existing utilities will be avoided. In instances in which utilities cannot be avoided, the relocation of existing utilities will be completed either before or during project construction.	Prior to project construction	Project sponsor	Engineering	Verify prior to issuance of building permits
Other CEQA Considerations				
Mitigation Measure CE-3: Implement City of Manteca General Plan Policies for Energy Conservation	During project design	Project sponsor	Planning	Verify prior to issuance of building permits