

**ATTACHMENT B**

---

**GPAC MEETING #2 – SUMMARY NOTES**





# Manteca

## General Plan Update

### Summary Notes

#### General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting 2 – October 2, 2017

---

These meeting notes provide an overview and summary of the input received during October 2, 2017 General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting which addressed safety and noise.

##### **Attendance**

GPAC Members Present: Bill Barnhart, Joann Beattie, Victoria Brunn, Ronald Cheek, James DuClair, Demetri Filios, Ronald Light, Jose Nuno, Daryll Quaresma, Parminder Singh Sahi, Jack Snyder, David Tenney, Stephen Tompkins

GPAC Members Absent: Wendy Benavides, Matthew Sickler

GPAC Alternates Present: David Cushman, Jason Laughlin, Marco Galeazzi

GPAC Alternates Absent: Benjamin Cantu, Richard Paz

##### **Selection of Chair and Vice Chair**

The GPAC elected Daryll Quaresma as Chair and Victoria Brunn as Vice Chair.

##### **GPAC Safety Discussion**

- Flooding
  - Consider separating flooding requirements for residential development from non-residential development as residential development requires a more stringent approach.
  - Consider the potential effects of growth and development on flooding on properties inside and outside of the City
- Hazardous Materials
  - Proximity to railroads, residential neighborhoods and schools – response to 2016 derailment that occurred near Manteca High School.
  - The hazardous materials goals, policies, and actions need more emphasis on hazardous materials and the specific requirements that need to be met, including requirements for day-to-day handling and storage of hazardous materials and waste.
  - Was Action S-I-11 implemented and is the list of facilities and associated hazardous materials available and being maintained?
    - It was noted that the 911 operations center maintains a hazardous materials database. The database is not maintained by the City, so there are concerns about the implications on losing data if the joint powers agreement goes away.
  - S-P-17 – update the policy to include disposal.
- Seismic Hazards
  - Earthquake-proofing – the topic lacks teeth. What been done to address the issue?
  - Address subsidence through long-term goals and policies.

- Was the 1988 geological report that addressed extraction of groundwater updated?
  - It was suggested by a GPAC member that the change in technology renders the report outmoded.
- Fire Hazards
  - Fire Insurance Rating – General Plan identifies goal of 4 or greater
    - What is the basis for the ISO rating and what is the current ISO rating by provider?
- Other Comments
  - Logistics, including coordination with schools, are important to consider, and do not appear to be well-addressed by existing policies.
  - Flooding adequately addressed with the update to the Safety Element, but other topics are not.
  - Consider how to address safety concerns associated with substandard structures.
  - Commuter train – safety and noise considerations.
  - Address drought.
- The following Safety goal, policies, and implementation actions were identified as adequate. It was recommended the remaining goals, policies, and actions be reviewed for adequacy and specificity.
  - S: 3
  - S-P: 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19
  - S-I: 4, 13, 15, 16

#### **GPAC Noise Discussion**

- N-P-11: Rather than requiring the construction of a soundwall AND mitigation measures to meet performance standards, require performance standards to be met through soundwall construction AND/OR mitigation measures.
- Consider addressing redirection of noise from soundwalls and tunnel effect of noise where there are openings between walls/buildings.
- Need to address maximum noise levels over a specific period of time (loud laundry facilities at Del Webb were provided as an example – they might not exceed noise levels over a 24-hour period, but are very loud while operating during the day).
- The need to address nighttime sounds through a night-time penalty or maximum night-time sound was addressed, rather than applying a 24-hour average that does not take into account higher one-time or short-term increased sound levels.
- Take noise into consideration when designating/updating Trucking Route
- Update the noise map, taking into account noise associated with the General Plan Update
- More vertical construction – consider potential noise increases/impacts associated with higher buildings
- Consider relocation of planned train station: central location, circulation effects, noise effects
- Use a common-sense approach that does not make regulations so difficult to comply with that established uses and businesses are infringed upon. There also needs to be recognition that there will be some disturbances and annoyances.
- Ensure new businesses and industries comply with the General Plan and noise requirements – don't give special deals for new development.
- Consider noise near schools.
- There needs to be proactive enforcement of noise regulations.

- Provide more noise reduction measures – consider what can be done to reduce noise and exposure to noise.

#### **GPAC Discussion - Other Items**

- Request that GPAC materials be provided earlier to allow for more review time and include clearer labeling/naming of files and reading assignments.
- Prepare a flowchart to show relationship between General Plan and other City processes/decisions.
- Review the General Plan and identify the policies and implementation actions that have been implemented and those that have not.
- Review use of language such as endeavor, where feasible, etc. and provide an introduction to the General Plan that identifies how the General Plan is administered, applied, and enforced.
- Request for information on roundabout safety and the bicycle plan and implementation when the circulation topic is discussed.
- Interested in a comparison between roundabouts and other, more conventional intersections.
- A GPAC member inquired about where drought is addressed in the General Plan – Conservation Element.
- Consider agricultural-related conflicts
  - Tourism
  - Right to farm ordinance – may addresses noise, smell, etc. – reference if it exists
  - Dust from shaking almonds – northern residential areas
  - Conflicts between newer residential and long-established agricultural uses
  - Use a common sense approach – who was there first
  - Longstanding issue
- Do not give away too much (from regulatory perspective) to grow business.
- Intensity (development) is good – consider more stories/higher buildings.

#### **Public Comment**

- Flooding
  - Concerned about flooding issue emanating from the “Triangle” area, surrounded by the San Joaquin River, the Old River, and the Paradise Cut, and expedited by the twin tunnels’ project.
  - Would like letters and comments submitted to the City and Consultant to be reviewed by the GPAC before further flooding discussion and decisions occur.
  - Advocated for addressing residential and nonresidential uses in separate manner, as was discussed by the GPAC.
  - Consider levee quality and ability to withstand saturation.
  - Consider how much sewer waste water and runoff are you producing.
  - How will water be conveyed? Consider southern conveyance alternative.
  - Concern regarding reclamation district plans and development in the floodplain.
  - Levees are unfair to rural communities because they divide land and can displace existing property owners and/or buildings. Eminent domain is not fair.
- Request for materials to review in advance of meeting and consultation with other government agencies.
- Inquired about considering any plans for another roadway across Stanislaus
- Union Pacific expansion

Subject: Summary Notes for GPAC Meeting 2 – October 2, 2017

Date: October 11, 2017

Page: 4 of 4

- Request that the General Plan address older residential neighborhoods constructed without soundwalls, which is problematic along arterial streets and/or truck routes.
- Route traffic through Highway 132 before Tracy.