



INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR THE

CENTERPOINT SOUTH PROJECT

APRIL 1, 2021

Prepared for:

City of Manteca – City Hall
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337
(209) 456-8000

Prepared by:

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

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

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm



INITIAL STUDY AND
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR THE

CENTERPOINT SOUTH PROJECT

APRIL 1, 2021

Prepared for:

City of Manteca – City Hall
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337
(209) 456-8000

Prepared by:

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

Proposed Centerpoint South Project

Lead Agency:

City of Manteca
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

Project Title: Centerpoint South Project

Project Location: The 8.85-acre project site (project site) is located at 2205 N. Airport Way (APN: 198-030-35). The project site is within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area, is zoned 'Master Plan' (MP), and is designated as 'Light Industrial' (LI) in the General Plan. The project site is bound by Airport Way and the Woodbridge Del Webb community to the east, Crothall laundry facility to the north, an approved but undeveloped 486-stall container yard to the west, and undeveloped land within the Master Plan area to the south.

Project Description: The proposed CenterPoint South project (proposed project) would develop the 8.85-acre vacant subject property (project site) with two concrete tilt-up wall warehouse buildings, automobile and trailer parking areas, landscaped areas, drainage and utility improvements, as well as driveways and drive aisles. Cold storage uses would not be allowed. In addition to the site plan, CenterPoint Properties will file a tentative parcel map that will subdivide the project site into two separate parcels that will each be developed with a warehouse facility ("Proposed Facility A" and "Proposed Facility B"). Proposed Facility A is located on the southeast part of the project site and consists of an approximately 52,029 square foot (sq. ft.) warehouse that features 18 exterior dock-high doors and two drive-in dock doors on the western building facade. A trailer parking area consisting of 19 trailer positions will be located to the west of the proposed truck court and Proposed Facility A, while a 71-car parking lot will be located to the east of Proposed Facility A. Proposed Facility B is located on the northeast part of the project site and consists of an approximately 47,485 sq. ft. warehouse that features 14 exterior dock-high doors and two drive-in dock doors on the western building facade. A trailer parking area consisting of 17 trailer positions will be located to the west of the proposed truck court and Proposed Facility B, while a 45-car parking lot will be located to the east of Proposed Facility B.

Findings:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Manteca has prepared an Initial Study to determine whether the proposed project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. The Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration reflect the independent judgment of City of Manteca staff. On the basis of the Initial Study, the City of Manteca hereby finds:

Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has thus been prepared.

The Initial Study, which provides the basis and reasons for this determination, is attached and/or referenced herein and is hereby made a part of this document.

Signature

Date

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

The following Mitigation Measures are extracted from the Initial Study. These measures are designed to avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts, and thereby reduce them to an insignificant level. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is an integral part of project implementation to ensure that mitigation is properly implemented by the City and the implementing agencies. The MMRP will describe actions required to implement the appropriate mitigation for each CEQA category including identifying the responsible agency, program timing, and program monitoring requirements. Based on the analysis and conclusions of the Initial Study, the impacts of proposed project would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of the mitigation measures presented below.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

MM AG-1: At the time building permits are sought for any Master Plan contemplated use, the project applicant shall pay the required City of Manteca agricultural mitigation fee to help offset the conversion of Important Farmland pursuant to Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 13.42.

AIR QUALITY

MM AIR-1a: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which the following measures will be complied with:

- Off-road equipment used onsite shall achieve a fleet average emissions equal to or less than the Tier II emissions standard of 4.8 grams of NO_x per horsepower hour. This can be achieved through any combination of uncontrolled engines and engines complying with Tier II and above engine standards. Tier II emission standards are set forth in Section 2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations.
- Construction equipment shall be properly maintained at an offsite location; maintenance shall include proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and data sheets of equipment design specifications shall be kept on-site during construction.
- Onsite construction equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes in any one hour.
- During the building phase, onsite electrical hook ups shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, to eliminate the need for diesel powered electric generators.
- Construction workers shall be encouraged to carpool to and from the construction site to the greatest extent practical. Workers shall be informed in writing and a letter shall be placed on file in the City office documenting efforts to carpool.

MM AIR-1b: During the architectural coating phase for all Master Plan uses, paints with a volatile organic compound content less than 10 grams per liter shall be used.

MM AIR-1c: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan building, the project applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable requirements of San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, Rule 9510 via the submittal of a Rule 9510 Implementation Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The implementation plan shall achieve a 33-percent reduction in NO_x and a 45-percent reduction in PM₁₀ over the first 10 years of operations through the use of onsite emissions reduction measures or through the payment of offsite mitigation fees to the SJVAPCD for purchase of emission reductions. The requirements of the approved implementation plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.

MM AIR-1d: Prior to approval of the final site plan for each Master Plan building that would receive 10 more truck deliveries per week, the project applicant shall demonstrate that the following anti-idling measures would be implemented:

- Provide available electricity hookups for trucks in the loading dock areas.
- Signs shall be posted in dock areas advising drivers that idling shall not occur for more than 3 minutes.
- Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the California Air Resources Board shall be posted on signs at truck entrances to report idling violations.

MM AIR-6: Prior to final site plan approval for any Master Plan use that includes food service (i.e., restaurants, cafeterias, etc.), the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with SJVAPCD Rules 4102 (Nuisance) and 4692 (Commercial Charbroiling) to the extent that these rules are applicable. Compliance may entail the installation of kitchen exhaust vents, exhaust filtration systems, or other odor-reduction measures in accordance with accepted engineering practice. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MM BIO-1a: If ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31), then pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted in all area suitable for nesting that are located within 250 feet of the Master Plan area. Surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the beginning of ground disturbance. If an active nest is located, a 250-foot buffer shall be delineated and maintained around the nest until a qualified biologist has determined that fledging has occurred. Alternatively, CDFG may be consulted to determine if the protective buffer can be reduced based upon individual species responses to disturbance. This mitigation measure does not apply if ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur outside of the nesting season (September 1 through February 14).

MM BIO-1b: No more than 30 day prior to the beginning of ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in general accordance with the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium. Should the surveys be scheduled to occur during the period extending from February 1 through May 1, then surveys shall be conducted no more that 15 days prior to the start of ground disturbance. Surveys shall be conducted from 2 hours before sunset to 1 hour after sunset, or from 1 hour before sunrise to 2 hours after sunrise, and shall be conducted during weather conducive to observing owls outside of their burrows. No surveys shall occur during heavy rain, high winds, or dense fog. If occupied burrows are found, mitigation for potential impacts shall follow the guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, including passive relocation.

MM BIO-6: Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit for the Master Plan, the project applicant shall obtain coverage under the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan. Coverage shall consist of approval of the Master Plan-specific "Section 8.2.1 (10) Checklist for Unmapped SJMSCP Projects" by the San Joaquin Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee. The applicant shall pay all required fees to the San Joaquin Council of Governments prior to the commencement of construction activities.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

MM CUL-1: If potentially significant historic resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities for any Master Plan use, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.

MM CUL-2: If potentially significant archaeological resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.

MM CUL-3: In the event that plant or animal fossils are discovered during subsurface excavation activities for the proposed project, all excavation within 50 feet of the fossil shall cease until a qualified paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provides recommendations in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the City of Manteca to determine procedures to be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the find is determined to be significant and the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall design and implement a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. Upon approval, the plan shall be incorporated into the project.

MM CUL-4: If previously unknown human remains are encountered during construction activities, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code applies, and the following procedures shall be followed: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code Section 5097.98 must be followed. Once project-related ground disturbance begins and if there is accidental discovery of human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

- There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the San Joaquin County Coroner's Office is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation into cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

MM GEO-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the project applicant shall submit a design-level geotechnical study and building plans to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable recommendations of the design-level geotechnical study and comply with all applicable requirements of the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. All onsite soil engineering activities shall be conducted under the supervision of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

MM HAZ-1a: Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use in areas where total petroleum hydrocarbons of diesel (i.e. TPH-D) has been detected, the applicant shall conduct soil sampling to delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of the TPH-D in order to implement a soil remediation program. Soil remediation shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. Contaminated soil shall be excavated and disposed of at an approved disposal facility. Following excavation, confirmation sampling shall be conducted to confirm whether remaining soil meets acceptable applicable regulatory levels. The excavation shall be backfilled with clean soil.

MM HAZ-1b: Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use, any onsite wells or septic systems intended to be removed shall be destroyed under permit and inspection with San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

MM HYD-1: Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits for each proposed activities within the Master Plan area, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City of Manteca that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify a practical sequence for BMP implementation, monitoring, and maintenance; site restoration; contingency measures; responsible parties; and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the following elements:

- Temporary erosion control measures shall be employed for disturbed areas.
- Specific measures shall be identified to protect the onsite open drainages during construction of the proposed resort.
- Specific measures shall be identified to protect the French Camp Outlet Canal and Drain 3 during any construction activities.
- No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.
- Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.

- The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains.
- BMP performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (e.g., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (such as inadvertent petroleum release) is required by the RWQCB to determine adequacy of the measure.
- In the event of significant construction delays or delays in final landscape installation, native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance, as an interim erosion control measure throughout the wet season.

MM HYD-2: Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for any development activities that occur pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan and identify expected site-specific pollutants and required measures to treat those pollutants before they reach the regional detention basins and, ultimately, the French Camp Outlet Canal and San Joaquin River. The approved measures shall be incorporated into the proposed project. The plan will describe monitoring and performance measures and standards required in order to ensure water quality is adequately protected during operation of all proposed sites within the project area. Examples of stormwater pollution prevention measures and practices to be incorporated into the plan include but are not limited to:

- Strategically placed bioswales and landscaped areas that promote percolation of runoff
- Pervious pavement
- Roof drains that discharge to landscaped areas
- Trash enclosures with screen walls and roofs
- Stenciling on storm drains
- Curb cuts in parking areas to allow runoff to enter landscaped areas
- Rock-lined areas along landscaped areas in parking lots
- Catch basins
- Oil/water separators
- Regular sweeping of parking areas and cleaning of storm drainage facilities
- Employee training to inform maintenance personnel of stormwater pollution prevention measures

MM HYD-4: Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan for the project as a whole to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan that demonstrates attainment of pre-project runoff requirements prior to release at the outlet canal and describes the volume reduction measures and treatment controls used to reach attainment. The drainage plan shall identify all expected flows from the project area and the location, size, and type of facilities used to retain and treat the runoff volumes and peak flows to meet pre-project conditions. The approved drainage plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.

NOISE

MM NOI-1: During construction activities for all Master Plan uses, the applicant shall require its construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements:

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily. The City of Manteca Director of Public Works shall have the discretion to permit construction activities to occur outside of allowable hours if compelling circumstances warrant such an exception (e.g., weather conditions necessary to pour concrete).
- All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. If no noise-reduction features were installed by the manufacturer, then the contractor shall require that at least a muffler be installed on the equipment.
- Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearest residence, unless safety or technical factors take precedence (e.g., an equipment breakdown).
- A 10-foot-high construction noise barrier shall be installed along the edge of the Master Plan area within 300 feet of any offsite residence prior to start of grading activities. The noise barrier shall either be constructed of a minimum 0.5-inch plywood or utilize acoustical blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 12. The barrier shall remain in place until noise intensive aspects of construction are completed.

MM NOI-4: During Master Plan operations, the use of street sweepers and mechanical landscape maintenance equipment (lawnmowers, leaf blowers, etc.) shall be prohibited between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

PUBLIC SERVICES

MM PSU-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for any Master Plan uses, the project applicant shall provide the City of Manteca will all applicable fire protection development fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule.

TRANSPORTATION

MM TRANS-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall pay all transportation-related fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule at the time permits are sought. Such fees shall include, but not be limited to, the City of Manteca Public Facilities Implementation Plan fee and the San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Impact Fee.

MM TRANS-4a: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about appropriate frontage improvements. All necessary frontage improvements shall be depicted on the final site plan and implemented as part of site development.

MM TRANS-6a: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department, Manteca Transit, and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District about the inclusion of appropriate transit facilities (turnouts, shelters, etc.) or services (e.g., an employee shuttle). If transit facilities are deemed to be necessary, they shall be provided on the final site plan. If transit services are deemed to be necessary, the applicant shall prepare a service plan and submit it to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The approved plan shall be incorporated into the project. To the extent feasible, transit facilities and services shall be coordinated among Master Plan uses to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.

MM TRANS-6b: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate bicycle facilities (racks, lockers, etc.). If bicycle facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.

MM TRANS-6c: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate pedestrian facilities. If pedestrian facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.

MM TRANS-7: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall submit a Construction Traffic Control Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall identify the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network. The plan shall encourage the use of Interstate 5 (I-5), Roth Road, Airport Way, and Lathrop Road wherever practical. Anticipated temporary road closures should be identified, along with safety measures and detours. If necessary, construction equipment and materials deliveries shall be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation. The plan shall also identify suitable locations for construction worker parking.

UTILITIES

MM PSU-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying a non-potable irrigation system that is separate from the potable water systems. The non-potable irrigation system shall use non-potable well water until recycled water is available, at which point it shall be converted to use recycled water.

MM PSU-3b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying that all appropriate and feasible water conservation measures are incorporated into the proposed use(s). The approved measures shall be incorporated into the final development plans. Examples of water conservation measures include but are not limited to:

- Drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping
- Water efficient irrigation systems (drip irrigation, bubbler/soaker systems, hydrozones, evapotranspiration controllers, etc.)
- Sensor-activated low-flow fixtures (e.g., faucets, urinals, and toilets)

MM PSU-6a: Prior to issuance of building permits for any building developed pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to perform construction and demolition debris recycling. Following the completion of construction activities, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the satisfaction of the City of Manteca demonstrating that construction and demolition debris was recycled.

MM PSU-6b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building developed pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which recycling and waste diversion activities shall be achieved. This information shall include but is not limited to the type and location of facilities necessary to collect and store recyclable materials, contractors who would pick-up recyclable and reusable materials, and how recycling and waste diversion activities would be integrated into operational practices. To the extent feasible, centralized recycling facilities are encouraged to enhance the ease and efficiency of such practices. The approved facilities and practices shall be incorporated into the uses envisioned by the Master Plan.

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Initial Study Checklist.....3

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected25

Determination.....25

Evaluation Instructions26

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....27

Environmental Checklist.....28

I. AESTHETICS.....28

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.....31

III. AIR QUALITY.....33

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....39

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....57

VI. ENERGY.....60

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....62

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....71

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....76

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....80

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.....91

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.....92

XIII. NOISE.....93

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....104

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.....105

XVI. RECREATION.....111

XVII. TRANSPORTATION.....112

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....117

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....118

XX. WILDFIRE.....121

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....124

References127

Appendix A: CalEEMod Results.....130

Appendix B: Air Toxics Health Risk Assessment.....133

Appendix C: Traffic Impact Analysis.....133

Appendix D: MMRP for the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan.....133

Appendix E: Settlement Agreement Between City of Manteca and City of Lathrop.....133

Appendix F: Ongoing Projects – City of Manteca.....133

This page left intentionally blank.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

PROJECT TITLE

CenterPoint South Project

LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Manteca – City Hall
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337
(209) 456-8000

CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

Ryan Kelleher
CenterPoint Properties
725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3005
Los Angeles, California 90017
(949) 281-9912
rkelleher@centerpoint.com

PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The 8.85-acre project site (project site) is located at 2205 N. Airport Way (APN: 198-030-35). The project site is within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area, is zoned 'Master Plan' (MP), and is designated as 'Light Industrial' (LI) in the General Plan. The project site is bound by Airport Way and the Woodbridge Del Webb community to the east, Crothall laundry facility to the north, an approved but undeveloped 486-stall container yard to the west, and undeveloped land within the Master Plan area to the south.

The project site currently contains vacant land. There are scattered trees located throughout the project site, primarily along the boundary of the project site. The project site is generally flat, with an elevation range for the entire project site of approximately 21 to 34 feet above sea level. See Figures 1 and 2 for the regional location and the project vicinity. The site plan is shown in Figure 3.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed CenterPoint South project (proposed project) would develop the 8.85-acre vacant subject property (project site) with two concrete tilt-up wall warehouse buildings, automobile and trailer parking areas, landscaped areas, drainage and utility improvements, as well as driveways and drive aisles. Cold storage uses would not be allowed. In addition to the site plan, CenterPoint Properties will file a tentative parcel map that will subdivide the project site into two separate parcels that will each be developed with a warehouse facility ("Proposed Facility A" and "Proposed Facility B"). Proposed Facility A is located on the southeast part of the project site and consists of an approximately 52,029 square foot (sq. ft.) warehouse that features 18 exterior dock-high doors and two drive-in dock doors on the western building facade. A trailer parking area consisting of 19 trailer positions will be located to the west of the proposed truck court and Proposed Facility A, while a 71-car parking lot will be located to the east of Proposed Facility A. Proposed Facility B is located on the northeast part of the project site and consists of an approximately 47,485 sq. ft. warehouse that features 14 exterior dock-high doors and two drive-

in dock doors on the western building facade. A trailer parking area consisting of 17 trailer positions will be located to the west of the proposed truck court and Proposed Facility B, while a 45-car parking lot will be located to the east of Proposed Facility B.

A driveway on the western property boundary will be limited to trucks only, allowing trucks to access the project site from Operation Court. The automobile parking lots to the east of Proposed Facility A and Proposed Facility B will be accessible to automobiles via a proposed driveway (automobiles only, restricted to right-in/right-out) along Operation Court on the western portion property boundary, as well as via a proposed driveway (automobiles only) along Pinnacle Drive on the northeast portion of the subject property. Landscaping will be provided throughout the subject property located between the proposed warehouse buildings and parking areas, as well as along the subject property's frontage with Operation Court, Airport Way, and Pinnacle Drive. Landscaping, pedestrian, and curb-and-gutter improvements will be constructed along the project site's frontage with Operation Court, Airport Way, and Pinnacle Drive, as required by the City. The loading docks, truck court, and trailer parking areas will be sufficiently screened from view from Airport Way by the proposed warehouse buildings and an 8-foot concrete tilt-up screening wall that will be located between the proposed warehouse buildings.

The proposed development is consistent with the light industrial design standards and guidelines established in the approved Northwest Airport Way Master Plan and implements the small-scale light industrial uses along the Airport Way frontage that are encouraged within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan. Furthermore, the environmental impacts of this proposed development have already been fully analyzed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the certified Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2010022024). As this development is speculative in nature, future tenants are unknown at this point in time; however future tenants would be required to comply with the uses that are permitted by right (and conditionally with procurement of a Conditional Use Permit) within the Light Industrial Zoning District by the City of Manteca Zoning Code and Northwest Airport Way Master Plan.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The proposed project is located within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area (Master Plan area), which is a master plan area that guides the development of industrial uses, community commercial uses, and associated site improvements on 390 acres. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared and certified for the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area (State Clearinghouse # 2010022024) in 2010 (Master Plan EIR). An EIR Addendum was completed for CenterPoint Container Yard 2 in April 2019.

Tiering

According to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(5), “[a] program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with later activities if it provides a description of planned activities that would implement the program and deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible.” Later environmental documents (EIRs, mitigated negative declarations, or negative declarations) can incorporate by reference materials from the program EIR regarding regional influences, secondary impacts, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d][2]). These later documents need only focus on new impacts that have not been considered before (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d][3]).

Section 15168(c), entitled “Use with Later Activities,” provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

Later activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared:

1. If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. That later analysis may tier from the program EIR as provided in Section 15152.
2. If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no subsequent EIR would be required, the agency can approve the activities as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. Whether a later activity is within the scope of a program EIR is a factual question that the lead agency determines based on substantial evidence in the record. Factors that an agency may consider in making that determination include, but are not limited to, consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure, as described in the program EIR.
3. An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into later activities in the program.
4. Where the later activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were within the scope of the program EIR.

Generally, when a property owner submits applications for site-specific approvals (i.e., tentative maps, conditional use permits, or other discretionary entitlements), the City staff will review the applications for consistency with the higher tier document. This consistency review ultimately determines whether the application for site specific approval is consistent with the higher tier document, Conditions of Approval, and Mitigation Measures, and whether it is consistent with what was anticipated and analyzed in the program EIR. Often a City will conclude that most, or all, components of the site-specific application can be developed with no new analysis of environmental effects, or a focused analysis limited to the environmental effects that could not be reasonably foreseen at the time the certified EIR was prepared.

These site-specific approvals may be narrowed pursuant to the rules for tiering set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152. “[T]iering is a process by which agencies can adopt programs, plans, policies, or ordinances with EIRs focusing on ‘the big picture,’ and can then use streamlined CEQA review for individual projects that are consistent with such...[first tier decisions] and are...consistent with local agencies’ governing general plans and zoning.” (*Koster v. County of San Joaquin* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 29, 36.) Section 15152 provides that, where a first-tier EIR has “adequately addressed” the subject of cumulative impacts, such impacts need not be revisited in second- and third-tier documents. Furthermore, second- and third-tier documents may limit the examination of impacts to those that “were not examined as significant effects” in the prior EIR or “[a]re susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means.” In general, significant environmental effects have been “adequately addressed” if the lead agency determines that:

- a. they have been mitigated or avoided as a result of the prior environmental impact report and findings adopted in connection with that prior environmental impact report; or

- b. they have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior environmental impact report to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the later project.

Where a site-specific approval within the City warrants additional environmental review, there are several paths forward. This includes an EIR Addendum, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or some form of Environmental Impact Report. The Mitigated Negative Declaration is a form of CEQA review that is commonly prepared for small projects built out under a Master Plan with a certified EIR. Based on the characteristics of the proposed project, the City of Manteca has determined it is appropriate to develop an IS/MND for the proposed project, using the tiering concept. Therefore, this IS/MND tiers from the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR and the Addendum to the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR. These documents can be found at the City of Manteca website at the following location:

<https://www.ci.manteca.ca.us/CommunityDevelopment/Planning%20Division/Pages/Planning-Division-Documents.aspx>

Mitigation Measures

Table PD-1, below, identifies the applicable mitigation measures from the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR that are applicable to the proposed project. It should be noted that these mitigation measures, which are directly from the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, have been included throughout this IS/MND. It should also be noted that the mitigation measure lettering and numbering scheme for the mitigation measures in this IS/MND is consistent with the lettering and numbering scheme from the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, for the sake of consistency between the two documents.

Table PD-1: Applicable Mitigation Measures from the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR

Environmental Topic	Mitigation Measure
Agricultural and Forestry Resources	MM AG-1: At the time building permits are sought for any Master Plan contemplated use, the project applicant shall pay the required City of Manteca agricultural mitigation fee to help offset the conversion of Important Farmland pursuant to Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 13.42.
Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<p>MM AIR-1a: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which the following measures will be complied with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-road equipment used onsite shall achieve a fleet average emissions equal to or less than the Tier II emissions standard of 4.8 grams of NO_x per horsepower hour. This can be achieved through any combination of uncontrolled engines and engines complying with Tier II and above engine standards. Tier II emission standards are set forth in Section 2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations. • Construction equipment shall be properly maintained at an offsite location; maintenance shall include proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and data sheets of equipment design specifications shall be kept on-site during construction. • Onsite construction equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes in any one hour.

Environmental Topic	Mitigation Measure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the building phase, onsite electrical hook ups shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, to eliminate the need for diesel powered electric generators. • Construction workers shall be encouraged to carpool to and from the construction site to the greatest extent practical. Workers shall be informed in writing and a letter shall be placed on file in the City office documenting efforts to carpool. <p>MM AIR-1b: During the architectural coating phase for all Master Plan uses, paints with a volatile organic compound content less than 10 grams per liter shall be used.</p> <p>MM AIR-1c: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan building, the project applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable requirements of San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, Rule 9510 via the submittal of a Rule 9510 Implementation Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The implementation plan shall achieve a 33-percent reduction in NOx and a 45-percent reduction in PM10 over the first 10 years of operations through the use of onsite emissions reduction measures or through the payment of offsite mitigation fees to the SJVAPCD for purchase of emission reductions. The requirements of the approved implementation plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.</p> <p>MM AIR-1d: Prior to approval of the final site plan for each Master Plan building that would receive 10 more truck deliveries per week, the project applicant shall demonstrate that the following anti-idling measures would be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide available electricity hookups for trucks in the loading dock areas. • Signs shall be posted in dock areas advising drivers that idling shall not occur for more than 3 minutes. • Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the California Air Resources Board shall be posted on signs at truck entrances to report idling violations. <p>MM AIR-6: Prior to final site plan approval for any Master Plan use that includes food service (i.e., restaurants, cafeterias, etc.), the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with SJVAPCD Rules 4102 (Nuisance) and 4692 (Commercial Charbroiling) to the extent that these rules are applicable. Compliance may entail the installation of kitchen exhaust vents, exhaust filtration systems, or other odor-reduction measures in accordance with accepted engineering practice. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.</p>
Biological Resources	<p>MM BIO-1a: If ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31), then pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted in all area suitable for nesting that are located within 250 feet of the Master Plan area. Surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the beginning of ground disturbance. If an active nest is located, a 250-foot buffer shall be delineated and maintained around the nest until a qualified biologist has determined that fledging has occurred. Alternatively, CDFG may be consulted to determine if the protective buffer can be reduced based upon individual species responses to disturbance. This mitigation measure does not apply if ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur outside of the nesting season (September 1 through February 14).</p>

Environmental Topic	Mitigation Measure
	<p>MM BIO-1b: No more than 30 day prior to the beginning of ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in general accordance with the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium. Should the surveys be scheduled to occur during the period extending from February 1 through May 1, then surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the start of ground disturbance. Surveys shall be conducted from 2 hours before sunset to 1 hour after sunset, or from 1 hour before sunrise to 2 hours after sunrise, and shall be conducted during weather conducive to observing owls outside of their burrows. No surveys shall occur during heavy rain, high winds, or dense fog. If occupied burrows are found, mitigation for potential impacts shall follow the guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, including passive relocation.</p> <p>MM BIO-6: Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit for the Master Plan, the project applicant shall obtain coverage under the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan. Coverage shall consist of approval of the Master Plan-specific "Section 8.2.1 (10) Checklist for Unmapped SJMSCP Projects" by the San Joaquin Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee. The applicant shall pay all required fees to the San Joaquin Council of Governments prior to the commencement of construction activities.</p>
Cultural & Tribal Resources	<p>MM CUL-1: If potentially significant historic resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities for any Master Plan use, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.</p> <p>MM CUL-2: If potentially significant archaeological resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.</p>

Environmental Topic	Mitigation Measure
	<p>MM CUL-3: In the event that plant or animal fossils are discovered during subsurface excavation activities for the proposed project, all excavation within 50 feet of the fossil shall cease until a qualified paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provides recommendations in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the City of Manteca to determine procedures to be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the find is determined to be significant and the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall design and implement a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. Upon approval, the plan shall be incorporated into the project.</p> <p>MM CUL-4: If previously unknown human remains are encountered during construction activities, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code applies, and the following procedures shall be followed: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code Section 5097.98 must be followed. Once project-related ground disturbance begins and if there is accidental discovery of human remains, the following steps shall be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the San Joaquin County Coroner’s Office is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation into cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.
Geology and Soils	<p>MM GEO-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the project applicant shall submit a design-level geotechnical study and building plans to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable recommendations of the design-level geotechnical study and comply with all applicable requirements of the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. All onsite soil engineering activities shall be conducted under the supervision of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.</p>
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<p>MM HAZ-1a: Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use in areas where total petroleum hydrocarbons of diesel (i.e. TPH-D) has been detected, the applicant shall conduct soil sampling to delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of the TPH-D in order to implement a soil remediation program. Soil remediation shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. Contaminated soil shall be excavated and disposed of at an approved disposal facility. Following excavation, confirmation sampling shall be conducted to confirm whether remaining soil meets acceptable applicable regulatory levels. The excavation shall be backfilled with clean soil.</p> <p>MM HAZ-1b: Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use, any onsite wells or septic systems intended to be removed shall be destroyed under permit and inspection with San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department.</p>

<i>Environmental Topic</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure</i>
Hydrology and Water Quality	<p>MM HYD-1: Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits for each proposed activities within the Master Plan area, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City of Manteca that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify a practical sequence for BMP implementation, monitoring, and maintenance; site restoration; contingency measures; responsible parties; and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary erosion control measures shall be employed for disturbed areas. • Specific measures shall be identified to protect the onsite open drainages during construction of the proposed resort. • Specific measures shall be identified to protect the French Camp Outlet Canal and Drain 3 during any construction activities. • No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months. • Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures. • The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains. • BMP performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (e.g., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (such as inadvertent petroleum release) is required by the RWQCB to determine adequacy of the measure. • In the event of significant construction delays or delays in final landscape installation, native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance, as an interim erosion control measure throughout the wet season. <p>MM HYD-2: Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for any development activities that occur pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan and identify expected site-specific pollutants and required measures to treat those pollutants before they reach the regional detention basins and, ultimately, the French Camp Outlet Canal and San Joaquin River. The approved measures shall be incorporated into the proposed project. The plan will describe monitoring and performance measures and standards required in order to ensure water quality is adequately protected during operation of all proposed sites within the project area. Examples of stormwater pollution prevention measures and practices to be incorporated into the plan include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategically placed bioswales and landscaped areas that promote percolation of runoff • Pervious pavement • Roof drains that discharge to landscaped areas • Trash enclosures with screen walls and roofs • Stenciling on storm drains • Curb cuts in parking areas to allow runoff to enter landscaped areas • Rock-lined areas along landscaped areas in parking lots • Catch basins • Oil/water separators • Regular sweeping of parking areas and cleaning of storm drainage facilities

Environmental Topic	Mitigation Measure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employee training to inform maintenance personnel of stormwater pollution prevention measures <p>MM HYD-4: Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan for the project as a whole to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan that demonstrates attainment of pre-project runoff requirements prior to release at the outlet canal and describes the volume reduction measures and treatment controls used to reach attainment. The drainage plan shall identify all expected flows from the project area and the location, size, and type of facilities used to retain and treat the runoff volumes and peak flows to meet pre-project conditions. The approved drainage plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.</p>
Noise	<p>MM NOI-1: During construction activities for all Master Plan uses, the applicant shall require its construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily. The City of Manteca Director of Public Works shall have the discretion to permit construction activities to occur outside of allowable hours if compelling circumstances warrant such an exception (e.g., weather conditions necessary to pour concrete). • All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. If no noise-reduction features were installed by the manufacturer, then the contractor shall require that at least a muffler be installed on the equipment. • Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearest residence, unless safety or technical factors take precedence (e.g., an equipment breakdown). • A 10-foot-high construction noise barrier shall be installed along the edge of the Master Plan area within 300 feet of any offsite residence prior to start of grading activities. The noise barrier shall either be constructed of a minimum 0.5-inch plywood or utilize acoustical blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 12. The barrier shall remain in place until noise intensive aspects of construction are completed. <p>MM NOI-4: During Master Plan operations, the use of street sweepers and mechanical landscape maintenance equipment (lawnmowers, leaf blowers, etc.) shall be prohibited between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.</p>
Public Services	<p>MM PSU-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for any Master Plan uses, the project applicant shall provide the City of Manteca will all applicable fire protection development fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule.</p>

<i>Environmental Topic</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure</i>
Transportation	<p>MM TRANS-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall pay all transportation-related fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule at the time permits are sought. Such fees shall include, but not be limited to, the City of Manteca Public Facilities Implementation Plan fee and the San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Impact Fee.</p> <p>MM TRANS-4a: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about appropriate frontage improvements. All necessary frontage improvements shall be depicted on the final site plan and implemented as part of site development.</p> <p>MM TRANS-6a: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department, Manteca Transit, and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District about the inclusion of appropriate transit facilities (turnouts, shelters, etc.) or services (e.g., an employee shuttle). If transit facilities are deemed to be necessary, they shall be provided on the final site plan. If transit services are deemed to be necessary, the applicant shall prepare a service plan and submit it to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The approved plan shall be incorporated into the project. To the extent feasible, transit facilities and services shall be coordinated among Master Plan uses to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>MM TRANS-6b: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate bicycle facilities (racks, lockers, etc.). If bicycle facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.</p> <p>MM TRANS-6c: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate pedestrian facilities. If pedestrian facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.</p> <p>MM TRANS-7: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall submit a Construction Traffic Control Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall identify the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network. The plan shall encourage the use of Interstate 5 (I-5), Roth Road, Airport Way, and Lathrop Road wherever practical. Anticipated temporary road closures should be identified, along with safety measures and detours. If necessary, construction equipment and materials deliveries shall be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation. The plan shall also identify suitable locations for construction worker parking.</p>

<i>Environmental Topic</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure</i>
Utilities	<p>MM PSU-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying a non-potable irrigation system that is separate from the potable water systems. The non-potable irrigation system shall use non-potable well water until recycled water is available, at which point it shall be converted to use recycled water.</p> <p>MM PSU-3b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying that all appropriate and feasible water conservation measures are incorporated into the proposed use(s). The approved measures shall be incorporated into the final development plans. Examples of water conservation measures include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping • Water efficient irrigation systems (drip irrigation, bubbler/soaker systems, hydrozones, evapotranspiration controllers, etc.) • Sensor-activated low-flow fixtures (e.g., faucets, urinals, and toilets) <p>MM PSU-6a: Prior to issuance of building permits for any building developed pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to perform construction and demolition debris recycling. Following the completion of construction activities, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the satisfaction of the City of Manteca demonstrating that construction and demolition debris was recycled.</p> <p>MM PSU-6b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building developed pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which recycling and waste diversion activities shall be achieved. This information shall include but is not limited to the type and location of facilities necessary to collect and store recyclable materials, contractors who would pick-up recyclable and reusable materials, and how recycling and waste diversion activities would be integrated into operational practices. To the extent feasible, centralized recycling facilities are encouraged to enhance the ease and efficiency of such practices. The approved facilities and practices shall be incorporated into the uses envisioned by the Master Plan.</p>

SOURCE: NORTHWEST AIRPORT WAY MASTER PLAN DRAFT AND FINAL EIRS

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF MANTECA AND CITY OF LATHROP

In 2005, the City of Manteca and the City of Lathrop were engaged in lawsuits with each other over the responsibility for payment of traffic impact fees for new development. City of Lathrop officials wanted the City of Manteca to pay traffic impact fees, fearing increased use of Lathrop roads from new development. On May 16th, 2005, the “Cooperative Agreement and Agreement to Settle Litigation” (Cooperative Agreement) was made between the City of Manteca and the City of Lathrop (i.e. the two parties), in an attempt to resolve the lawsuits. The Cooperative Agreement included an agreement to hire an engineering consultant to quantify traffic impacts associated with approval of land use applications in each city, in the form of a jointly funded traffic study. The Cooperative Agreement also included a pledge from the two parties that they desired to resolve the lawsuits and to avoid litigation regarding similar issues in the future.

In 2008, the jointly funded traffic study (i.e. the Lathrop-Manteca Traffic Study) was published. The study analyzed traffic impacts due to new development along roadways that were under dispute. Subsequently, the City of Manteca and the City of Lathrop agreed to a modification to the Cooperative Agreement in March 2012 (Modification of Cooperative Agreement). The Modification of the Cooperative Agreement identified that the joint traffic study had been

prepared and extensively reviewed by both parties, and that both parties were satisfied that all the concerns raised by the litigation have been addressed by the joint traffic study (see Appendix E of this IS/MND for the Modification of Settlement Agreement). As part of the Modification of Cooperative Agreement, the two parties agreed to modify the Cooperative Agreement as follows: 1) Lathrop agreed to dismiss the litigation without prejudice; 2) Both parties agreed that the sums necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts at the relevant sites examined in the joint traffic study were relatively equal and the small difference was waived; and 3) Both parties agreed that no payment between them would occur for the sites analyzed in the joint traffic study.

Recently, the City of Lathrop has shown concern with future industrial truck traffic traveling from the City of Manteca's Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area and industrial projects to the south along Airport Way within the City of Manteca, through the City of Lathrop to I-5. More specifically, the City of Lathrop is concerned with truck traffic traveling on Lathrop Road, Louise Avenue, and Roth Road, and roadway maintenance and improvements needed to maintain those roadways for Lathrop residents as well as the truck traffic originating in Manteca. Given the time elapsed since the signing of the Modification of Cooperative Agreement, combined with the City of Lathrop's stated concerns, the City of Manteca has solicited a proposal from a traffic engineer to revisit the original Lathrop-Manteca Traffic Study.

GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

The project site is designated Light Industrial (LI) by the Manteca General Plan Land Use Map. According to the City of Manteca 2023 General Plan, the LI designation provides for industrial parks, warehouses, distribution centers, light manufacturing, public and quasi-public uses and similar and compatible uses.

The project site is zoned MP – Master Plan for the City of Manteca Zoning Map. The purpose of the MP - Master Plan Zoning District is to establish a process for the consideration and regulation of areas suitable for proposed comprehensive development with detailed development plans and of those areas that require special planning.

The existing General Plan land uses and the zoning designations are shown on Figure 4. No General Plan amendment or zoning change is required for the proposed project.

REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER APPROVALS

The City of Manteca is the Lead Agency for the proposed project, pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15050.

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


- Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND);
- Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- City review and approval of the proposed Grading and Improvement Plans; and
- City Site Plan & Design Review (SPC).

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




- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) – Construction activities would be required to be covered under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES);


-
- RWQCB – The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be required to be approved prior to construction activities pursuant to the Clean Water Act;
 - San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) – Approval of construction-related air quality permits;
 - San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) – Review of project application to determine consistency with the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat, Conservation, and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP).

This page left intentionally blank.



Legend

-  Project Location
-  County Boundary
-  City Area



MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH

Figure 1. Regional Location Map


Sources: CalAtlas; California County GIS Departments. Map date: June 1, 2020.

This page left intentionally blank.



Legend

- Project Location
- City of Lathrop
- City of Manteca
- Unincorporated San Joaquin County
- Union Pacific Railyard
- School
- Park
- Union Pacific Railroad Main Line
- Drainage Canal or Ditch




Sources: San Joaquin County GIS; CalTrans. Map date: June 1, 2020.

MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH
Figure 2. Project Vicinity Map


This page left intentionally blank.

CA CA 95336

S
TE 3005




PROVED
ERLY
THE
ED BY
CA.



MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH

Figure 3. Site Plan



Source: MCR Engineering, 2/7/2020. Map date: June 2, 2020.

This page left intentionally blank.

This page left intentionally blank.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

None of the environmental factors listed below would have potentially significant impacts as a result of development of this project, as described on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Energy
	Geology and Soils		Greenhouse Gasses		Hazards and Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology and Water Quality		Land Use and Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population and Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities and Service Systems		Wildfire		Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION , including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

In each area of potential impact listed in this section, there are one or more questions which assess the degree of potential environmental effect. A response is provided to each question using one of the four impact evaluation criteria described below. A discussion of the response is also included.

- **Potentially Significant Impact.** This response is appropriate when there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, upon completion of the Initial Study, an EIR is required.
- **Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** This response applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- **Less than Significant Impact.** A less than significant impact is one which is deemed to have little or no adverse effect on the environment. Mitigation measures are, therefore, not necessary, although they may be recommended to further reduce a minor impact.
- **No Impact.** These issues were either identified as having no impact on the environment, or they are not relevant to the project.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This section of the Initial Study incorporates the most current Appendix "G" Environmental Checklist Form contained in the CEQA Guidelines. Impact questions and responses are included in both tabular and narrative formats for each of the 21 environmental topic areas.

I. AESTHETICS

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), c): The City of Manteca General Plan does not specifically designate any scenic viewsheds within the city. The existing Manteca General Plan does, however, note Manteca's scenic environmental resources including the San Joaquin River environment, and scenic vistas of the Coast Range and the Sierra.

For analysis purposes, a scenic vista can be discussed in terms of a foreground, middleground, and background viewshed. The middleground and background viewshed is often referred to as the broad viewshed. Examples of scenic vistas can include mountain ranges, valleys, ridgelines, or water bodies from a focal point of the forefront of the broad viewshed, such as visually important trees, rocks, or historic buildings. An impact would generally occur if a project would change the view to the middle ground or background elements of the broad viewshed, or remove the visually important trees, rocks, or historic buildings in the foreground.

The project site itself does not provide any visual resources that would be considered a scenic vista because it primarily consists of former agricultural lands, which are relatively common in other areas of the city and are not unique to the surrounding visual setting. Further, onsite agricultural production activities have altered the natural landscape; therefore, the project site does not provide views of the indigenous natural landscape. Although the current land uses provide views of a landscape that is representative of the region, the proposed project does not

contain resources that are exemplary of the agricultural history of the area (such as historic structures or landmarks). Views of the project site are not unique in the region.

The project site is generally flat with unobstructed view of the surrounding agricultural lands, the Lathrop Intermodal Terminal, and residential developments. Neither the project site nor any of the surrounding land uses contains features typically associated with scenic vistas (e.g., ridgelines, peaks, overlooks). Therefore, little opportunity exists for project activities to obscure views of scenic vistas that may be located within the immediate area of the project site

More distant views of the Coast Ranges (including Mt. Diablo) and the Sierra Nevada Mountains would largely be unaffected by the development of the project site because of the distance and limited visibility of these features. Furthermore, the City of Manteca does not identify views of these features to be “protected” and, therefore, any obstruction that does occur would not be significant. Moreover, the proposed project would not impact any views of the San Joaquin River environment.

Chapter 9, Design Standards and Guidelines of the Master Plan specifically identifies City design expectation in the context of new industrial and commercial developments within the project site. Design standards are required of all developments. Design guidelines are recommended measures that help ensure quality design. Together, the standards and guidelines address the placement and appearance of buildings, circulation, parking and loading, landscape design, fencing and screening, signage, exterior lighting, and sustainable design practices.

The design standards from the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan are to be applied to the proposed project in conjunction with the development standards listed in the Manteca Municipal Code and applicable utility master plans. Where differences occur between the design standards of the Master Plan and the Manteca Municipal Code, the design standards of the Master Plan shall prevail. The design standards and guidelines are to be used by applicants and their consultants in the formulation of specific development proposals. The standards and guidelines will also be used by City of Manteca staff in the review of development proposals. The proposed project would comply with these standards and guidelines.

Upon build-out, the project would be of similar visual character to nearby and adjacent developments (such as existing light industrial and commercial uses nearby). For motorists travelling along nearby roadways, the project would blend into existing and future development and would not present unexpected or otherwise unpleasant aesthetic values within the general project vicinity. Furthermore, the proposed project would also be consistent with the applicable design standards and development standards. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to these topics.

Response b): The project site is not located within view of a state scenic highway. Only one highway section in San Joaquin County is listed as a Designated Scenic Highway by the Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System; the segment of Interstate 580 from Interstate 5 to State Route 205. The City of Manteca is not visible from this roadway segment. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Implementation of the proposed project would have *no impact* relative to this topic.

Response d): The project site does not contain existing sources of light and glare. However, nearby land uses, such as the commercial and residential uses located to the north and east of the project site, include outdoor lighting. The Union Pacific Railroad Lathrop Intermodal Terminal,

the Sharpe Army Depot, scattered rural residential development, and Union Ranch also include outdoor lighting. Other nearby sources of light include the streetlights at the intersections of Airport Way and Roth Road, Airport Way and Daisywood Drive, and Airport Way and Lathrop Road, as well as vehicles traveling along Airport Way, Roth Road, Lathrop Road, Daisywood Drive, and Lovelace Road.

The proposed project would include the installation of freestanding and building-mounted lighting associated with the light industrial uses. Such lighting would include lighting in parking lots, along pathways, and mounted on buildings for safety and security reasons. As such, the proposed project may create a substantial source of nighttime light, which may affect nighttime views in the surrounding area.

The Northwest Airport Way Master Plan includes Design Standards and Guidelines to minimize light impacts. Specifically, all lighting in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area (which includes the project site) must comply with candle foot standards established in the Manteca Municipal Code. Night lighting in the Master Plan area shall be limited to that necessary for operations, security, safety, and identification, and it shall be screened from adjacent residential areas and not be directed in an upward manner or beyond the boundaries of the parcel on which the buildings are located. Specific design standards also apply to signage in the Master Plan area that requires signs to be illuminated only by backlighting of raised letters, internally illuminated individual letters, or by low-intensity spotlights that are screened from direct view. Internally illuminated box or can signs are prohibited in the Master Plan area. Signs are to be glare-free and light fixtures must be screened from view. Additional best management practices to minimize light trespass are described in the design guidelines and include the following recommended measures:

- Light bulbs or tubes should not be exposed.
- Light shields should reduce the spillage of light onto adjacent properties.
- Lighting should be adequate but not overly bright.
- Security lighting may be indirect or diffused and should be shielded or directed away from a residential district.

As the project site is included in the Master Plan area, it will be required to comply with the above standards.

In addition, all street lighting would have to comply with the City of Manteca lighting standards. Section 17.50.060 of the Manteca Municipal Code identifies general lighting standards for light shielding, illumination levels, and nuisance prevention.

In summary, existing standards, including the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Design Guidelines, establish a comprehensive and robust set of standards to ensure that proposed project uses do not introduce substantial sources of light and glare to the project vicinity. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?		X		
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1222(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The project site includes land designated as Prime Farmland and Rural Residential Land, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency (California Department of Conservation, 2018). The proposed project would result in the conversion of this designated Prime Farmland to a non-agricultural use. The loss of prime farmland was analyzed under the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR and determined to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The City adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and certified the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR with a significant and unavoidable conclusion under this environmental topic. The proposed project is consistent with the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan in terms of the loss of prime farmland and is subject to all mitigation measure and conditions associated with the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan.

The proposed project is subject to the City’s agricultural mitigation fee program and the SJMSCP. The City’s agricultural mitigation fee program helps offset the conversion of Important Farmland by funding the acquisition of irrevocable instruments on active farmland (e.g., conservation easements or farmland deed restrictions), to ensure such land remains in agricultural use in perpetuity. The SJMSCP, while created more specifically for the protection of biological resources, functionally serves as compensation and mitigation for impacts to agricultural resources when agricultural land or easements are purchased and preserved for the benefit of wildlife. This occurs when SJMSCP fees are paid to SJCOG who uses the funds to preserve open space land of comparable types throughout the County, often coordinating with other private or public land trusts to purchase conservation easements or buy land outright for preservation. This is more specifically addressed under the biological discussion later in this document.

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure AG-1 below, the project proponent would be required to pay the established fees on a per-acre basis for the loss of important farmland. Fees paid toward the City's program shall be used to fund conservation easements on comparable or better agricultural lands to provide compensatory mitigation. Therefore, with implementation of the following mitigation measure the proposed project would be reduced to a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this issue.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure AG-1: *At the time building permits are sought for any Master Plan contemplated use, the project applicant shall pay the required City of Manteca agricultural mitigation fee to help offset the conversion of Important Farmland pursuant to Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 13.42.*

Response b): The project site does not include any land associated with a Williamson Act contract. The project site is designated as LI by the Manteca General Plan Land Use Map and is zoned MP. The City of Manteca General Plan designates the project site for light industrial uses. These designations indicate the City has contemplated the conversion of this agricultural land to urban uses over the planning horizon of the General Plan and, therefore, does not view the project site as a preferred location for permanent agricultural uses. Moreover, the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan and the Master Plan EIR previously analyzed the project site for development light industrial uses. The proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** relative to this issue.

Response c): The project site is not forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1222(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526). The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland. Implementation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** relative to this issue.

Response d): The project site is not forest land. The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Implementation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** relative to this issue.

Response e): The project site is vacant and undeveloped, and was previously used for agricultural purposes. The project site does not contain forest land, and there is no forest land in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is included in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area and is designated LI and is zoned MP. Lands to the west and south of the project site are also included in the Master Plan area; as such, development of these adjacent areas are already planned for urban uses. Separately, the farmland located south of the project site has previously been anticipated for commercial development within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan. The proposed project does not involve any other changes in the existing environment not disclosed under the previous responses which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use, or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1, the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this issue.

III. AIR QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X		
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?		X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X		

Existing Setting

The project site is located within the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). This agency is responsible for monitoring air pollution levels and ensuring compliance with federal and state air quality regulations within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) and has jurisdiction over most air quality matters within its borders.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): Air quality emissions would be generated during operation and construction of the proposed project. Because of the region’s non-attainment status for ozone, PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀, if project-generated emissions of either of the ozone precursor pollutants (i.e., ROG and NO_x), PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} would exceed the SJVAPCD’s significance thresholds, then the proposed project uses would be considered to conflict with the attainment plans. Discussion of construction and operational-related air quality impacts is provided below.

Separately, if the proposed project uses would result in a change in land use and corresponding increases in vehicle miles traveled, they may result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled that is unaccounted for in regional emissions inventories contained in regional air quality control plans. The proposed project neither includes a change in land use, nor does it increase vehicle miles traveled compared to what had previously been planned for within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR (see section XVII. Transportation for further detail on project VMT).

Construction

PM₁₀ emitted during construction can vary greatly depending on the level of activity, the specific operations taking place, the equipment being operated, local soils, weather conditions, and other factors, making quantification difficult. Despite this variability in emissions, experience has shown that there are a number of feasible control measures that can be reasonably implemented to significantly reduce PM₁₀ emissions from construction activities.

Construction would result in numerous activities that would generate dust. The fine, silty soils in the project area and often strong afternoon winds exacerbate the potential for dust, particularly in the summer months. Impacts would be localized and variable. Construction impacts would last for a period of approximately one year. The initial phase of project construction would involve grading and site preparation activities, followed by paving, building construction, and

architectural coatings. Construction activities that could generate dust and vehicle emissions are primarily related to grading, soil excavation, and other ground-preparation activities.

Control measures are required and enforced by the SJVAPCD under Regulation VIII. The SJVAPCD considers construction-related emissions from all projects in this region to be mitigated to a less than significant level if SJVAPCD-recommended PM₁₀ fugitive dust rules and equipment exhaust emissions controls are implemented. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable measures from SJVAPCD Regulation Rule VIII. In addition, Table AIR-1 (below) provides the results of the construction-related emissions modeling results from CalEEMod.

Table AIR-1: Project Unmitigated Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)

<i>Emissions Type</i>	<i>Proposed Project Emissions</i>	<i>SJVAPCD Threshold</i>	<i>Above Threshold in Proposed Project?</i>
ROG	0.75	10	N
NO _x	3.09	10	N
CO	<0.1	100	N
PM ₁₀	0.36	15	N
PM _{2.5}	0.19	15	N
SO _x	<0.1	27	N

Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2

In addition, the proposed project would also implement construction-related mitigation measures, in accordance with the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR (i.e. Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-2, which are provided below).

Operational

Operational-related criteria pollutant emissions would be generated primarily from passenger (employee) vehicle and heavy-duty truck travel generated by the proposed project, as well as electricity and other energy usage on-site. Table AIR-1, below, provides the unmitigated results of the operational-related emissions modeling results from CalEEMod.

Table AIR-2: Project Unmitigated Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions (tons/year)

<i>Emissions Type</i>	<i>Proposed Project Emissions</i>	<i>SJVAPCD Threshold</i>	<i>Above Threshold in Proposed Project?</i>
ROG	0.71	10	N
NO _x	6.81	10	N
CO	1.63	100	N
PM ₁₀	0.59	15	N
PM _{2.5}	0.17	15	N
SO _x	<0.1	27	N

Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2

As shown above, the proposed project would not exceed the applicable SJVAPCD thresholds associated with operational emissions. Nevertheless, the proposed project would also be required to implement the additional mitigation measures for the operational phase of the project (i.e. Mitigation Measure AIR-3 through AIR-5), in accordance with the applicable mitigation measures provided in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR.

Therefore, with implementation of the following mitigation measures (for the sake of consistency with the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR), the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact related to the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure AIR-1a: *Prior to issuance of grading permits, as applicable, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which the following measures will be complied with:*

- *Off-road equipment used onsite shall achieve a fleet-average emissions equal to or less than the Tier II emissions standard of 4.8 grams of NO_x per horsepower hour. This can be achieved through any combination of uncontrolled engines and engines complying with Tier II and above engine standards. Tier II emission standards are set forth in Section 2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations.*
- *Construction equipment shall be properly maintained at an offsite location; maintenance shall include proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and data sheets of equipment design specifications shall be kept on-site during construction.*
- *Onsite construction equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes in any one hour.*
- *During the building phase, onsite electrical hook ups shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, to eliminate the need for diesel powered electric generators.*
- *Construction workers shall be encouraged to carpool to and from the construction site to the greatest extent practical. Workers shall be informed in writing and a letter shall be placed on file in the City office documenting efforts to carpool.*

Mitigation Measure AIR-1b: *During the architectural coating phase, paints with a volatile organic compound content less than 10 grams per liter shall be used.*

Mitigation Measure AIR-1c: *Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable requirements of San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, Rule 9510 via the submittal of a Rule 9510 Implementation Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The implementation plan shall achieve a 33-percent reduction in NO_x and a 45-percent reduction in PM₁₀ over the first 10 years of operations through the use of onsite emissions reduction measures or through the payment of offsite mitigation fees to the SJVAPCD for purchase of emission reductions. The requirements of the approved implementation plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.*

Mitigation Measure AIR-1d: *Prior to approval of the final site plan, the project applicant shall demonstrate that the following anti-idling measures would be implemented:*

- *Provide available electricity hookups for trucks in the loading dock areas.*
- *Signs shall be posted in dock areas advising drivers that idling shall not occur for more than 3 minutes.*

- Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the California Air Resources Board shall be posted on signs at truck entrances to report idling violations.

Mitigation Measure AIR-6: Prior to final site plan approval for any use that includes food service (i.e., restaurants, cafeterias, etc.), the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with SJVAPCD Rules 4102 (Nuisance) and 4692 (Commercial Charbroiling) to the extent that these rules are applicable. Compliance may entail the installation of kitchen exhaust vents, exhaust filtration systems, or other odor-reduction measures in accordance with accepted engineering practice. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.

Response c): Sensitive receptors are those individuals within the population that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants. Sensitive receptors include children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing serious health problems affected by air quality, and sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care center, nursing homes, hospitals, and residences. The closest sensitive receptors are the rural residential properties located adjacent to the project site (to the east), on the opposite side of Airport Way. Based on these residential community's characteristics, the community contains sensitive receptors.

A toxic air contaminant (TAC) is defined as an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or that may pose a hazard to human health. TACs are usually present in minute quantities in the ambient air. However, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at very low concentrations. In general, for those TACs that may cause cancer, there is no concentration that does not present some risk. This contrasts with the criteria pollutants for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which the state and federal governments have set ambient air quality standards.

Construction-Related Impacts on Sensitive Receptors: The construction phase of the project would be temporary and short-term, and the implementation of all State, Federal, and SJVAPCD requirements would greatly reduce pollution concentrations generated during construction activities. As shown in Table AIR-1, the project's construction-related criteria pollutant emissions would not exceed the applicable thresholds. Therefore, criteria pollutants from construction of the proposed project would be reduced and would be consistent with SJVAPCD guidance on this topic. Impacts to sensitive receptors during construction would be negligible and this is a **less than significant** impact.

Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts on Sensitive Receptors: The proposed project has the potential to impact nearby sensitive receptors during the proposed project's operational phase, due to the project's generation of trips by heavy-duty diesel trucks, which are an emitter of diesel particulate matter (DPM). In particular, DPM is emitted from on-site truck vehicle circulation and idling, and off-site mobile travel. Combined, these sources of DPM have the potential to generate substantial TACs on nearby sensitive receptors, including those located nearest to the project site. The SJVAPCD has established a screening calculator entitled the "Prioritization Calculator". An estimate of DPM emissions generated by the heavy-duty trucks associated with the proposed project was calculated for on-site mobile and idling emissions, in accordance with the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) guidance, as recommended by the SJVAPCD. The estimate of DPM emissions were based on the data provided by Fehr & Peers in the Transportation Analysis for the project, and with diesel particulate matter mobile emission rates from CARB's EMFAC2017 database (for year 2022, 10 MPH, San Joaquin County; emission rates for DPM), and from standard heavy-duty truck idling emission rates from CARB.

The results of the screening analysis show that the cancer and non-cancer risks associated with the proposed project are below the SJVAPCD screening thresholds contained within their Prioritization Calculator. Specifically, the Prioritization Calculator estimates that the prioritization score associated with total cancer risk from proposed project DPM would be approximately 4.68, well below the SJVAPCD threshold of 10 that would require development of and air toxics Health Risk Assessment (HRA) that includes air dispersion modeling. Additionally, non-cancer (i.e. chronic and acute risks) associated with project DPM would also be well below the applicable thresholds for the Maximally Exposed Individual (i.e. greater than or equal to the Hazard Index level of 1). Therefore, the complex air dispersion modeling using software such as AERMOD is not required. See Appendix B for further detail.

Overall, as described, the proposed project would not exceed the maximum risk values established by the SJVAPCD for TACs, as described above. All receptor types would be below the applicable SJVAPCD significance thresholds. In addition, criteria pollutant emission would be below the applicable SJVAPCD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants, as described under Impacts a) and b). Impacts to sensitive receptors from substantial pollutant concentrations would be a ***less than significant*** impact.

CO Hotspots: Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds.

Although the SJVAPCD has not established a specific numerical screening threshold for CO impacts, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established that, under existing and future vehicle emissions rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix (i.e., bridges and tunnels)—in order to generate a substantial CO impact. As described in Section XVII: Transportation, the proposed project would generate a maximum of approximately 69 AM peak hour trips and 63 PM peak hour trips, which would be significantly less than the volumes cited above (Fehr & Peers, 2020). The City of Manteca, as the lead agency, has selected the BAAQMD's threshold for analyzing the significance of CO impacts. Thus, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections in the vicinity of the project site, and impacts would be ***less than significant***.

Conclusion

The construction phase of the project would be temporary and short-term. The proposed project would not generate significant concentrations of air emissions during construction.

Maximum incremental residential cancer risk was evaluated over a 70-year period; maximum incremental workplace cancer risk was evaluated over a 40-year period. Chronic and acute cancer risks on the nearest sensitive receptors were also modeled. The modeling showed that the proposed project would not exceed the maximum risk values established by the SJVAPCD for TACs. All receptor types would be below the applicable SJVAPCD significance thresholds.

Under existing and future vehicle emissions rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per

hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix (i.e., bridges and tunnels)—in order to generate a substantial CO impact. The proposed project would generate much fewer than such peak hour trips, which would be significantly lower than the thresholds for causing a significant CO impact.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant increased exposure of sensitive receptors to localized concentrations of TACs, or create a CO hotspot. This project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

Response d): The proposed project would not generate objectionable odors that would adversely affect substantial numbers of people. People in the immediate vicinity of construction activities may be subject to temporary odors typically associated with construction activities (diesel exhaust, hot asphalt, etc.). However, any odors generated by construction activities would be minor and would be short and temporary in duration.

Examples of facilities that are known producers of operational odors include: Wastewater Treatment Facilities, Chemical Manufacturing, Sanitary Landfill, Fiberglass Manufacturing, Transfer Station, Painting/Coating Operations (e.g. auto body shops), Composting Facility, Food Processing Facility, Petroleum Refinery, Feed Lot/Dairy, Asphalt Batch Plant, and Rendering Plant. The proposed project would not contain any of these land uses. If a project would locate receptors and known odor sources in proximity to each other further analysis may be warranted; however, if a project would not locate receptors and known odor sources in proximity to each other, then further analysis is not warranted.

The project does not include any of the aforementioned uses. Additionally, construction activities would be temporary and minor. Lastly, other emissions are evaluated in responses a-c), as provided above. As such, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 through AIR-5, implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		X		

Regional Setting

The City of Manteca is located in the western portion of the Great Valley Geomorphic Province of California. The Great Valley Province is a broad structural trough bounded by the tilted block of the Sierra Nevada on the east and the complexly folded and faulted Coast Ranges on the west. The San Joaquin River is located just south and west of the City. This major river drains the Great Valley Province into the San Joaquin Delta to the north, ultimately discharging into the San Francisco Bay to the northwest.

The City of Manteca is located within the San Joaquin Valley Bioregion, which is comprised of Kings County, most of Fresno, Kern, Merced, and Stanislaus counties, and portions of Madera, San Luis Obispo, and Tulare counties. The San Joaquin Valley Bioregion is the third most populous out of ten bioregions in the state, with an estimated 2 million people. The largest cities are Fresno, Bakersfield, Modesto, and Stockton. Interstate 5 and State Route 99 are the major north-south roads that run the entire length of the bioregion. Habitat in the bioregion includes vernal pools, valley sink scrub and saltbush, freshwater marsh, grasslands, arid plains, orchards, and oak savannah. Historically, millions of acres of wetlands flourished in the bioregion, but stream diversions for irrigation dried all but about five percent. Remnants of the wetland habitats are

protected in this bioregion in publicly owned parks, reserves, and wildlife areas. The bioregion is considered the state's top agricultural producing region with the abundance of fertile soil.

The region has a Mediterranean climate that is subject to cool, wet winters (often blanketed with fog) and hot, dry summers. The average annual precipitation is approximately 13.81 inches. Precipitation occurs as rain most of which falls between the months of November through April, peaking in January at 2.85 inches. The average temperatures range from December lows of 37.5 F to July highs of 94.3 F.

The project site is generally flat, with an elevation range for the entire project site of approximately 21 to 34 feet above sea level. There are no water bodies located within the project site. The project site has previously “disced” (discing is a soil preparation process that follows plowing, which breaks up clods and surface crusts, thereby improving soil granulation and surface uniformity).

Vegetation on the project site consists of primarily of disturbed ruderal, with a small amount of developed/disturbed vegetation. Agricultural and ruderal vegetation found on the project site provides habitat for both common and a few special-status wildlife populations. For example, some commonly observed wildlife species in the region include: California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), California vole (*Microtus californicus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), American killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*), gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), garter snake (*Thamnophis species*), and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), as well as many native insect species. There are also several bat species in the region. Bats often feed on insects as they fly over agricultural and natural areas.

Locally common and abundant wildlife species are important components of the ecosystem. Due to habitat loss, many of these species must continually adapt to using agricultural, ruderal, and ornamental vegetation for cover, foraging, dispersal, and nesting.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The following discussion is based on a background search of special-status species that are documented in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and the field survey conducted by Biologist Steve McMurtry in October 2020. No special status species were identified by during the field survey conducted by Steve McMurtry. In addition, biological surveys that were conducted as part of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR determined that no designated critical habitat occurs within the entire Master Plan area.

Figure 5 shows the results of the CNDDDB background search within a 1-mile radius of the project site, and Figure 6 shows the results of the CNDDDB background search within a 9-quad area of the project site (i.e. approximately 630 square miles). The 9-quad background search was regional in scope and focused on the documented occurrences within 9-quad of the project site. Table BIO-1 provides a list of special-status plants and animals that occur within a 9-quad radius of the project site.

TABLE BIO-1: SPECIAL-STATUS WILDLIFE, FISH, AND PLANT SPECIES WHICH MAY OCCUR WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE'S 9-QUAD RADIUS

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMSCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
<i>INVERTEBRATES</i>			
Vernal pool fairy shrimp <i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>	T/--/Yes	Central Valley, central and south Coast Ranges from Tehama County to Santa Barbara County. Isolated populations also in Riverside County	Common in vernal pools; they are also found in sandstone rock outcrop pools
Vernal pool tadpole shrimp <i>Lepidurus packardii</i>	E/--/Yes	Shasta County south to Merced County	Vernal pools and ephemeral stock ponds
Sacramento anthicid beetle <i>Anthicus sacramento</i>	--/--/No	Found in several locations along the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers, from Shasta to San Joaquin counties, and at one site along the Feather River	Sand dune area, sand slipfaces among bamboo and willow, but may not depend on these plants.
Valley elderberry longhorn beetle <i>Desmocerus californicus dimorphus</i>	T/--/Yes	Stream side habitats below 3,000 feet throughout the Central Valley	Riparian and oak savanna habitats with elderberry shrubs; elderberries are the host plant
Crotch bumble bee <i>Bombus crotchii</i>	--/C/--	California	Crotch's bumblebee inhabits grassland and scrub areas, requiring a hotter and drier environment than other bumblebee species, and can only tolerate a very narrow range of climatic conditions
Western bumble bee <i>Bombus occidentalis</i>	--/C/--	Historically broadly distributed in western North America. <i>Bombus occidentalis</i> occurs along the Pacific coast and western interior of North America, from Arizona, New Mexico and California, north through the Pacific Northwest and into Alaska	Rangewide, habitats for this species include open coniferous, deciduous and mixed-wood forests, wet and dry meadows, montane meadows and prairie grasslands, meadows bordering riparian zones, and along roadsides in taiga adjacent to wooded areas, urban parks, gardens and agricultural areas, subalpine habitats and more isolated natural areas
Conservancy fairy shrimp <i>Branchinecta conservatio</i>	E/--/Yes	There are eight distributed populations of Conservancy fairy shrimp	Conservancy fairy shrimp inhabit rather large, cool-water vernal pools with moderately turbid water. The pools generally last until June. However, the shrimp are gone long before then. They have been collected from early November to early April
Lindieriella occidentalis <i>California lindieriella</i>	E/E/--	The California fairy shrimp is currently known from the Central Valley and Coast ranges of California	The California fairy shrimp has been documented on most land forms, geologic formations, and soil types supporting vernal pools in California
Lytta moesta <i>Moestan blister beetle</i>	--/--/Yes	These beetles are found in the Central Valley from Contra Costa County in the north to Tulare and Kern counties in the south	Information on this species is sparse, but some beetles were collected on filaree.
<i>AMPHIBIANS</i>			
California tiger salamander <i>Ambystoma californiense</i> (<i>A. tigrinum c.</i>)	T/SSC/Yes	Central Valley, including Sierra Nevada foothills, up to approximately 1,000 feet, and coastal region from Butte County south to northeastern San Luis Obispo County	Small ponds, lakes, or vernal pools in grass-lands and oak woodlands for larvae; rodent burrows, rock crevices, or fallen logs for cover for adults and for summer dormancy
California red-legged frog <i>Rana aurora draytoni</i>	T/SSC/Yes	Found along the coast and coastal mountain ranges of California from Marin County to San Diego County and in the Sierra Nevada from Tehama County to Fresno County	Permanent and semi-permanent aquatic habitats, such as creeks and cold-water ponds, with emergent and submergent vegetation. May estivate in rodent burrows or cracks during dry periods

<i>SPECIES</i>	<i>STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMSCP)</i>	<i>GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION</i>	<i>HABITAT REQUIREMENTS</i>
Foothill yellow-legged frog <i>Rana boylei</i>	--/C/Yes	These frogs occupy the western Sierra Nevada north of the Monarch Divide (in Fresno County) and the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada (east of the crest) from Inyo County, through Mono County (including the Glass Mountains), to areas north of Lake Tahoe	Typical habitat includes lakes, ponds, marshes, meadows, and streams at high elevations—typically ranging from about 4,500 to 12,000 feet, but can occur as low as about 3,500 feet in the northern portions of their range
Western spadefoot <i>Spea hammondi</i>	--/--/--	Ranges throughout the central valley of California as well as the coast south of San Jose and some parts of the desert.	Grassland, scrub and chaparral locally but can occur in oak woodlands.
<i>BIRDS</i>			
Burrowing owl <i>Athene cucularia</i>	BCC/SSC/ Yes	Lowlands throughout California, including the Central Valley, northeastern plateau, southeastern deserts, and coastal areas. Rare along south coast	Level, open, dry, heavily grazed or low stature grassland or desert vegetation with available burrows
Cackling (=Aleutian Canada) goose <i>Branta hutchinsii leucopareia</i>	D/--/No	This species is native to North America.	It breeds in northern Canada and Alaska in a variety of tundra habitats.
California black rail <i>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</i>	BCC/T/Yes	Permanent resident in the San Francisco Bay and east-ward through the Delta into Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties; small populations in Marin, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, Orange, Riverside, and Imperial Counties	Tidal salt marshes associated with heavy growth of pickleweed; also occurs in brackish marshes or freshwater marshes at low elevations
California horned lark <i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>	--/--/Yes	Resident in northern Baja California (south to about 30 degrees N latitude) and northward through California in the coast range north to Humboldt County and in the San Joaquin Valley, except the extreme southern end	Much habitat has been lost or degraded by agricultural development
Loggerhead shrike <i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	BCC/SSC/ Yes	Resident and winter visitor in lowlands and foothills throughout California. Rare on coastal slope north of Mendocino County, occurring only in winter	Prefers open habitats with scattered shrubs, trees, posts, fences, utility lines, or other perches
Song sparrow (Modesto Population) <i>Melospiza melodia</i>	BCC/SSC/ Yes	Restricted to California, where it is locally numerous in the Sacramento Valley, Sacramento–San Joaquin River Delta, and northern San Joaquin Valley. Exact boundaries of range uncertain.	Found in emergent freshwater marshes dominated by tules (<i>Scirpus</i> spp.) and cattails (<i>Typha</i> spp.) as well as riparian willow (<i>Salix</i> spp.) thickets. They also nest in riparian forests of Valley Oak (<i>Quercus lobata</i>) with a sufficient understory of blackberry (<i>Rubus</i> spp.), along vegetated irrigation canals and levees, and in recently planted Valley Oak restoration sites.
Swainson's hawk <i>Buteo swainsoni</i>	BCC/T/Yes	Lower Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the Klamath Basin, and Butte Valley. Highest nesting densities occur near Davis and Woodland, Yolo County	Nests in oaks or cottonwoods in or near riparian habitats. Forages in grasslands, irrigated pastures, and grain fields
Merlin <i>Falco columbarius</i>	--/--/Yes	Does not nest in California. Rare but widespread winter visitor to the Central Valley and coastal areas	Forages along coastline in open grasslands, savannas, and woodlands. Often forages near lakes and other wetlands
Tricolored blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	BCC/C (SSC)/Yes	Permanent resident in the Central Valley from Butte County to Kern County. Breeds at scattered coastal locations from Marin County south to San Diego County; and at scattered locations in Lake, Sonoma, and Solano Counties. Rare nester in Siskiyou, Modoc, and Lassen Counties	Nests in dense colonies in emergent marsh vegetation, such as tules and cattails, or upland sites with blackberries, nettles, thistles, and grainfields. Habitat must be large enough to support 50 pairs. Probably requires water at or near the nesting colony

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMSCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
Watershield <i>Brasenia schreberi</i>	--/--/No	It is widespread in North America, and is found in South and Central America, the West Indies, eastern Asia, Africa, and eastern Australia	Lacustrine (in lakes or ponds), riverine (in rivers or streams)
Western yellow-billed cuckoo <i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	T (BCC)/E/Y es	Nests along the upper Sacramento, lower Feather, south fork of the Kern, Amargosa, Santa Ana, and Colorado Rivers	Wide, dense riparian forests with a thick understory of willows for nesting; sites with a dominant cottonwood overstory are preferred for foraging; may avoid valley oak riparian habitats where scrub jays are abundant
White-tailed kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>		Open or cleared agricultural or range lands, natural shrublands and grasslands, lightly wooded areas	They can be found in the Central Valley and southern coastal areas, open land around Goleta including the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, marshes in Humboldt County, and also around the San Francisco Bay
Yellow-headed blackbird <i>Xanthocephalus</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Nests in freshwater emergent wetlands with dense vegetation and deep water. Often along borders of lakes or ponds.	Nests only where large insects such as odonatan are abundant, nesting timed with maximum emergence of aquatic insects.
Least Bell's vireo <i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>	E/E/No	San Joaquin River refuge	Dense shrubs and small trees along rivers and streams.
FISH			
Delta smelt <i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	T/T/Yes	Primarily in the Sacramento–San Joaquin Estuary but has been found as far upstream as the mouth of the American River on the Sacramento River and Mossdale on the San Joaquin River; range extends downstream to San Pablo Bay	Occurs in estuary habitat in the Delta where fresh and brackish water mix in the salinity range of 2–7 parts per thousand
Hardhead <i>Mylopharodon conocephalus</i>	--/SSC/No	Tributary streams in the San Joaquin drainage; large tributary streams in the Sacramento River and the main stem	Resides in low to mid-elevation streams and prefer clear, deep pools and runs with slow velocities. They also occur in reservoirs
Central Valley steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	T/--/No	Sacramento River and tributary Central Valley rivers.	Occurs in well-oxygenated, cool, riverine habitat with water temperatures from 7.8°C to 18°C. Habitat types are riffles, runs, and pools.
Longfin smelt <i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	--/SSC/Yes	Occurs in estuaries along the California coast. Adults concentrated in Suisun, San Pablo, and North San Francisco Bays	Prior to spawning, these fish aggregate in deepwater habitats available in the northern Delta, including, primarily, the channel habitats of Suisun Bay and the Sacramento River. Spawning occurs in fresh water on the San Joaquin River below Medford Island and on the Sacramento River below Rio Vista
MAMMALS			
Riparian brush rabbit <i>Sylvilagus bachmani riparius</i>	E/E/Yes	Limited to San Joaquin County at Caswell State Park near the confluence of the Stanislaus and San Joaquin Rivers and Paradise Cut area on Union Pacific right-of-way lands	Native valley riparian habitats with large clumps of dense shrubs, low-growing vines, and some tall shrubs and trees
American badger <i>Taxidea taxus</i>	--/SSC/Yes	In California, badgers occur throughout the state except in humid coastal forests of northwestern California in Del Norte and Humboldt Counties	Badgers occur in a wide variety of open, arid habitats but are most commonly associated with grasslands, savannas, mountain meadows, and open areas of desert scrub; the principal habitat requirements for the species appear to be sufficient food (burrowing rodents), friable soils, and relatively open, uncultivated ground
San Joaquin kit fox <i>Vulpes macrotis mutica</i>	E/T/Yes	Principally occurs in the San Joaquin Valley and adjacent open foothills to the west; recent records from 17 counties extending from Kern County north to Contra Costa County	Saltbush scrub, grassland, oak, savanna, and freshwater scrub

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMSCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
Pallid Bat <i>Antrozous pallidus</i>	--/--/No	Pallid bats range from southern British Columbia through Montana to central Mexico.	Pallid bats roost in a variety of places but favor rocky outcrops. They also occur in oak and pine forested areas and open farmland. Roosting sites are variable, depending on what is available. They can be found roosting in caves, rock crevices, mines, hollow trees, and buildings
San Joaquin Pocket Mouse <i>Perognathus inornatus</i>	--/--/Yes	Primarily Central Valley in California	Savanna, Grassland, Desert
REPTILES			
California glossy snake <i>Arizona elegans occidentalis</i>	--/--/No	Glossy snakes are most common in desert habitats but also occur in chaparral, sagebrush, valley-foothill hardwood, pine-juniper, and annual grass.	Primarily nocturnal, glossy snakes spend periods of inactivity during the day and during winter in mammal burrows and rock outcrops, and to a lesser extent under surface objects such as flat rocks and vegetation residue. Individuals occasionally burrow in loose soil.
Townsend's big-eared bat <i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>	--/--/Yes	A broad range in western North America, from southern Canada to southern Mexico.	Oak-hickory forests
Western pond turtle <i>Emys marmorata</i>	--/--/No	Western pond turtles (also known as Pacific pond turtles and Pacific mud turtles) are native to the west coast and are found from Baja California, Mexico north through Klickitat County, Washington.	Western pond turtles use both aquatic and terrestrial habitats. They are found in rivers, lakes, streams, ponds, wetlands, vernal pools, ephemeral creeks, reservoirs, agricultural ditches, estuaries, and brackish waters.
Western mastiff bat <i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	--/--/Yes	North America: arid and semiarid, rocky canyon country habitats	Woodland - Mixed, Cliff, Shrubland/chaparral, Suburban/orchard, Woodland - Conifer, Bare rock/talus/scree, Savanna, Woodland - Hardwood, Desert, Grassland/herbaceous
San Joaquin coachwhip <i>Masticophis flagellum ruddocki</i>	--/--/Yes	In the United States, their range extends as far west as the San Francisco Bay and as far east as the Coastal Plain of North Carolina.	Coachwhip snakes inhabit sites that are dry, open terrain. The species can be found in deserts, prairies, scrublands, juniper-grasslands, woodlands, thorn-forests, farmlands, creek valleys, chaparral, and, occasionally, swamplands.
Coast horned lizard <i>Phrynosoma blainvillii</i>	--/--/No	This lizard ranges throughout most of west-central and southwestern California	This lizard occurs in a variety of habitats, including scrubland, grassland, coniferous woods, and broadleaf woodlands
Giant gartersnake <i>Thamnophis gigas</i>	T/T/Yes	Historically the range included much of the floor of the Central Valley (Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys) of California, from Butte County in the north to Kern County in the south, at elevations from near sea level to 122 meters	Habitat of this highly aquatic species includes primarily marshes and sloughs, sometimes low-gradient streams, ponds, and small lakes, with cattails, bulrushes, willows, or other emergent or water-edge vegetation usually present and used for basking and cover
PLANTS			
Large-flowered fiddleneck <i>Amsinckia grandiflora</i>	E/E/Yes	Has a historic range along the Inner Coast Range in Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Joaquin counties.	In its natural occurrences, large-flowered fiddleneck occupies north-facing slopes in the upper elevations of grasslands near the blue oak belt. Soil type, livestock grazing and air quality have been suggested as limiting habitat features.
Heartscale <i>Atriplex cordulata</i> var. <i>cordulata</i>	--/--/No	California	Chenopod scrub; Meadows and seeps; Valley and foothill grassland (sandy)
Less saltscale <i>Atriplex minuscula</i>	--/--/No	Central Valley; San Jose region	Chenopod scrub; Playas; Valley and foothill grassland
Big tarplant <i>Blepharizonia plumosa</i>	--/--/No	Northern California	Valley and foothill grassland
Bristly Sedge <i>Carex comosa</i>	--/--/Yes	Various locations throughout Northern California	Coastal prairie; Marshes and swamps (lake margins); Valley and foothill grassland

SPECIES	STATUS (FED/CA/ SJMSCP)	GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS
Palmate-bracted bird's-beak <i>Chloropyron palmatum</i>	E/E/No	Central and Northern California	Chenopod scrub; Valley and foothill grassland
Slough thistle <i>Cirsium crassicaule</i>	--/--/Yes	Southern Central Valley, California	Chenopod scrub; Marshes and swamps (sloughs); Riparian scrub
Recurved larkspur <i>Delphinium recurvatum</i>	--/--/Yes	Dispersed throughout California	Chenopod scrub; Cismontane woodland; Valley and foothill grassland
Delta button-celery <i>Eryngium racemosum</i>	--/E/Yes	Central Valley, California	Riparian scrub (vernally mesic clay depressions)
Diamond-petaled California poppy <i>Eschscholzia rhombipetala</i>	--/--/Yes	Dispersed throughout California	Valley and foothill grassland (alkaline, clay)
San Joaquin spearscale <i>Extriplex joaquinana</i>	--/--/--	Dispersed throughout Northern and Central California	Chenopod scrub; Meadows and seeps; Playas; Valley and foothill grassland
Woolly rose-mallow <i>Hibiscus lasiocarpus</i> var. <i>occidentalis</i>	--/--/--	Northern Central Valley, California	Marshes and swamps (freshwater)
Delta tule pea <i>Lathyrus jepsonii</i> var. <i>jepsonii</i>	--/--/Yes	Northern California	Marshes and swamps (freshwater and brackish)
Mason's lilaeopsis <i>Lilaeopsis masonii</i>	--/R/Yes	Northern California	Marshes and swamps (brackish or freshwater); Riparian scrub
Showy golden madia <i>Madia radiata</i>	--/--/Yes	Dispersed throughout southern and central California	Cismontane woodland; Valley and foothill grassland
Sanford's arrowhead <i>Sagittaria sanfordii</i>	--/--/Yes	Dispersed throughout California	Marshes and swamps (assorted shallow freshwater)
Suisun Marsh aster <i>Symphyotrichum lentum</i>	--/--/--	Northern California	Marshes and swamps (brackish and freshwater)
Wright's trichocoronis <i>Trichocoronis wrightii</i> var. <i>wrightii</i>	T/T/Yes	San Bernardino	Meadows and seeps; Marshes and swamps; Riparian forest; Vernal pools
Saline clover <i>Trifolium hydrophilum</i>	--/--/--	Dispersed throughout northern California	Marshes and swamps; Valley and foothill grassland (mesic, alkaline); Vernal pools
Caper-fruited tropidocarpum <i>Tropidocarpum capparideum</i>	--/--/Yes	Dispersed throughout central and southern California	Valley and foothill grassland (alkaline hills)

STATUS EXPLANATIONS:

FEDERAL

- E = ENDANGERED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- T = THREATENED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- PE = PROPOSED FOR ENDANGERED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- PT = PROPOSED FOR THREATENED UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- C = CANDIDATE SPECIES FOR LISTING UNDER THE FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- D = DELISTED FROM FEDERAL LISTING STATUS.
- BCC = BIRD OF CONSERVATION CONCERN

STATE

- E = ENDANGERED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- T = THREATENED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- C = CANDIDATE SPECIES FOR LISTING UNDER THE STATE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.
- FP = FULLY PROTECTED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME CODE.
- SSC = SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN IN CALIFORNIA.

Special Status Plant Species

There are twenty special status plants that are documented within a 9-quad radius of the project site, according to the CNDDDB. Of the twenty species, there are three federal listed species and five state listed species.

Special Status Wildlife Species

Invertebrates: There are nine special-status invertebrates that are documented within a 9-quad radius of the project site according to the CNDDDB. Habitat for special status invertebrates known in the region would include vernal pool, sand dunes, riparian, wooded/forested, meadows, or another undisturbed natural habitat, none of which were identified in the field survey conducted by Steve McMurtry in October 2020. In addition, biological surveys that were conducted as part of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR determined that none of these habitat conditions occur within the entire Master Plan area. The appropriate habitat for these species is not present, field surveys have not revealed presence, and database records do not show any recorded occurrences; therefore, these special-status invertebrates are expected to be affected by the proposed project.

Reptile and amphibian species: There are four special-status amphibian that are documented within a 9-quad radius of the project site according to the CNDDDB. There are also seven special-status amphibians that are documented within a 9-quad radius of the project site according to the CNDDDB. Habitat for special status reptiles and amphibians known in the region would include ponds, lakes, vernal pool, marshes, meadows, scrub, chaparral, oak woodlands, forests, or another undisturbed natural habitat, none of which were identified in the field survey conducted by Steve McMurtry in October 2020. In addition, biological surveys that were conducted as part of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR determined that none of these habitat conditions occur within the entire Master Plan area. The appropriate habitat for these species is not present, field surveys have not revealed presence, and database records do not show any recorded occurrences; therefore, these special-status reptiles or amphibians are expected to be affected by the proposed project.

Birds: There are fourteen special-status birds that are documented in the CNDDDB within a 9-quad radius of the project site.

Analysis: While the project site contains very limited nesting habitat, there are powerlines and trees located in the region that represent potentially suitable nesting habitat for a variety of special-status birds. Additionally, the disturbed land located on the project site represents potentially suitable nesting habitat for the ground-nesting birds where disturbance is less frequent. In general, most nesting occurs from late February and early March through late July and early August, depending on various environmental conditions. The CNDDDB currently contains nesting records for Swainson's hawk and burrowing owl in the vicinity of the project site. In addition to the species described above, common raptors may nest in or adjacent to the project site.

The proposed project would eliminate some of the former agricultural areas on the project site, which serve as potential foraging habitat for birds throughout the year. Mitigation Measure BIO-1a requires pre-construction surveys if ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31). If an active nest is located, a 250-foot buffer would be delineated and maintained around the nest until a qualified biologist has determined that fledging has occurred. Alternatively, CDFG can be consulted to determine if the

protective buffer can be reduced based upon individual species responses to disturbance. Additionally, Mitigation Measure BIO-1b requires that a pre-construction survey is conducted for burrowing owls by a qualified biologist in general accordance with the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium. If occupied burrows are found, mitigation for potential impacts shall follow the guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, including passive relocation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1a and Mitigation Measure BIO-1b, the proposed project would fully mitigate all habitat impacts on covered special-status species.

Mammal: There are five special-status mammals that are documented within the 9-quad radius of the project site include. Habitat for special status mammals known in the region would include riparian, scrub, oak woodlands, forests, grasslands, desert, savanna, caves, or another undisturbed natural habitat, none of which were identified in the field survey conducted by Steve McMurtry in October 2020. In addition, biological surveys that were conducted as part of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR determined that none of these habitat conditions occur within the entire Master Plan area. The appropriate habitat for these species is not present, field surveys have not revealed presence, and database records do not show any recorded occurrences; therefore, these special-status mammals are expected to be affected by the proposed project.

Conclusion: No special-status species are expected to be affected by the proposed project due to the lack of habitat, absence of special status species during field surveys, and lack of any recorded occurrences of these species within databases. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b require mitigation to protect nesting birds and burrowing owls through pre-construction surveys; if active nests and/or occupied burrows are found, further mitigation (such as establishing buffers) according to these mitigation measures is then required.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1a and BIO-1b, the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: *If ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31), then pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted in all area suitable for nesting that are located within 250 feet of the Master Plan area. Surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the beginning of ground disturbance. If an active nest is located, a 250-foot buffer shall be delineated and maintained around the nest until a qualified biologist has determined that fledging has occurred. Alternatively, CDFG may be consulted to determine if the protective buffer can be reduced based upon individual species responses to disturbance. This mitigation measure does not apply if ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur outside of the nesting season (September 1 through February 14).*

Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: *No more than 30 day prior to the beginning of ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in general accordance with the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium. Should the surveys be scheduled to occur during the period extending from February 1 through May 1, then surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the start of ground disturbance. Surveys shall be conducted from 2 hours before sunset to 1 hour after sunset, or from 1 hour before sunrise to 2 hours after sunrise, and shall be conducted during weather conducive to observing owls outside of their burrows. No surveys shall occur during heavy rain, high winds, or dense fog. If occupied burrows are found, mitigation for potential impacts shall follow the*

guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, including passive relocation.

Response b): There is no riparian habitat on the project site. The CNDDDB record search revealed documented occurrences of five sensitive habitats within the 9-quad area of the project site including: Coastal and Valley Freshwater Marsh, Elderberry Savanna, Great Valley Cottonwood Riparian Forest, Great Valley Mixed Riparian Forest, Great Valley Oak Riparian Forest. None of these sensitive natural communities are recorded in the CNDDDB as occurring on the project site, and a field survey performed by Steve McMurtry in October 2020 verified that these habitats are absent from the project site. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 was adopted as part of the Master Plan EIR to ensure protections to jurisdictional facilities and/or riparian habitat; however, this mitigation measure is not applicable to the proposed project because such habitat is absent from the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact on riparian habitats or natural communities.

Response c): The project site does not contain protected wetlands or other jurisdictional areas and there is no need for permitting associated with the federal or state Clean Water Acts. Absent any wetlands or jurisdictional waters, implementation of the proposed project would have ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

Response d): The CNDDDB record search did not reveal any documented wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites on or adjacent to the project site. The field survey did not reveal any evidence of a wildlife corridor or nursery site. Special status fish species documented within the region include: Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*), Hardhead (*Mylopharodon conocephalus*), Central Valley steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Central Valley fall- /late fall-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and Longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*). The closest major natural movement corridor for native fish that are documented in the region is the San Joaquin River, located six miles to the west of the project site. The land uses within the project site would not have any direct disturbance to the San Joaquin River or its tributaries, and therefore, would not have any direct disturbance to the movement corridor or habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

Therefore, the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

Response e): The proposed project is subject to the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP). The SJMSCP is administered by a Joint Powers Authority consisting of members of the SJCOG, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). According to the SJMSCP, adoption and implementation by local planning jurisdictions provides full compensation and mitigation for impacts to plants, fish and wildlife. Adoption and implementation of the SJMSCP also secures compliance pursuant to the state and federal laws such as CEQA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Planning and Zoning Law, the State Subdivision Map Act, the Porter-Cologne Act and the Cortese-Knox Act in regard to species covered under the SJMSCP. Applicants pay mitigation fees on a per-acre basis. The entire County is mapped according to these categories so that landowners, project proponents and project reviewers are easily aware of the applicable SJMSCP fees for the proposed development. The appropriate fees are collected by the City and remitted to SJCOG for administration. SJCOG uses the funds to preserve open space land of comparable types throughout the County, often coordinating with other private or public land trusts to purchase conservation easements or buy land outright for preservation. The fees are automatically adjusted on an annual basis. The fees have been designed to sufficiently mitigate the impacts of projects on candidate, sensitive, and special status species. In addition,

additional field surveying is required as part of the SJMSCP process prior to any construction activities.

Table BIO-2, below, provides a consistency analysis with the criteria set forth by the SJMSCP. As shown in the table, the proposed Master Plan is consistent with applicable criteria.

TABLE BIO-2: SJMSCP CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

No.	CRITERION	CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION
1	Coverage for the proposed project is consistent with the overall SJMSCP biological intent and conservation program.	Consistent: The Master Plan area is mapped as “Agriculture” by the SJMSCP. The plan contemplates the conversion of 1,899 acres of agricultural land in Manteca to urban use over the 50-year life of the plan. The City of Manteca General Plan contemplates urban development within the Master Plan area; therefore, the conversion of this area from agricultural to urban use is accounted for in the SJMSCP. The SJMSCP requires payment of fees to permanently preserve agricultural land elsewhere in San Joaquin County at a ratio of 1:1. This requirement is codified in Mitigation Measure BIO-6. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan is consistent with the overall SJMSCP biological intent and conservation program.
2	Coverage for the proposed project is consistent with the SJMSCP Biological Opinion.	Consistent: The SJMSCP Biological Opinion reflects the activities covered by the SJMSCP. Because the conversion of the Master Plan area from agricultural to urban use is accounted for in the SJMSCP, the Biological Opinion would reflect this activity. Furthermore, mitigation is required for all development activities that adversely affect special-status species and waterways, which is consistent with the SJMSCP. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan is consistent with the SJMSCP Biological Opinion.
3	Biological impacts and Incidental Take associated with the proposed project are within the scope of the environmental analyses adopted in conjunction with the SJMSCP.	Consistent: The Master Plan area is mapped as “Agriculture” by the SJMSCP. The plan contemplates the conversion of 1,899 acres of agricultural land in Manteca to urban use over the 50-year life of the plan. The City of Manteca General Plan contemplates urban development within the Master Plan area; therefore, the conversion of this area from agricultural to urban use is accounted for in the SJMSCP. As such, the proposed Master Plan’s biological impacts are within the scope of the SJMSCP environmental analyses.
4	The project does not introduce significant new biological conditions into the Plan area (i.e., impacts of the proposed project are less than or equal to those described in the SJMSCP and its supporting environmental documents).	Consistent: The Master Plan area is mapped as “Agriculture” by the SJMSCP. The plan contemplates the conversion of 1,899 acres of agricultural land in Manteca to urban use over the 50-year life of the plan. The City of Manteca General Plan contemplates urban development within the Master Plan area; therefore, the conversion of this area from agricultural to urban use is accounted for in the SJMSCP. As such, the proposed Master Plan would not introduce significant new biological conditions into the SJMSCP boundaries.
5	The project acres have been analyzed based on habitat type (e.g., Natural Land, Agricultural Habitat Land or Multi-Purpose project are less than or equal to those described in the SJMSCP and its supporting environmental documents).	Consistent: The Master Plan area is mapped as “Agriculture” by the SJMSCP. The plan contemplates the conversion of 1,899 acres of agricultural land in Manteca to urban use over the 50-year life of the plan. The City of Manteca General Plan contemplates urban development within the Master Plan area; therefore, the conversion of this area from agricultural to urban use is accounted for in the SJMSCP. As such, the proposed Master Plan’s conversion of agricultural land is equal or less than those described in the SJMSCP.

No.	CRITERION	CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION
6	<p>The project meets at least one of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is adjacent to existing city limits; or • The project is adjacent to the boundaries of defined communities; or • The project is adjacent to existing airport facilities; or • The project is within an area designated as Freeway Service Commercial; or • The project is an expansion of an existing industrial or urbanized area in the unincorporated county; or • The project is proposed for annexation to a jurisdiction. 	<p>Consistent: The Master Plan meets three of the listed criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Master Plan area is adjacent to the Manteca city limits. 2. The Master Plan would develop light industrial uses that would interface with the existing Union Pacific Railroad Lathrop Intermodal Terminal, which is located in unincorporated San Joaquin County. As such, it would represent an expansion of existing industrial or urbanized area in the unincorporated county. 3. The Master Plan area is proposed for annexation into the City of Manteca.
7	<p>The project is not one of the projects specifically exempted from SJMSCP Coverage as identified in SJMSCP Section 8.2.2.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Master Plan is not one of the projects specifically exempted from SJMSCP Coverage as identified in SJMSCP Section 8.2.2.</p>
8	<p>The project does not disrupt a corridor used by the giant garter snake, riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, the San Joaquin kit fox, or fisheries as identified in the SJMSCP.</p>	<p>Consistent: As indicated in Impact BIO-4, the Master Plan area is not suitable for use as a wildlife movement corridor by the giant garter snake, riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, the San Joaquin kit fox, or any fish species.</p>
9	<p>The project does not interfere with the San Joaquin River Wildlife Corridor as established in Section 5.5.2.3.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Master Plan area is located more than 2.5 miles from the San Joaquin River Wildlife Corridor. Intervening urban development and infrastructure exists between the Master Plan area and the San Joaquin River. As such, the development of the Master Plan would not interfere with the San Joaquin River Wildlife Corridor.</p>
10	<p>The project does not include installation of a linear barrier to species dispersal as defined in Section 5.5.8.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Master Plan does not propose any transportation improvements that would create a linear barrier to species dispersal (e.g., median barrier installation or freeway widening).</p>
11	<p>The Technical Advisory Committee may consider and make additional findings for an individual project to determine if SJMSCP coverage for a project in this category is consistent with the overall biological intent of the SJMSCP and is consistent with the Biological Opinion.</p>	<p>Consistent: The Master Plan does not contain any provisions that would preclude the Technical Advisory Committee from considering and making additional findings.</p>

The proposed project does not conflict with the SJMSCP, as Mitigation Measure BIO-6 below requires participation in the plan. Therefore, the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5 was adopted as part of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR to ensure all activities that would remove one or more trees subject to City of Manteca Ordinance 17.19.060 replace trees at the appropriate ratio; however, this mitigation measure is not applicable to the proposed project because trees are absent from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no impact** relative to this topic.

Response f): The Resource Conservation Element of the General Plan establishes numerous policies and implementation measures related to biological resources as listed below:

Conservation Element Policies

RC-P-31. Minimize impact of new development on native vegetation and wildlife.

- **Consistent:** *This Initial Study includes an in-depth analysis of impacts for sensitive plants and wildlife, as well as habitat. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are presented to minimize, avoid, or compensate to the extent practicable.*

RC-P-33. Discourage the premature removal of orchard trees in advance of development, and discourage the removal of other existing healthy mature trees, both native and introduced.

- **Consistent:** *The proposed project will not require the removal of orchard trees.*

RC-P-34. Protect special status species and other species that are sensitive to human activities.

- **Consistent:** *This Initial Study includes an in-depth analysis of impacts for sensitive plants and wildlife, as well as habitat. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are presented to minimize, avoid, or compensate to the extent practicable.*

RC-P-35. Allow contiguous habitat areas.


- **Consistent:** *Habitat areas in the vicinity of the project site include agricultural plant communities which provide habitat for a variety of biological resources in the region. Agricultural areas occur throughout the region and are generally flat and well drained, and as a result are well suited for many crops. Alfalfa fields, hay, row crops, orchards, dominate the agricultural areas in the vicinity. The proposed project does not require contiguous habitat areas to change or convert to another use.*

The proposed project would not conflict with any of these policies and implementation measures, nor would it conflict with any ordinances contained in the Manteca Municipal Code. Mitigation Measure BIO-6, below, which requires the project applicant to obtain coverage under the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan, was adopted with the Master Plan EIR to ensure that the appropriate SJMSCP coverage is provided to the entirety of the Master Plan area irrespective of the habitat within each parcel. With implementation of this Mitigation Measure, the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: *Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit for the Master Plan, the project applicant shall obtain coverage under the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan. Coverage shall consist of approval of the Master Plan-specific "Section 8.2.1 (10) Checklist for Unmapped SJMSCP Projects" by the San Joaquin Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee. The applicant shall pay all required fees to the San Joaquin Council of Governments prior to the commencement of construction activities.*


This page left intentionally blank.



1-mile Radius of Project Boundary

Legend

- Project Location
- Animal (non-specific)
- Animal (80m)
- Animal (circular)




MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH

**Figure 5. California Natural Diversity Database
1-mile Radius Search**


Data sources: San Joaquin County GIS; ArcGIS Online National Map Service; CNDDDB version 05/2020. Please Note: the occurrences shown on this map represent the known locations of the species listed here as of the date of this version. There may be additional occurrences or additional species within this area which have not been surveyed and/or mapped. Lack of information in the CNDDDB about a species or an area can never be used as proof that no special status species occur in an area. Map date: June 1, 2020.

This page left intentionally blank.



Special Status Species Occurrences

Plant (80m)	Animal (non-specific)
Plant (specific)	Animal (circular)
Plant (non-specific)	Terrestrial Comm. (specific)
Plant (circular)	Terrestrial Comm. (circular)
Animal (80m)	Multiple (non-specific)
Animal (specific)	Multiple (circular)



MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH
Figure 6. California Natural Diversity Database
 9-Quad Search

CNDDDB version 5/2/2020. Please Note: the occurrences shown on this map represent the known locations of the species listed here as of the date of this version. There may be additional occurrences or additional species within this area which have not been surveyed and/or mapped. Lack of information in the CNDDDB about a species or an area can never be used as proof that no special status species occur in an area. Basemap: ArcGIS Online Topographic Map Service. Map date: June 1, 2020.

This page left intentionally blank.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a):

As provided in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, the record search showed that there are no historic resources that have been previously recorded within the Master Plan area. In addition, during the course of the pedestrian survey, no historic resources were discovered within the Master Plan area. However, there is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during project development could potentially impact previously unknown historic resources. As such, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 requires standard inadvertent discovery procedures to be implemented in the event that subsurface historical resources are encountered during construction. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a level of *less than significant*.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: *If potentially significant historic resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities for any Master Plan use, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.*

Response b): The results of the CCIC record search conducted within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR indicate that no archaeological resources have been previously recorded within the Master Plan project area or within a 0.25-mile radius of the project area. In addition, no archaeological resources were discovered during the pedestrian field survey conducted for the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR. The results of the NAHC record search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate vicinity of the Master Plan

project area. Additionally, the Master Plan project area has been highly disturbed by row crop agriculture and other development and is considered to have a low sensitivity for archaeological resources.

However, there is always the possibility that ground-disturbing activities during project development could potentially impact previously unknown prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. Prehistoric resources can include flaked-stone tools (such as projectile points, knives, and choppers) or obsidian, chert, or quartzite toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (such as midden soil containing heat-affected rock, ash, and charcoal, shellfish remains, and animal bones); and stone milling equipment (such as mortars, pestles, grinding slicks). Historical materials can include wood, stone, foundations, and other structural remains; debris-filled wells or privies; and deposits of wood, glass, ceramics, and other refuse.

As such, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires standard inadvertent discovery procedures to be implemented in the event that subsurface archaeological resources are encountered during construction. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: *If potentially significant archaeological resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.*

Response c): There are no known burial sites within the Master Plan project area. The pedestrian survey conducted for the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR did not find any evidence of human remains or burial goods within the project area. In addition, none of the previous surveys that included the Master Plan project area or were within a 0.25-mile radius reported finding any human remains. Nonetheless, the possibility exists that subsurface construction activities may encounter previously undiscovered human remains. Accordingly, this is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure CUL-4 requires standard inadvertent discovery procedures to be implemented in the event that subsurface cultural resources are encountered during construction. With the implementation of mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: *If previously unknown human remains are encountered during construction activities, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code applies, and the following procedures shall be followed: In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code Section 5097.98 must be followed. Once project-related ground disturbance begins and if there is accidental discovery of human remains, the following steps shall be taken:*

There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the San Joaquin County Coroner's Office is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation into cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the "most likely descendant" of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

VI. ENERGY

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a), b): Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines requires consideration of the potentially significant energy implications of a project. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary” energy usage (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. In particular, the proposed project would be considered “wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary” if it were to violate state and federal energy standards and/or result in significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy inefficiencies, energy intensiveness of materials, cause significant impacts on local and regional energy supplies or generate requirements for additional capacity, fail to comply with existing energy standards, otherwise result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources, or conflict or create an inconsistency with applicable plan, policy, or regulation, including the Manteca CAP.¹

The proposed project includes the construction of the proposed project. The amount of energy used at the project site would directly correlate to the energy consumption (including fuel) used by vehicle trips generated during project construction, fuel used by off-road construction vehicles during construction, fuel used by vehicles during project operation, and electricity and other energy usage during project operation. The CalEEMod modeling results for the proposed project estimate annual operational electricity usage at approximately 558,083 kWh/year, and annual natural gas usage at 608,030 kBTU/year (see Appendix A for further detail).

It should be noted that, as provided in Appendix C of this IS/MND (the Traffic Impact Analysis), the proposed CenterPoint South Project will result in a decrease in VMT when compared to the baseline citywide, from 37.9 to 32.9 vehicle miles when prorated to each individual employee. This represents a 13.2% decrease when compared to baseline city-wide average. Therefore, the proposed project will improve the jobs to housing balance in the City of Manteca and provide an overall benefit to reducing VMT on a per employee basis, as well as reductions to fuel consumption.

Conclusion

The proposed project would be in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regulating energy usage. For example statewide measures, including those intended to improve the energy efficiency of the statewide passenger and heavy-duty truck vehicle fleet (e.g. the Pavley Bill and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard) are improving vehicle fuel economies,

¹ See Section VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions of this IS/MND for a comparison of the project’s consistency with relevant CAP reduction measures.

thereby conserving gasoline and diesel fuel. These energy savings would continue to accrue over time.

As a result, the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. PG&E, the electricity and natural gas provider to the site, maintains sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. In addition, PG&E is on its way to achieving the statewide requirement of 50% of total energy mix generated by eligible renewables by year 2030. As of 2018, PG&E generated approximately 38% of its energy from eligible renewables (PG&E, 2019). The proposed project would comply with all existing energy standards, including the statewide Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources during construction and operation, nor conflict with or construct with a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. This is a ***less than significant*** impact.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		X		
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		X		
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		X		
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a.i), a.ii), a.iv): Figure 7 shows the earthquake faults in the vicinity of the project site. As shown in the figure, the site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and known surface expression of active faults does not exist within the site. However, the site is located within a seismically active region. The U.S. Geological Survey identifies potential seismic sources within approximately 20 miles of the project site. Two of the closest known faults classified as active by the U.S. Geological Survey are an unnamed fault east of the City of Tracy, located approximately 8 miles to the west, and the San Joaquin fault, located approximately 16 miles to the southwest. The Midway fault is located approximately 20 miles to

the west. Other faults that could potentially affect the proposed project include the Corral Hollow-Carnegie fault, the Greenville fault, the Antioch fault, and the Los Positas fault.

Geologic Hazards

Potential seismic hazards resulting from a nearby moderate to major earthquake could generally be classified as primary and secondary. The primary seismic hazard is ground rupture, also called surface faulting. The common secondary seismic hazards include ground shaking and ground lurching.

Ground Rupture

Because the project site does not have known active faults crossing the site, and the site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Special Study Zone, ground rupture is unlikely at the subject property.

Ground Shaking

According to the California Geological Survey's Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment Program, Manteca is considered to be within an area that is predicted to have a 10 percent probability that a seismic event would produce horizontal ground shaking of 10 to 20 percent within a 50-year period. This level of ground shaking correlates to a Modified Mercalli intensity of V to VII, light to strong. As a result of these factors the California Geological Survey has defined the entire county as a seismic hazard zone. There will always be a potential for groundshaking caused by seismic activity anywhere in California, including the project site.

Landslides

The proposed project site is not susceptible to landslides because the area is essentially flat. This is a less than significant impact.

Conclusion

In order to minimize potential damage to the proposed site improvements, all construction in California is required to be designed in accordance with the latest seismic design standards of the California Building Standards Code. Design in accordance with these standards would reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level. Because all development in the project site must be designed in conformance with these State standards, any potential impact would be considered *less than significant*.

Responses a.iii), c), d): Liquefaction normally occurs when sites underlain by saturated, loose to medium dense, granular soils are subjected to relatively high ground shaking. During an earthquake, ground shaking may cause certain types of soil deposits to lose shear strength, resulting in ground settlement, oscillation, loss of bearing capacity, landsliding, and the buoyant rise of buried structures. The majority of liquefaction hazards are associated with sandy soils, silty soils of low plasticity, and some gravelly soils. Cohesive soils are generally not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction. In general, liquefaction hazards are most severe within the upper 50 feet of the surface, except where slope faces or deep foundations are present.

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements. Expansion is a typical

characteristic of clay-type soils. Expansive soils shrink and swell in volume during changes in moisture content, such as a result of seasonal rain events, and can cause damage to foundations, concrete slabs, roadway improvements, and pavement sections.

Soil expansion is dependent on many factors. The more clayey, critically expansive surface soil and fill materials will be subjected to volume changes during seasonal fluctuations in moisture content. Figure 8 shows the soils within the project site. There are no expansive (i.e. shrink-swell) soils within the project site. The soils encountered at the project site consist of Veritas fine sandy loam (within the northern portion of the project site), and Tinnin loamy course sand (within the southern portion of the project site).

Future development of the project could expose people or structures to adverse effects associated with liquefaction and/or soil expansion. Construction of the project would be required to comply with the City's General Plan policies related to geologic and seismic hazards. For example, Policy S-P-2 provides that the City will require new development to mitigate the potential impacts of geologic hazards through building review, and Policy S-P-3 provides that the City will require new development to mitigate the potential impacts of seismic-induced settlement of uncompacted fill and liquefaction due to the presence of a high-water table. To that end, General Plan Policy S-P-1 requires that all proposed development prepare geological reports and/or geological engineering reports for projects located in areas of potentially significant geological hazards, including potential subsidence (collapsible surface soils) due to groundwater extraction. Moreover, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would ensure that the project applicant will submit a design-level geotechnical study and buildings plans to the City of Manteca for review and approval.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, this potential impact would be ***less than significant***.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: *Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall submit a design-level geotechnical study and building plans to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable recommendations of the design-level geotechnical study and comply with all applicable requirements of the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. All onsite soil engineering activities shall be conducted under the supervision of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.*

Response b): According to the project site plans prepared for the proposed project, development of the proposed project would result in the creation of new impervious surface areas throughout the project site. The development of the project site would also cause ground disturbance of top soil. The ground disturbance would be limited to the areas proposed for grading and excavation, including the proposed internal roadways and drain infrastructure improvements. After grading and excavation, and prior to overlaying the disturbed ground surfaces with impervious surfaces and structures, the potential exists for wind and water erosion to occur, which could adversely affect downstream storm drainage facilities.

Without implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) related to prevention of soil erosion during construction, development of the project would result in a potentially significant impact with respect to soil erosion. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 requires the

project applicant to prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan identifying specific actions and BMPs to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities. The SWPPP shall include, among other things, temporary erosion control measures to be employed for disturbed areas. Implementation of the following mitigation measure, therefore, would ensure the impact is *less than significant*.


Mitigation Adopted by the City
Implement Mitigation Measure HYD-1.

Response e): The project is an infrastructure project and no septic systems will be used. Therefore, *no impact* would occur related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks.

Response f): Known paleontological resources or sites are not located on the project site. Additionally, unique geologic features are not located on the site. The site is currently undeveloped and surrounded by existing or future urban development. Additionally, as discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, in the event that plant or animal fossils are discovered during subsurface excavation activities, Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would all excavation within 50 feet of the fossil to cease until a paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provided recommendations in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. If the find is determined to be significant and the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist would design and implement a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards, to be submitted to the City for review and approval. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3, impacts to paleontological resources or unique geologic features are not expected. This is a *less than significant* impact.

Mitigation Adopted by the City
Implement Mitigation Measure CUL-3.

This page left intentionally blank.




Project Location

Legend

- Quaternary fault
- Foothills fault system
- Calaveras fault zone
- Corral Hollow-Carnegie fault zone
- Greenville fault zone
- Alquist-Priolo Zone


Data sources: US Geologic Survey; CalAtlas. Map date: June 2, 2020.











MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH


Figure 7. Earthquake Fault Map

This page left intentionally blank.



Legend

-  Project Boundary
-  City Limits
-  Manteca Sphere of Influence (SOI)
-  Assessor Parcel
-  254:Timor loamy sand
-  255:Tinnin loamy coarse sand (1.2 acres on site)
-  260:Urban land
-  266:Veritas fine sandy loam (7.2 acres on site)



MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH

Figure 8. Soils Map

Sources: NRCS Web Soil Survey, San Joaquin County, California (CA077), Survey Area Version 13, 9-16-2019. City of Manteca; San Joaquin County GIS. Map date: June 2, 2020.

This page left intentionally blank.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?			X	

Existing Setting

Various gases in the Earth’s atmosphere, classified as atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the Earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters Earth’s atmosphere from space, and a portion of the radiation is absorbed by the Earth’s surface. The Earth emits this radiation back toward space, but the properties of the radiation change from high-frequency solar radiation to lower-frequency infrared radiation.

Naturally occurring GHGs include water vapor (H₂O), carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and ozone (O₃). Several classes of halogenated substances that contain fluorine, chlorine, or bromine are also GHGs, but they are, for the most part, solely a product of industrial activities. Although the direct GHGs, including CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, occur naturally in the atmosphere, human activities have changed their atmospheric concentrations. From the pre-industrial era (i.e., ending about 1750) to 2011, concentrations of these three GHGs have increased globally by 40, 150, and 20 percent, respectively (IPCC, 2013).

Greenhouse gases, which are transparent to solar radiation, are effective in absorbing infrared radiation. As a result, this radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is now retained, resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon is known as the greenhouse effect. Among the prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), ozone (O₃), water vapor, nitrous oxide (N₂O), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs).

Emissions of GHGs contributing to global climate change are attributable in large part to human activities associated with the industrial/manufacturing, utility, transportation, residential, and agricultural sectors. Consumption of fossil fuels in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California’s GHG emissions in 2018, accounting for 41% of total GHG emissions in the state. This category was followed by the industrial sector (24%), the electricity generation sector (including both in-state and out of-state sources) (15%) and the agriculture and forestry sector (8%) (California Energy Commission, 2016).

As the name implies, global climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern, respectively. California produced approximately 425 million gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MMTCO₂e) in 2018 (California Energy Commission, 2021). Given that the U.S. EPA estimates that worldwide emissions from human activities totaled nearly 46 billion gross metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (BMTCO₂e) in 2010, California’s incremental contribution to global GHGs is approximately 2% (U.S. EPA, 2014).

Carbon dioxide equivalents are a measurement used to account for the fact that different GHGs have different potential to retain infrared radiation in the atmosphere and contribute to the greenhouse effect. This potential, known as the global warming potential of a GHG, is also dependent on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. Expressing GHG emissions in carbon dioxide equivalents takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO₂ were being emitted.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): Existing science is inadequate to support quantification of impacts that project specific GHG emissions have on global climatic change. This is readily understood when one considers that global climatic change is the result of the sum total of GHG emissions, both man-made and natural that occurred in the past; that is occurring now; and will occur in the future. The effects of project specific GHG emissions are cumulative, and unless reduced or mitigated, their incremental contribution to global climatic change could be considered significant.

The SJVAPCD's *Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (SJVAPCD, 2015) provides an approach to assessing a project's impacts on greenhouse gas emissions by evaluating the project's emissions to the "reduction targets" established in ARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan. For instance, the SJVAPCD's guidance recommends that projects should demonstrate that "*project specific GHG emissions would be reduced or mitigated by at least 29%, compared to Business as Usual (BAU), including GHG emission reductions achieved since the 2002-2004 baseline period, consistent with GHG emission reduction targets established in ARB's AB 32 Scoping Plan. Projects achieving at least a 29% GHG emission reduction compared to BAU would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG.*"

Subsequent to the SJVAPCD's approval of the *Final Draft Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (SJVAPCD 2015), the California Supreme Court issued an opinion that affects the conclusions that should/should not be drawn from a GHG emissions analysis that is based on consistency with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. More specifically, in *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife*, the Court ruled that showing a "project-level reduction" that meets or exceeds the Scoping Plan's overall statewide GHG reduction goal is not necessarily sufficient to show that the project's GHG impacts will be adequately mitigated: "*the Scoping Plan nowhere related that statewide level of reduction effort to the percentage of reduction that would or should be required from individual projects...*" According to the Court, the lead agency cannot simply assume that the overall level of effort required to achieve the statewide goal for emissions reductions will suffice for a specific project.

Given this Court decision, reliance on a 29 percent GHG emissions reduction from projected BAU levels compared to the project's estimated 2020 levels as recommended in the SJVAPCD's guidance documents is not an appropriate basis for an impact conclusion in the MND. Given that the SJVAPCD staff has concluded that "*existing science is inadequate to support quantification of impacts that project specific GHG emissions have on global climatic change,*" this MND instead relies on consistency with the local reduction strategies contained within the existing City of Manteca Climate Action Plan (CAP) (2013) for this analysis.

The City of Manteca adopted its CAP in October 2013. The purpose of the CAP is to: 1) outline a course of action for the City government and the community of Manteca to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions by amounts required to show consistency with AB 32 goals and adapt to effects of climate change, and 2) provide clear guidance to City staff regarding when and how to implement key provisions of the CAP, and 3) provide a streamlined mechanism for projects

that are consistent with the CAP to demonstrate that they would not contribute significant greenhouse gas impacts.

The GHG Plan is considered a “Qualified Plan,” according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5.2.

The approach still relies on the Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines thresholds which indicate that climate change-related impacts are considered significant if implementation of the proposed Project would do any of the following:

1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

These two CEQA Appendix G threshold questions are provided within the Initial Study checklist and are the thresholds used for the subsequent analysis. The focus of the analysis is on the project’s consistency with the CAP. The CAP contains an inventory of GHG emissions, reduction strategies, and a means to implement, monitor, and fund the Plan. The purpose of the CAP is to outline a course of action for the City government and the community of Manteca to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions by amounts required to show consistency with AB 32 goals for the year 2020, and to adapt to effects of climate change. The CAP also provides clear guidance to City staff regarding when and how to implement key provisions of the CAP. Lastly, the CAP provides a streamlined mechanism for projects that are consistent with the CAP to demonstrate that they would not contribute significant greenhouse gas impacts. The analysis provided herein includes quantitative modeling to show the construction and operational emissions of GHGs as a result of the project, however, the conclusions are based on the fact that the project is consistent with the reduction strategies contained within the CAP.

Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project would generate GHGs during the construction and operational phases of the proposed project. The primary source of construction-related GHGs from the proposed project would result from emissions of CO₂ associated with the construction of the proposed project, and worker vehicle trips. The proposed project would require limited grading, and would also include site preparation, building construction, architectural coating, and paving phases. Sources of GHGs during project operation would include CO₂ associated with operational vehicle trips and on-site energy usage (e.g. electricity). Other sources of GHG emissions would be minimal.

It should be noted that, as provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis in Appendix C of this IS/MND, the proposed CenterPoint South Project will result in a decrease in overall project VMT (inclusive of VMT from all project-generated vehicles) when considered on a per-employee basis, when compared to baseline citywide, from 37.9 to 32.9 vehicle miles per employee. This represents a 13.2% decrease when compared to baseline city-wide average. Therefore, the proposed project will improve the jobs to housing balance in the City of Manteca and provide an overall benefit to reducing VMT per employee, as well as GHG emissions.

Table GHG-1 provides the estimated GHG emissions that would be generated during project construction and operation.

Table GHG-1: Project Unmitigated Construction and Operational GHG Emissions (metric tons/year)

Year	CO ₂ e
Construction	
2020	29.78
2021	624.0
2022	4.66
Operation	
Annual	2,152.1

Source: CalEEMod, v.2016.3.2

Project Consistency with the Manteca CAP

Table GHG-2, below provides a consistency analysis of the relevant Manteca CAP policies in comparison to the proposed project.

TABLE GHG-2: PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE MANTECA CAP

No.	Strategy	Consistency Determination
CD-1	The City shall encourage projects consistent with the development densities allowed by the General Plan and are contiguous to existing development meet compact development criteria.	Consistent: The project is consistent with the development densities allowed by the General Plan.
CD-2	The City shall encourage projects that are at or near the maximum densities allowed by the General Plan and zoning designations to achieve more compact development.	Consistent: The project is near the maximum density allowed by the General Plan and zoning designations.
TDM-1	Notify developers of large commercial and industrial developments of the requirements of SJVAPCD Rule 9410 to implement TDM programs that reduce commute trips.	Consistent: The City would notify the developer of the project regarding the requirements of SJVAPCD Rule 9410 to implement TDM programs that reduce commute trips.
TEF-1	The City shall provide developers of projects with the potential for employing more than 100 persons at a single work site with information on end-of-trip facilities appropriate for the type of business and size of the project that will assist in their compliance with SJVAPCD Rule 9410.	Consistent: The City would notify the developer of the project regarding the potential for employing more than 100 persons at a single work site with information on end-of-trip facilities
ENB-1	The City shall require developers to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards by at least 10 percent. The City recognizes that it may not be feasible for all buildings and structures to exceed Title 24 by this amount because of the form or function of the building. Projects that cannot meet the reduction level may provide solar panels or other non-building-related energy efficiency measures such as exterior lighting or water savings.	Consistent: The project developer would be required to develop building plans consistent with this measure.

Project Consistency with SJCOG's RTP/SCS

In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with the implementation of regional transportation-related GHG targets outlined in San Joaquin Council of Governments' (SJCOG) 2018 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2018 RTP/SCS). The 2018 RTP/SCS includes the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan in their population and employment projections, and VMT increases associated with buildout of the City of Manteca. However, because the proposed project reduces VMT on a per employee basis compared to what

was previously analyzed in the, the proposed project would result in emissions less than those anticipated and forecasted in the 2018 RTP/SCS.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposed project would be consistent with the strategies as described in the City of Manteca CAP and it functions as an implementation project toward achieving the City's Climate Action Plan. Since the proposed project would not conflict with the Manteca CAP (including consistency with the growth projections generated by the Manteca CAP or SJCOG's RTP/SCS, the proposed project would not generate a significant cumulative impact to GHGs.

The proposed project would not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, impacts related to greenhouse gases are ***less than significant***.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?		X		
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		X		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): The proposed project is warehouse project that is surrounded by light industrial, commercial, residential, and agricultural uses. The project site has been similarly configured since the 1950s. The Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area has previously been identified as having past and present uses that could potentially result in the exposure of persons and environment to hazardous materials. These issues potentially include soil impacts from hazardous materials storage vessels, agricultural chemicals, and septic systems. The project site could also potentially result in the exposure of persons and environment to hazardous materials from some or all of these sources. Since the proposed project does not include demolition, risks associated with demolition of buildings that may contain potential hazards (such as lead and/or asbestos associated with building demolition) are not further discussed herein.

The Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR requires as mitigation that limited soil sampling is to be conducted to delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of the total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel (TPH-D) present in the soils near the deep soil sample location. The proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, which would

ensure that proper soil sampling would occur at the project site, as well as Mitigation Measure HAZ-2, which would ensure that any onsite wells or septic systems intended to be removed shall be destroyed under permit and inspection with San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department (as applicable).

Short-Term Impacts

Project construction activities may involve the use and transport of hazardous materials. These materials may include fuels, oils, mechanical fluids, and other chemicals used during construction. However, under normal conditions, human health and the environment would not be exposed to hazardous materials. In addition, Mitigation Measure HYD-1 requires the project applicant to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan during construction activities to prevent contaminated runoff from leaving the project site.

Long-Term Impacts

Typically, light industrial/warehouse and commercial/retail land uses do not generate, store, or dispose of significant quantities of hazardous materials. Such uses also do not normally involve dangerous activities that could expose persons onsite or in the surrounding areas to large quantities of hazardous materials. While the specific tenants for this project are not known, general landscaping and maintenance will include the use of pest control, herbicide, and janitorial products such as commercial cleaners.

Small quantities of hazardous materials would be used onsite, including cleaning solvents (such as degreasers, paint thinners, and aerosol propellants), paints (both latex- and oil-based), acids and bases (such as many cleaners), disinfectants, and fertilizers. These substances would be stored in secure areas. The potential risks posed by the use and storage of these hazardous materials are primarily limited to the immediate vicinity of the materials. Transport of these materials would be performed by commercial vendors who would be required to comply with various federal and state laws regarding hazardous materials transportation.

Conclusion

The proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, which would ensure that the potential for the proposed project to create a significant hazard to the public or environment due to release of hazardous materials would be less than significant. The proposed project would also be required to implement Mitigation Measure HYD-1. Overall, with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this issue.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Implement Mitigation Measure HYD-1.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a: *Prior to grading activities in areas where TPH-D has been detected, the applicant shall conduct soil sampling to delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of the TPH-D in order to implement a soil remediation program. Soil remediation shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. Contaminated soil shall be excavated and disposed of at an approved disposal facility. Following excavation, confirmation sampling shall be conducted to confirm whether remaining soil meets acceptable applicable regulatory levels. The excavation shall be backfilled with clean soil.*

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b: *Prior to grading activities, any onsite wells or septic systems intended to be removed shall be destroyed under permit and inspection with San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department.*

Response c): The project site is not located within ¼ mile of an existing school. The nearest school (George McParland Elementary School) is located approximately 0.63 miles to the southeast of the project site, at its closest point. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

Response d): According the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) there are no Federal Superfund Sites, State Response Sites, or Voluntary Cleanup Sites on, or in the near vicinity of the project site. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5. The nearest site identified within these databases is located approximately 0.75 miles to the west of the project site, is the:

- Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin – Sharpe Site (site CA8210020832): This site is a hazardous waste facility, which has a current status of Undergoing Closure. Operations at DDRW-Sharpe generate various types of hazardous wastes which are stored in containers on-site in Building 605. When a sufficient quantity of hazardous waste has accumulated, a contractor transfers the waste off-site to an approved treatment and/or disposal facility.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a *less than significant* impact relative to this environmental topic.

Response e): The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) establishes distances of ground clearance for take-off and landing safety based on such items as the type of aircraft using the airport. The project site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip or public airport, and is not located within an airport land use plan. The closest airport or airstrip is the Stockton Metropolitan Airport, located approximately 4 miles north of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact with regards to this environmental issue.

Response f): The Office of Emergency Services (OES) maintains an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) that serves as the official Emergency Plan for San Joaquin County. It includes planned operational functions and overall responsibilities of County Departments during an emergency situation. The Emergency Plan also contains a threat summary for San Joaquin County, which addresses the potential for natural, technological and human-caused disasters (County Code, Title 4-3007).

The County OES also prepared a Hazardous Materials Area Plan (§2720 H&S, 2008) that describes the hazardous materials response system developed to protect public health, prevent environmental damage and ensure proper use and disposal of hazardous materials. The plan establishes effective response capabilities to contain and control releases, establishes oversight of long-term cleanup and mitigation of residual releases, and integrates multi-jurisdiction and agency coordination. This plan is now implemented by the San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department.

The San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department maintains a Hazardous Materials Management Plan/ Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMMP/HMBP). The HMMP/HMBP describes agency roles, strategies and processes for responding to emergencies involving hazardous materials. The Environmental Health Department maintains a Hazardous Materials Database and Risk and Flood Maps available to the public on its website.

In San Joaquin County, all major roads are available for evacuation, depending on the location and type of emergency that arises. The proposed project does not include any actions that would impair or physically interfere with any of San Joaquin County's emergency plans or evacuation routes because it would not change any major roads. Construction activities are not expected to result in any unknown significant road closures, traffic detours, or congestion that could hinder the emergency vehicle access or evacuation in the event of an emergency. Operational traffic generated by the project site would not be significant relative to emergency access.

The project site would provide adequate emergency vehicular access via driveway connections with adjoining roadways and an internal circulation network. All driveways and internal roadways would be designed to accommodate large emergency vehicles such as fire engines. These improvements would contribute to effective emergency response and evacuation, and they would promote efficient circulation in the project vicinity. Furthermore, the proposed project does not propose any permanent road closures, lane reductions, or other adverse circulation conditions that may adversely affect emergency response or evacuation in the project vicinity. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact with regards to this environmental issue.

Response g): The risk of wildfire is related to a variety of parameters, including fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidity levels and fuel moisture contents), and topography (degree of slope). Steep slopes contribute to fire hazard by intensifying the effects of wind and making fire suppression difficult. Fuels such as grass are highly flammable because they have a high surface area to mass ratio and require less heat to reach the ignition point, while fuels such as trees have a lower surface area to mass ratio and require more heat to reach the ignition point.

The city has areas with an abundance of flashy fuels (i.e., grassland) in the outlying residential parcels and open lands that, when combined with warm and dry summers with temperatures often exceeding 100 degrees Fahrenheit, create a situation that results in higher risk of wildland fires. Most wildland fires are human caused, so areas with easy human access to land with the appropriate fire parameters generally result in an increased risk of fire.

According to CalFire, the City of Manteca contains areas with "moderate" and "non-wildland fuel" ranks. The areas warranting "moderate" fuel ranks possess combustible material in sufficient quantities combined with topographic characteristics that pose a wildfire risk. CalFire data for the areas immediately surrounding the project also include "moderate" and "non-wildland fuel" ranks. Areas west of Interstate 5, approximately 15 miles or further southwest of the project site, are designated as "moderate" and "high" fuel ranks.

The project site is located in an area with a "Local Responsibility Zone (LRA) Unzoned" rank. The site is not located on a steep slope, and is essentially flat. The project site is also located in an area with existing agricultural and/or urban development, with existing or future agricultural and/or urban development located on all sides. Therefore, this is a *less than significant* impact and no mitigation is required.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		X		
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;		X		
(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or		X		
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), c.i), c.ii), c.iii), e):

Construction

Construction activities including grading could temporarily increase soil erosion rates during and shortly after project construction. Construction-related erosion could result in the loss of soil and could adversely affect water quality in nearby surface waters.

Temporary stockpiles of sediment or other materials also have the potential to erode and be carried into the stormwater system and waterways. Construction activities will likely involve the use of gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles and equipment that pose a potential risk of accidental fuel and related chemical releases that could enter the drainage system and degrade water quality. As described below, BMPs would be implemented and maintained just before and during any project construction activities to protect surface water in the drainages and the San Joaquin River during all earthwork activities.

The RWQCB requires a project-specific SWPPP to be prepared for each project that disturbs an area one acre or larger, which includes the project. The SWPPP is required to include project specific BMPs that are designed to control drainage and erosion. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 would require the preparation of a SWPPP to ensure that the proposed project prepares and implements a SWPPP throughout the construction phase of the project. By implementing and maintaining proper BMPs, the potential for short-term sediment introduction should be minimized. The SWPPP (Mitigation Measure HYD-1) would reduce the potential for the proposed project to violate water quality standards during construction.

Operation

When land is in a natural or undeveloped condition, soils, mulch, vegetation, and plant roots absorb rainwater. This absorption process is called infiltration or percolation. Much of the rainwater that falls on natural or undeveloped land slowly infiltrates the soil and is stored either temporarily or permanently in underground layers of soil. When the soil becomes completely soaked or saturated with water or the rate of rainfall exceeds the infiltration capacity of the soil, the rainwater begins to flow on the surface of land to low lying areas, ditches, channels, streams, and rivers. Rainwater that flows off a site is defined as storm water runoff. When a site is in a natural condition or is undeveloped, a larger percentage of rainwater infiltrates into the soil and a smaller percentage flows off the site as storm water runoff.

The infiltration and runoff process is altered when a site is developed. Buildings, sidewalks, roads, and parking lots introduce asphalt, concrete, and roofing materials to the landscape. These materials are relatively impervious, which means that they absorb less rainwater. As impervious surfaces are added to the ground conditions, the natural infiltration process is reduced. As a result, the volume and rate of storm water runoff increases. The increased volumes and rates of storm water runoff can result in flooding if adequate storm drainage facilities are not provided.

There are no rivers, streams, or water courses located on or immediately adjacent to the project site. As such, there is low potential for the project to alter a water course, which could lead to on or offsite flooding. Drainage improvements associated with the project site would be located on the project site, and the project would not alter or adversely impact offsite drainage facilities.

The proposed project would not generate new or altered stormwater discharge into streams. Existing streams/crossings would be maintained, and no new crossings are proposed as part of the proposed project.

The proposed project would increase impervious surfaces throughout the project site. The proposed project is subject to the requirements of Chapter 13.28 of the Manteca Municipal Code – Stormwater Management and Discharge Control. The purpose of these requirements is to “establish minimum storm water management requirements and controls to protect and safeguard the general health, safety and welfare of the public residing in watersheds within the City of Manteca.” These requirements are intended to assist in the protection and enhancement of the water quality of watercourses, water bodies, and wetlands in a manner pursuant to and consistent with the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act, 33 USC Section 1251 et seq.), Porter- Cologne Water Quality Control Act (California Water Code Section 13000 et seq.) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) Permit No. CAS000004, as such permit is amended and/or renewed.

Additionally, mitigation is proposed that would require the project applicant to prepare and submit a stormwater quality control plan for the project as a whole to the City of Manteca for review and approval that would demonstrate adequate water quality protection prior to issuance

of building or grading permits. The plan would be required to document the expected target pollutants and types of treatments that would be required of the building site to address those pollutants during operation. The expected polluted runoff from the paved internal roadways and proposed treatment must be included in the plan. The plan would also describe any monitoring effort and performance measures required and what entity would provide oversight to ensure that stormwater quality is sufficiently treated so as not to impede downstream detention basin performance or degrade water quality downstream.

Additionally, as discussed in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, unless a drainage plan is designed and implemented properly, runoff volumes and peak flows generated within the Master Plan area could increase significantly and potentially cause erosion, sedimentation, ponding or flooding along natural and constructed drainages both on- and offsite. As such, it is recommended that the project applicant implement a plan that would keep the volume of runoff equal to or less than existing conditions in order to avoid these potential impacts.

To ensure that such a system is implemented, mitigation is proposed requiring the project applicant, as part of the stormwater quality control plan required under Mitigation Measure HYD-2, to include a drainage plan that demonstrates attainment of pre-project runoff volumes and peak flows prior to release at the outlet canal. As required under Mitigation Measure HYD-4, the drainage plan must also describe the volume reduction measures and treatment controls used to reach attainment. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, drainage impacts would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

With implementation of the following mitigation measures, the proposed project would have a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this environmental topic.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure HYD-1: *Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits for each proposed activity within the Master Plan area, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City of Manteca for approval that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify a practical sequence for BMP implementation, monitoring, and maintenance; site restoration; contingency measures; responsible parties; and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the following elements:*

- *Temporary erosion control measures shall be employed for disturbed areas.*
- *Specific measures shall be identified to protect the onsite open drainages during construction of the proposed resort.*
- *Specific measures shall be identified to protect the French Camp Outlet Canal and Drain 3 during any construction activities.*
- *No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.*
- *Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.*

- *The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains.*
- *BMP performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (e.g., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (such as inadvertent petroleum release) is required by the RWQCB to determine adequacy of the measure.*
- *In the event of significant construction delays or delays in final landscape installation, native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance, as an interim erosion control measure throughout the wet season.*

Mitigation Measure HYD-2: *Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for any development activities that occur pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan and identify expected site-specific pollutants and required measures to treat those pollutants before they reach the regional detention basins and, ultimately, the French Camp Outlet Canal and San Joaquin River. The approved measures shall be incorporated into the proposed project. The plan will describe monitoring and performance measures and standards required in order to ensure water quality is adequately protected during operation of all proposed sites within the project area. Examples of stormwater pollution prevention measures and practices to be incorporated into the plan include but are not limited to:*

- *Strategically placed bioswales and landscaped areas that promote percolation of runoff*
- *Pervious pavement*
- *Roof drains that discharge to landscaped areas*
- *Trash enclosures with screen walls and roofs*
- *Stenciling on storm drains*
- *Curb cuts in parking areas to allow runoff to enter landscaped areas*
- *Rock-lined areas along landscaped areas in parking lots*
- *Catch basins*
- *Oil/water separators*
- *Regular sweeping of parking areas and cleaning of storm drainage facilities*
- *Employee training to inform maintenance personnel of stormwater pollution prevention measures*

Mitigation Measure HYD-4: *Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan for the project as a whole to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan that demonstrates attainment of pre-project runoff requirements prior to release at the outlet canal and describes the volume reduction measures and treatment controls used to reach attainment. The drainage plan shall identify all expected flows from the project area and the location, size, and type of facilities used to retain and treat the runoff volumes and peak flows to meet pre-project conditions. The approved drainage plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.*

Response b): The Master Plan area is located in the Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin. Groundwater levels in Eastern San Joaquin County have been in decline, due to overdraft, and there is a significant cone of depression east of Stockton and northeast of the project area. There may be some contribution from the site in support of agricultural or domestic uses, but there are no onsite or nearby domestic wells that would be directly affected.

There would be a measurable decrease in immediate recharge that is due to construction of impervious surfaces within the project site; however, the proposed regional detention ponds, open channel swale, and preservation of Drain 3 within the broader Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area would maintain local recharge capabilities, as described in the Master Plan EIR. The specific volume, location, and seasonal timing of recharge would vary from existing conditions, but the net local effect would not be expected to adversely impact overall groundwater supply in the area; therefore, this project does not have the potential to significantly interfere with groundwater recharge.

The proposed project uses would be served with potable water for domestic purposes, irrigation, and fire flow from the City of Manteca, through the City's Municipal Well System and an agreement with SSJID for treated surface water. A Water Supply Assessment was prepared by the City of Manteca and concluded that adequate long-term water supplies exist to serve the Master Plan uses, including the uses at the project site. As such, the Master Plan uses would not contribute to groundwater overdraft.

The proposed project is a warehouse project that is surrounded by light industrial, commercial, residential, and agricultural uses. The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). In addition, construction activities would be temporary and minor. Therefore, project construction and operation would not substantially deplete or interfere with groundwater supply or quality. This impact would be *less than significant*.

Response c.iv), d): As shown in Figure 9, the western portion of the project site is located within the 500-year flood zone. The 500-year flood zone by definition indicates an area protected by levees from the 1% annual chance flood.

The risks of flooding hazards on the project site and immediate surroundings are primarily related to large, infrequent storm events. These risks of flooding are greatest during the rainy season between November and March. Flooding events can result in damage to structures, injury or loss of human and animal life, exposure to waterborne diseases, and damage to infrastructure. In addition, standing floodwater can destroy agricultural crops, undermine infrastructure and structural foundations, and contaminate groundwater.

In 2007, the State of California passed a series of laws referred to as Senate Bill (SB) 5 directing the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to prepare flood maps for the Central Valley flood system and the State Plan of Flood Control, which includes a system of levees and flood control facilities located in the Central Valley. This legislation set specific locations within the area affected by the 200-year flood event as the urban level of flood protection (ULOP) for the Central Valley.

SB5 “requires all cities and counties within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, as defined in California Government Code Sections 65007(h) and (j), to make findings related to an ULOP or national Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standard of flood protection before: (1) entering into a development agreement for any property that is located within a flood hazard zone; (2) approving a discretionary permit or other discretionary entitlement, or ministerial permit that would result in the construction of a new residence, for a project that is located within a flood hazard zone; or (3) approving a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, for any subdivision that is located within a flood hazard zone.” In 2016, the City of Manteca approved a Memorandum of Understanding to pursue 200-year urban level of flood protection to satisfy SB 5.

However, according to FEMA’s Flood Map Service Center (FIRM Panel #06077C0610F), the project site is located outside of the 100-year floodplain. Additionally, according to the USACE, the project site is located outside of the 200-year floodplain. Therefore, the release of pollutants due to project inundation is unlikely, either during project construction or operation.

As shown in Figure 10, the project site is located within a dam inundation area for the New Melones Dam and the San Luis Dam. Dam failure is generally a result of structural instability caused by improper design or construction, instability resulting from seismic shaking, or overtopping and erosion of the dam. Larger dams that are higher than 25 feet or with storage capacities over 50 acre-feet of water are regulated by the California Dam Safety Act, which is implemented by the California Department of Water Resources, Division of Safety of Dams (DSD). The DSD is responsible for inspecting and monitoring these dams. The Act also requires that dam owners submit to the California Office of Emergency Services inundation maps for dams that would cause significant loss of life or personal injury as a result of dam failure. The County Office of Emergency Services is responsible for developing and implementing a Dam Failure Plan that designates evacuation plans, the direction of floodwaters, and provides emergency information.

Regular inspection by DSD and maintenance by the dam owners ensure that the dams are kept in safe operating condition. As such, failure of these dams is considered to have an extremely low probability of occurring and is not considered to be a reasonably foreseeable event.


The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

The project site is not anticipated to be inundated by a tsunami because it is located at an elevation of approximately 21 to 34 feet above sea level and is approximately 60 miles away from the Pacific Ocean which is the closest ocean waterbody.

The project site is not anticipated to be inundated by a seiche because it is not located in close proximity to a water body capable of creating a seiche.

Implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation by flood hazards, seiches, and tsunamis, or the potential to alter the course of a stream or river in a manner that would impede or redirect flood flows.


This page left intentionally blank.



Legend

- City Limits
- Manteca Sphere of Influence (SOI)
- Assessor Parcel
- FEMA 500-year Flood Zone
- FEMA Area with Reduced Risk due to Levee
- FEMA Area of Minimal Flood Hazard
- USACE Comprehensive Study 200-year Flood Zone


Source: FEMA; DWR; San Joaquin County; City of Manteca. Map date: June 2, 2020.










MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH

Figure 9. Flood Zone Map

This page left intentionally blank.



- Legend**
-  Project Boundary
 -  City Limits
 -  Manteca Sphere of Influence (SOI)
 -  Assessor Parcel
 -  San Luis Reservoir Inundation Area
 -  New Melones Dam Inundation Area



MANTECA CENTERPOINT SOUTH

Figure 10. Dam Inundation Areas

Source: Office of Emergency Services Dam Inundation Areas made available via sjmap.org; San Joaquin County; City of Manteca. Map date: June 2, 2020.

This page left intentionally blank.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The project site is located within the Manteca City limits and is adjacent primarily to existing urban and agricultural uses. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Response b): The key planning documents that are directly related to, or that establish a framework within which the proposed project must be consistent, include:

- City of Manteca General Plan; and
- City of Manteca Zoning Ordinance.

The project site is designated as LI by the City's General Plan Land Use Map, and the project site is zoned MP – Master Plan for the City of Manteca Zoning Map.

According to the City of Manteca 2023 General Plan, the LI designation provides for industrial parks, warehouses, distribution centers, light manufacturing, public and quasi-public uses and similar and compatible uses.

The purpose of the MP - Master Plan Zoning District is to establish a process for the consideration and regulation of areas suitable for proposed comprehensive development with detailed development plans and of those areas that require special planning.

The proposed project would not require changes to any land use designations, and would be consistent with the existing zoning, and is supportive to the utility demands for each of these uses. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with any goals, policies, or implementing actions contained within the General Plan. Therefore, impacts to land use compatibility would be **less than significant**.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X	

Existing Setting

The California Geological Survey identifies areas that contain or that could contain significant mineral resources so as to provide context for local agency land use decisions and to protect availability of known mineral resources. Classifications ranging from Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) -1 to MRZ-4 are based on knowledge of a resource's presence and the quality of the resource. No mineral extraction operations are known to exist in or adjacent to the project site. The project site is within MRZ-1, as delineated by the Mineral Resources and Mineral Hazards Mapping Program (MRMHMP) (California Department of Conservation, 2012). MRZ-1 is defined by the MRMHMP as being in areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): As noted above, the project site is located within MRZ-1. The proposed project activities would not result in substantial subsurface excavation and would not preclude future exploration for, and extraction of, mineral resources since the proposed use would be decommissioned in the long-term. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of an available known mineral resources nor result in the loss of availability of locally-important mineral resource recovery sites delineated in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Additionally, there are no oil and gas extraction wells within or near the property. Therefore, the impact is *less than significant* to this environmental topic.

XIII. NOISE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Fundamentals of Acoustics

Acoustics is the science of sound. Sound may be thought of as mechanical energy of a vibrating object transmitted by pressure waves through a medium to human (or animal) ears. If the pressure variations occur frequently enough (at least 20 times per second), then they can be heard and are called sound. The number of pressure variations per second is called the frequency of sound, and is expressed as cycles per second or Hertz (Hz).

Noise is a subjective reaction to different types of sounds. Noise is typically defined as (airborne) sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected or undesired, and may therefore be classified as a more specific group of sounds. Perceptions of sound and noise are highly subjective from person to person.

Measuring sound directly in terms of pressure would require a very large range of numbers. The decibel (dB) scale is used to facilitate graphical visualization of large ranges of numbers. The decibel scale uses the hearing threshold (20 micropascals), as a point of reference, defined as 0 dB. Other sound pressures are then compared to this reference pressure, and the logarithm is taken to keep the numbers in a graphically practical range. The decibel scale allows a million-fold increase in pressure to be expressed as 120 dB, and changes in levels correspond closely to human perception of relative loudness.

The perceived loudness of sounds is dependent upon many factors, including sound pressure level and frequency content. However, within the usual range of environmental noise levels, perception of loudness is relatively predictable, and can be approximated by A-weighted sound levels. There is a strong correlation between A-weighted sound levels (expressed as dBA) and the way the human ear perceives sound. For this reason, the A-weighted sound level has become the standard tool of environmental noise assessment. All noise levels reported in this section are in terms of A-weighted levels and are expressed in units of dBA, unless otherwise noted.

The decibel scale is logarithmic, not linear. In other words, two sound power levels 10 dB apart differ in acoustic energy by a factor of 10. When the standard logarithmic decibel is A-weighted,

an increase of 10 dBA is generally perceived as a doubling in loudness. For example, a 70 dBA sound is half as loud as an 80 dBA sound, and twice as loud as a 60 dBA sound.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the ambient noise level, which is defined as the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given environment. A common statistical tool to measure the ambient noise level is the average, or equivalent, sound level (L_{eq}), which corresponds to a steady-state A weighted sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given time period (usually one hour). The L_{eq} is the foundation of the composite noise descriptor, L_{dn} , and shows very good correlation with community response to noise.

The day/night average level (L_{dn}) is based upon the average noise level over a 24-hour day, with a +10 decibel weighting applied to noise occurring during nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) hours. The nighttime penalty is based upon the assumption that people react to nighttime noise exposures as though they were twice as loud as daytime exposures. Because L_{dn} represents a 24-hour average, it tends to disguise short-term variations in the noise environment. CNEL is similar to L_{dn} , but includes a +5 dBA penalty for evening noise. Typically, CNEL and L_{dn} values are within 0.5 dBA of each other and are often considered to be synonymous. Table NOISE-1 lists several examples of the noise levels associated with common situations.

Table NOISE-1: Typical Noise Levels

<i>Common Outdoor Activities</i>	<i>Noise Level (dBA)</i>	<i>Common Indoor Activities</i>
	--110--	Rock Band
Jet Fly-over at 300 m (1,000 ft)	--100--	
Gas Lawn Mower at 1 m (3 ft)	--90--	
Diesel Truck at 15 m (50 ft), at 80 km/hr (50 mph)	--80--	Food Blender at 1 m (3 ft) Garbage Disposal at 1 m (3 ft)
Noisy Urban Area, Daytime Gas Lawn Mower, 30 m (100 ft)	--70--	Vacuum Cleaner at 3 m (10 ft)
Commercial Area Heavy Traffic at 90 m (300 ft)	--60--	Normal Speech at 1 m (3 ft)
Quiet Urban Daytime	--50--	Large Business Office
Quiet Urban Nighttime	--40--	Theater, Large Conference Room
Quiet Suburban Nighttime	--30--	Library
Quiet Rural Nighttime	--20--	Bedroom at Night, Concert Hall
	--10--	Broadcast/Recording Studio
Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing	--0--	Lowest Threshold of Human

SOURCE: CALTRANS, TECHNICAL NOISE SUPPLEMENT, TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS PROTOCOL, NOVEMBER 2009.

Effects of Noise on People

The effects of noise on people can be placed in three categories:

- Subjective effects of annoyance, nuisance, and dissatisfaction;
- Interference with activities such as speech, sleep, and learning; and
- Physiological effects such as hearing loss or sudden startling.

Environmental noise typically produces effects in the first two categories. Workers in industrial plants can experience noise in the last category. There is no completely satisfactory way to

measure the subjective effects of noise or the corresponding reactions of annoyance and dissatisfaction. A wide variation in individual thresholds of annoyance exists and different tolerances to noise tend to develop based on an individual's past experiences with noise.

Thus, an important way of predicting a human reaction to a new noise environment is the way it compares to the existing environment to which one has adapted: the so-called ambient noise level. In general, the more a new noise exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise will be judged by those hearing it.

With regard to increases in A-weighted noise level, the following relationships occur:

- Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of 1 dBA cannot be perceived;
- Outside of the laboratory, a 3 dBA change is considered a just-perceivable difference;
- A change in level of at least 5 dBA is required before any noticeable change in human response would be expected; and
- A 10 dBA change is subjectively heard as approximately a doubling in loudness, and can cause an adverse response.

Stationary point sources of noise – including stationary mobile sources such as idling vehicles – attenuate (lessen) at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source, depending on environmental conditions (i.e. atmospheric conditions and either vegetative or manufactured noise barriers, etc.). Widely distributed noises, such as a large industrial facility spread over many acres, or a street with moving vehicles, would typically attenuate at a lower rate.

Regulatory Setting – Manteca General Plan

The City of Manteca General Plan Noise Element contains goals, policies, and implementation measures for assessing noise impacts within the City. Listed below are the noise goals, policies, and implementation measures that are applicable to the proposed project:

Goals

- N-1. Protect the residents of Manteca from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise.
- N-3. Ensure that the downtown core noise levels remain acceptable and compatible with commercial and higher density residential land uses.
- N-4. Protect public health and welfare by eliminating existing noise problems where feasible, by establishing standards for acceptable indoor and outdoor noise, and by preventing significant increases in noise levels.
- N-5. Incorporate noise considerations into land use planning decisions, and guide the location and design of transportation facilities to minimize the effects of noise on adjacent land uses.

Policies

- N-P-2. New development of residential or other noise-sensitive land uses will not be permitted in noise-impacted areas unless effective mitigation measures are incorporated into the project design to satisfy the performance standards in Table 9-1 (Table 14 of this section).
- N-P-3. The City may permit the development of new noise-sensitive uses only where the noise level due to fixed (non-transportation) noise sources satisfies the noise level standards of Table 9-2. Noise mitigation may be required to meet Table 9-2 performance standards (Table 15 of this section).
- N-P-5. In accord with the Table 9-2 standards, the City shall regulate construction-related noise impacts on adjacent uses.

Implementation Measures

- N-I-1. New development in residential areas with an actual or projected exterior noise level of greater than 60 dB L_{dn} will be conditioned to use mitigation measures to reduce exterior noise levels to less than or equal to 60 dB L_{dn} .
- N-I-3. In making a determination of impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a substantial increase will occur if ambient noise levels are increased by 10 dB or more. An increase from 5-10 dB may be substantial. Factors to be considered in determining the significance of increases from 5-10 dB include:
- the resulting noise levels
 - the duration and frequency of the noise
 - the number of people affected
 - the land use designation of the affected receptor sites
 - public reactions or controversy as demonstrated at workshops or hearings, or by correspondence
 - prior CEQA determinations by other agencies specific to the project
- N-I-4. Control noise at the source through use of insulation, berms, building design and orientation, buffer space, staggered operating hours and other techniques. Use noise barriers to attenuate noise to acceptable levels.

Table NOISE-2: Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure Mobile Noise Sources

MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NOISE EXPOSURE MOBILE NOISE SOURCES			
Land Use ⁴	Outdoor Activity Areas ¹	Interior Spaces	
		Ldn/CNEL, dB	Leq, dB ³
Residential	60 ²	45	
Transient Lodging	60 ²	45	
Hospitals, Nursing Homes	60 ²	45	
Theaters, Auditoriums, Music Halls			35
Churches, Music Halls	60 ²		40
Office Buildings	65		45
Schools, Libraries, Museums			45
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	70		

¹Outdoor activity areas for residential development are considered to be backyard patios or decks of single family dwellings, and the common areas where people generally congregate for multi-family developments. Outdoor activity areas for non-residential developments are considered to be those common areas where people generally congregate, including pedestrian plazas, seating areas, and outside lunch facilities. Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

²In areas where it is not possible to reduce exterior noise levels to 60 dB L_{dn} or below using a practical application of the best noise-reduction technology, an exterior noise level of up to 65 L_{dn} will be allowed.

³Determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

⁴Where a proposed use is not specifically listed on the table, the use shall comply with the noise exposure standards for the nearest similar use as determined by the City.

SOURCE: MANTECA GENERAL PLAN, TABLE 9-1.

Table NOISE-3: Performance Standards for Stationary Noise Sources or Projects Affected by Stationary Noise Sources

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR STATIONARY NOISE SOURCES OR PROJECTS AFFECTED BY STATIONARY NOISE SOURCES ^{1,2}		
Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime	Nighttime
	7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	10 p.m. to 7 a.m.
Hourly Leq, dB	50	45
Maximum Level, dB	70	65

¹Each of the noise levels specified above should be lowered by five (5) dB for simple noise tones, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or recurring impulsive noises. Such noises are generally considered by residents to be particularly annoying and are a primary source of noise complaints.

²No standards have been included for interior noise levels. Standard construction practices should, with the exterior noise levels identified, result in acceptable interior noise levels.

SOURCE: MANTECA GENERAL PLAN, TABLE 9-2.

Regulatory Setting – Manteca Noise Ordinance

Section 9.52.030 of the City of Manteca Municipal Code prohibits excessive or annoying noise or vibration to residential and commercial properties in the City. The following general rules are outline in the ordinance:

9.52.030 Prohibited noises—General standard

No person shall make, or cause to suffer, or permit to be made upon any public property, public right-of-way or private property, any unnecessary and unreasonable noises, sounds or vibrations which are physically annoying to reasonable persons of ordinary sensitivity or which are so harsh or so prolonged or unnatural or unusual in their use, time or place as to cause or contribute to the unnecessary and unreasonable discomfort of any persons within the neighborhood from which said noises emanate or which interfere with the peace and comfort of residents or their guests, or the operators or customers in places of business in the vicinity, or which may detrimentally or adversely affect such residences or places of business. (Ord. 1374 § 1(part), 2007)

17.58.050 D. Exempt Activities

8. Construction activities when conducted as part of an approved Building Permit, except as prohibited in Subsection 17.58.050(E)(1) (Prohibited Activities) below.

17.58.050 E. Prohibited Activities

1. Construction Noise. Operating or causing the operation of tools or equipment on private property used in alteration, construction, demolition, drilling, or repair work daily between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., so that the sound creates a noise disturbance across a residential property line, except for emergency work of public service utilities.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The proposed project has the potential to generate a substantial increase in temporary ambient noise from project construction activities, and a substantial increase in permanent ambient noise during project operation.

Construction Noise

The proposed project could result in temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. Table NOISE-4, below, provides a list of the types of equipment which may be associated with construction activities and the associated noise levels.

In order for noise impacts created by construction of the proposed Northwest Airport Way Master Plan uses (including the proposed project) to be considered potentially significant, the construction noise level would need to either increase noise levels by 10 dB or more where the without project noise level is less than the 60-dB Ldn residential standard, or increase noise levels by 5 dB or more where the without project noise level is greater than the 60-dB Ldn residential standard.

Activities involved in project construction would typically generate maximum noise levels ranging from 70 to 84 dB at a distance of 100 feet. The nearest residential receptors would be located approximately 100 feet from the nearest on-site project construction activities.

Nevertheless, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1, which was included within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, which requires the project applicant to follow strict noise attenuation requirements. Specifically, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 requires the contractor to implement various sound control measures, including limitation of construction hours, using noise attenuation devices on heavy equipment, and the use of a minimum 10-foot-high construction noise barrier along the edge of the project site within 300 feet of any offsite residence.

As provided in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, during the Southern phase of construction of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan (which includes the project site), with inclusion of the 10-foot-high construction noise barrier along the edge of the project site (as required under Mitigation Measure NOI-1), the noise increase during construction is estimated at 3.3 dB over existing noise levels, which is less than the 5 dB or greater significance threshold.

Moreover, Mitigation Measure TRANS-7 requires the applicant to submit a Construction Traffic Control Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval, to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network.

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, impacts from construction noise are considered **less than significant**.

Table NOISE-4: Construction Equipment Noise

Type of Equipment	Predicted Noise Levels, L_{max} dB				Distances to Noise Contours, feet	
	Noise Level at 50'	Noise Level at 100'	Noise Level at 200'	Noise Level at 400'	70 dB L_{max} contour	65 dB L_{max} contour
Backhoe	78	72	66	60	126	223
Compactor	83	77	71	65	223	397
Compressor (air)	78	72	66	60	126	223
Concrete Saw	90	84	78	72	500	889
Dozer	82	76	70	64	199	354
Dump Truck	76	70	64	58	100	177
Excavator	81	75	69	63	177	315
Generator	81	75	69	63	177	315
Jackhammer	89	83	77	71	446	792
Pneumatic Tools	85	79	73	67	281	500

SOURCE: ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION NOISE MODEL USER'S GUIDE. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION. FHWA-HEP-05-054. JANUARY 2006.

Operational Noise

Generally, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it will substantially increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas or expose people to severe noise levels. In practice, more specific professional standards have been developed. These standards state that a noise impact may be considered significant if it would generate noise that would conflict with local planning criteria or ordinances, or substantially increase noise levels at noise-sensitive land uses.

The proposed project would not directly generate increased noise beyond typical noise levels found at warehouse projects of the kind developed by the proposed project. The proposed project

would generate noise from the generation of new passenger and heavy-duty vehicle trips, as well as from on-site activities such as landscaping. However, operational vehicle traffic generated by the proposed project would be limited to no more than approximately 494 trips per day (246 passenger vehicle trips and 248 heavy-duty truck trips) as provided by the Transportation Impact Analysis Report prepared by Fehr & Peers (March 23, 2021).

In order for noise impacts created by roadway noise to be considered potentially significant, noise generated by the project would need to either increase noise levels by 10 dB or more, where the noise level without the project is less than the 60-dB Ldn residential standard, or increase noise levels by 5 dB or more where the noise level without the project is greater than the 60-dB Ldn residential standard. As identified in the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, for the cumulative conditions, a less than significant offsite noise impact from Master Plan-related vehicle traffic noise would occur along the study area roadways.

Moreover, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-4, in accordance with the Master Plan EIR, which requires limitations on the use of street sweepers and mechanical landscape equipment, as applicable.

Therefore, operation traffic noise associated with the proposed project would result in a **less than significant** impact generated from project-related traffic noise.

Conclusion

The proposed project is not anticipated to generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of the applicable standards. Nevertheless, the proposed project would be required to implement the following mitigation measures, which would provide for additional construction-related noise attenuation requirements. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 and NOI-4, this is a **less than significant** impact.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-7.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: *During project construction activities, the applicant shall require its construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements:*

- *Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily. The City of Manteca Director of Public Works shall have the discretion to permit construction activities to occur outside of allowable hours if compelling circumstances warrant such an exception (e.g., weather conditions necessary to pour concrete).*
- *All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. If no noise-reduction features were installed by the manufacturer, then the contractor shall require that at least a muffler be installed on the equipment.*
- *Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearest residence, unless safety or technical factors take precedence (e.g., an equipment breakdown).*
- *A 10-foot-high construction noise barrier shall be installed along the edge of the project site within 300 feet of any offsite residence prior to start of grading activities, as applicable. The noise barrier shall either be constructed of a minimum 0.5-inch plywood or utilize acoustical*

blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 12. The barrier shall remain in place until noise intensive aspects of construction are completed.

Mitigation Measure NOI-4: *During project operations, the use of street sweepers and mechanical landscape maintenance equipment (lawnmowers, leaf blowers, etc.) shall be prohibited between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.*

Response b): Vibration is like noise in that it involves a source, a transmission path, and a receiver. While vibration is related to noise, it differs in that in that noise is generally considered to be pressure waves transmitted through air, whereas vibration usually consists of the excitation of a structure or surface. As with noise, vibration consists of an amplitude and frequency. A person’s perception to the vibration will depend on their individual sensitivity to vibration, as well as the amplitude and frequency of the source and the response of the system which is vibrating.

Vibration can be measured in terms of acceleration, velocity, or displacement. A common practice is to monitor vibration measures in terms of peak particle velocities in inches per second. Standards pertaining to perception as well as damage to structures have been developed for vibration levels defined in terms of peak particle velocities.

Human and structural response to different vibration levels is influenced by several factors, including ground type, distance between source and receptor, duration, and the number of perceived vibration events. Table NOISE-5 indicates that the threshold for damage to structures ranges from 0.2 to 0.6 peak particle velocity in inches per second (in/sec p.p.v). One-half this minimum threshold or 0.1 in/sec p.p.v. is considered a safe criterion that would protect against architectural or structural damage. The general threshold at which human annoyance could occur is noted as 0.1 in/sec p.p.v.

The primary vibration-generating activities associated with the proposed project would occur during construction when activities such as grading, utilities placement, and roadway construction occur. Sensitive receptors which could be impacted by construction related vibrations, especially vibratory compactors/rollers, are located approximately 100 feet or further from the project site. At this distance, construction vibrations are not predicted to exceed the threshold of significance. Additionally, construction activities would be temporary in nature and would likely occur during normal daytime working hours.

Construction vibration impacts include human annoyance and building structural damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of perception. Building damage can take the form of cosmetic or structural. Table NOISE-6 shows the typical vibration levels produced by construction equipment.

Table NOISE-5: Effects of Vibration on People and Buildings

Peak Particle Velocity		Human Reaction	Effect on Buildings
mm/sec.	in./sec.		
0.15-0.30	0.006-0.019	Threshold of perception; possibility of intrusion	Vibrations unlikely to cause damage of any type
2.0	0.08	Vibrations readily perceptible	Recommended upper level of the vibration to which ruins and ancient monuments should be subjected

2.5	0.10	Level at which continuous vibrations begin to annoy people	Virtually no risk of “architectural” damage to normal buildings
5.0	0.20	Vibrations annoying to people in buildings (this agrees with the levels established for people standing on bridges and subjected to relative short periods of vibrations)	Threshold at which there is a risk of “architectural” damage to normal dwelling - houses with plastered walls and ceilings. Special types of finish such as lining of walls, flexible ceiling treatment, etc., would minimize “architectural” damage
10-15	0.4-0.6	Vibrations considered unpleasant by people subjected to continuous vibrations and unacceptable to some people walking on bridges	Vibrations at a greater level than normally expected from traffic, but would cause “architectural” damage and possibly minor structural damage.

SOURCE: CALTRANS. TRANSPORTATION RELATED EARTHBOEN VIBRATIONS. TAV-02-01-R9601 FEBRUARY 20, 2002.

Table NOISE-6: Vibration Levels for Varying Construction Equipment

Type of Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity @ 25 feet (inches/second)	Peak Particle Velocity @ 100 feet (inches/second)
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.011
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.010
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.000
Auger/drill Rigs	0.089	0.011
Jackhammer	0.035	0.004
Vibratory Hammer	0.070	0.009
Vibratory Compactor/roller	0.210	0.026

SOURCE: FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, TRANSIT NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES, MAY 2006

The Tables NOISE-5 and NOISE-6 data indicate that construction vibration levels anticipated for the project are less than the 0.2 in/sec p.p.v. threshold of damage to buildings and less than the 0.1 in/sec threshold of annoyance criteria at distances over 100 feet. Therefore, construction vibrations are not predicted to cause damage to existing buildings or cause annoyance to sensitive receptors.

Separately, operational levels of vibration are expected to be minimal, as the on-site operations and on- and off-site use of vehicles (including the heavy-duty trucks) generated by the proposed project are not known to be major sources of vibration. Any vibration generated by these sources on sensitive receptors would be far less than those generated by project construction activities nearby sensitive receptors during project construction. Therefore, operational vibrations are not predicted to cause damage to existing buildings or cause annoyance to sensitive receptors.

Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this environmental topic.

Response c): The project site is not located within the vicinity of an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport or airstrip is the Stockton Metropolitan Airport, located approximately 4 miles north of the project site. Based on the year 2035 operations of the airport, the Master Plan area

is located approximately 1.6 miles southwest of the nearest calculated noise contour of 60 dB CNEL. Because of distance, the Master Plan area is not adversely impacted by aviation noise. The proposed project would, therefore, not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with such airport facilities. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Implementation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** relative to this topic.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The proposed project is a warehouse project that is surrounded by light industrial, commercial, residential, and agricultural uses. The project would develop the 8.85-acre vacant subject property (project site) with two concrete tilt-up wall warehouse buildings, automobile and trailer parking areas, landscaped areas, drainage and utility improvements, as well as driveways and drive aisles. The proposed project would not include upsizing of offsite infrastructure or roadways. The installation of new infrastructure would be limited to the internal project site. The sizing of the infrastructure would be specific to the size of the proposed project building and the number and type of vehicles that would travel to and from the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. Although the proposed project would create new jobs, which could create some population growth, it is anticipated that such new jobs would be for the existing labor force within Manteca and the surrounding communities. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would have **no impact** relative to this topic.

Response b): The project site is currently vacant and does not contain housing. The proposed project would not displace housing or people. Implementation of the proposed project would have **no impact** relative to this topic.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?		X		
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?				X

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a):

Fire Protection

The project site is currently under the jurisdiction of the Manteca Fire Department. The Manteca Fire Department serves approximately 71,164 residents throughout approximately 17.2 square miles within the City limits. The Manteca Fire Department operates out of four (4) facilities that are strategically located in the City of Manteca. The nearest fire station to the project site is Manteca Fire Station #4 located at 1465 Lathrop Road, approximately 0.7 miles southeast of the project site.

The Manteca Fire Department maintains a goal for the initial company of three (3) firefighters to arrive on scene for fire and emergency medical service (EMS) incidents within five (5) minutes 90% of the time (Response Effectiveness). In 2016, the Department averaged a response time for Code 3 emergencies such as fires, medical calls or auto accidents at 4:20 minutes City-wide. In 2017, the Department averaged a 4:22 response time City-wide. In 2017, the MFD on an average handled 7,579 emergency calls and 6,737 in 2016. The Department is currently meeting the Response Effectiveness goal.

On September 11, 2013, Fire Station No. 4 opened in northwest Manteca. Fire Station No. 4 was one factor that helped to improve both the average response time and the percent of response effectiveness in since its opening.

The construction of Fire Station No. 5, which is planned in southeast Manteca, will have a similar impact on response times and response effectiveness. Funding for this station is dependent on additional annexations and development in the area. The construction and staffing of Fire Station No. 5 will allow the City the ability to achieve the full alarm standard outlined by the National Fire Protection Association 1710 for the first time in the City’s History; this will directly affect the Insurance Services Office (ISO) Public Protection Classification (PPC) rating, enhance service to the citizens of Manteca, and improve the department’s ability to obtain grants. Nevertheless, the City’s currently ISO PPC is rated Class 2 on a scale of 1 to 10, with Class 1 being the highest possible protection rating and Class 10 being the lowest, which is better than most of the jurisdictions in San Joaquin and Stanislaus County.

The proposed project is a warehouse project that is surrounded by light industrial, commercial, residential, and agricultural uses. The City of Manteca receives funds for the provision of public services through development fees, property taxes, and connection and usage fees. As land is developed within the City and annexed into the City of Manteca, these fees apply. The City of Manteca reviews these fee structures on an annual basis to ensure that they provide adequate financing to cover the provision of city services. The City's Community Development, Public Works, and Finance Departments are responsible for continual oversight to ensure that the fee structures are adequate. The City reviews the referenced fees and user charges on an annual basis to determine the correct level of adjustment required to reverse any deficits and assure funding for needed infrastructure going forward. The City includes discussion of these fees and charges as part of the annual budget hearings.

The City of Manteca General Plan 2023 includes policies and implementation measures that would allow for the Department to continue providing adequate facilities and staffing levels. Below is a list of relevant policies:

- The City shall endeavor to maintain an overall fire insurance (ISO) rating of 4 or better (Policy PF-P-42).
- The City shall endeavor through adequate staffing and station locations to maintain the minimum feasible response time for fire and emergency calls (PF-P-43).
- The City shall provide fire services to serve the existing and projected population (PF-P-44).
- The City will establish the criteria for determining the circumstances under which fire service will be enhanced (PF-P-45).
- The Fire Department shall continuously monitor response times and report annually on the results of the monitoring (PF-I-24).
- The City shall encourage a pattern of development that promotes the efficient and timely development of public services and facilities (LU-P-3).

Impact fees from new development are collected based upon projected impacts from each development. The adequacy of impact fees is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that the fee is commensurate with the service. Payment of applicable impact fees by new development, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes, sales taxes, and other revenues generated by the proposed project, would fund capital and labor costs associated with fire protection services. Payment of such fees is adequate to ensure that the proposed project would not result in any CEQA impacts related to this topic, including the potential for the proposed project to cause substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically alternated governmental services, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure PSU-1, the impact of the proposed project on the need for additional fire services facilities is ***less than significant***.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure PSU-1: *Prior to issuance of building permits for any project uses, the project applicant shall provide the City of Manteca will all applicable fire protection development fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule.*

Police Protection

The project site is currently under the jurisdiction of the Manteca Police Department. In 2019, the MPD had 74 sworn officers. The Manteca Police Department operates out of its headquarters located at 1001 W. Center Street. The project site is located approximately 4.52 miles northwest of the headquarters.

The Manteca Police Department is organized into two divisions: Operations and Services. Additionally, the Police Department operates a Public Affairs Unit. For budgeting purposes, the Police Department is organized into the following programs: administration, patrol, investigations, support services, dispatch, code enforcement, jail services, and animal services.

Response times are an important benchmark of police service. Response times can vary greatly depending on the size of the city and department, geographical location, and levels of crime. Smaller cities usually have faster response times, due simply to the geography. Calls for service are prioritized into three general categories: Priority 1, Priority 2 or Priority 3. Priority 1 calls are calls where a threat is posed to life or a crime of violence. Priority 2 calls are calls for service where there is an urgency or suspicious behavior. Priority 3 calls are calls for service where no emergency or serious problem is involved. In 2016, there were 217 Priority 1 calls, 18,080 Priority 2 calls, and 8,551 Priority 3 calls, totaling 26,841 calls. Calls for service increased to 46,256 total calls in 2018. The averages for the department's response times in 2016 for the 3 priorities are listed below.

- Priority 1 calls: 2016, 4 minutes and 27 seconds.
- Priority 2 calls: 2016, 27 minutes and 2 seconds.
- Priority 3 calls: 2016, 50 minutes and 22 seconds.

The proposed project is a warehouse project that is surrounded by light industrial, commercial, residential, and agricultural uses. The City of Manteca receives funds for the provision of public services through development fees, property taxes, and connection and usage fees. As land is developed within the City and annexed into the City of Manteca, these fees apply. The City of Manteca reviews these fee structures on an annual basis to ensure that they provide adequate financing to cover the provision of city services. The City's Community Development, Public Works, and Finance Departments are responsible for continual oversight to ensure that the fee structures are adequate. The City reviews the referenced fees and user charges on an annual basis to determine the correct level of adjustment required to reverse any deficits and assure funding for needed infrastructure going forward. The City includes discussion of these fees and charges as part of the annual budget hearings.

The Police Department had previously requested that the projects developed in the Master Plan area implement Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design practices, as well as other techniques intended to deter and prevent criminal activity. This request will be incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the Master Plan uses. Furthermore, as part of the City of Manteca's standard design review process, the Police Department will have the opportunity to review and comment on the site plans of each the Master Plan uses (including the proposed project), including the application of criminal activity deterrence and prevention practices and techniques.

The City's General Plan includes policies and implementation measures that would allow for the Manteca Police Department to continue providing adequate staffing levels. Below is a list of relevant policies:

- The City shall endeavor through adequate staffing and patrol arrangements to maintain the minimum feasible police response times for police calls. As of 2019, the City had 74 sworn officers. With a population of 84,800 (as of 2020), that equates to a staffing level of .87 officers per 1000 residents.
- The City shall provide police services to serve the existing and projected population. The Police Department will continuously monitor response times and report annually on the results of the monitoring.

Impact fees from new development are collected based upon projected impacts from each applicable development. The adequacy of impact fees is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that the fee is commensurate with the service. Payment of the applicable impact fees by the Project applicant, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes, sales taxes, and other revenues generated by the proposed project, would fund capital and labor costs associated with police services. Payment of such fees is adequate to ensure that the proposed project would not result in any CEQA impacts related to this topic, including the potential for the proposed project to cause substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically alternated governmental services, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.

Based on the current adequacy of existing response times and the ability of the Manteca Police Department to serve the City, it is anticipated that the existing police department facilities are sufficient to serve the proposed project. Consequently, any impacts would be ***less than significant***.

Schools

Most schools within the City of Manteca are part of the Manteca Unified School District (MUSD). The MUSD provides school services for grades kindergarten through 12 (K-12) within the communities of Manteca, Manteca, Stockton, and French Camp. The District is approximately 113 square miles and serves more than 23,000 students. Within the City of Manteca, there are three elementary schools (Manteca Elementary School, Joseph Widmer School, and Mossdale Elementary School) and one high school (Sierra High School). River Islands has two charter elementary schools, located within the Banta Unified School District (River Islands Technology Academy and the S.T.E.A.M. Academy).

MUSD provides school services for grades K through 12 within the communities of Manteca, Lathrop, Stockton, and French Camp. MUSD operates 14 elementary and middle schools (grades K-8), four high schools (grades 9-12), one community day school (grades 7-12), and one vocational academy (grades 11-12). The schools in the City had a total enrollment of approximately 14,279 students, of which 9,416 were enrolled in elementary and middle school (grades K – 8) and 4,863 were enrolled in high school (grades 9 – 12).

The proposed project does not include any residential units, and therefore would not directly increase the student population in the area.

The MUSD collects impact fees from new developments under the provisions of The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, enacted by Senate Bill 50 (“SB 50”). SB 50 restricts the ability of local agencies to deny or condition land use approvals on the basis that school facilities are inadequate and precludes local agencies from requiring anything other than payment of the prevailing developer fee adopted by the local school district. SB 50 sets forth the “exclusive methods of considering and mitigating impacts on school facilities” resulting from any planning

and/or development project, regardless of whether its character is legislative, adjudicative, or both. Govt. Code § 65996(a) (emphasis added).

Section 65995(h) provides that “[t]he payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code in the amount specified in Section 65995 ... is hereby deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property ... on the provision of adequate school facilities.”

The reference in Section 65995(h) to fees “imposed pursuant to Section 17620 of the Education Code in the amount specified in Section 65995” is to per-square-foot school fees that can be imposed by school districts on new residential and commercial and industrial construction. Pursuant to this authority, the District has adopted a Level 1 fee in the amount of \$3.79 per square foot of assessable space of new residential construction. Payment of this Level 1 fee by the applicant constitutes full and complete mitigation of all impacts of the project on the District’s school facilities as a matter of law. (Gov’t Code § 65995(h).)

Under SB 50, the City of Manteca is legally precluded from concluding, under CEQA or otherwise, that payment of the prevailing Level 1 fee will not completely mitigate the impacts of the project. Government Code § 65995(a) sets forth the “exclusive methods of considering and mitigating impacts on school facilities” when evaluating a development project. Because the methods of both “considering and mitigating” impacts on school facilities set forth in Government Code section 65996(a) are exclusive, SB 50 obviates the need for CEQA documents even to contain a description and analysis of a development project’s impacts on school facilities. See *Chawanakee Unified Sch. Dist. v. Cty. of Madera*, 196 Cal. App. 4th 1016, 1027 (2011). Further, these statutes prohibit local agencies from concluding that payment of the authorized fees do not constitute full and complete mitigation of a project’s school facilities impacts. Local agencies have no power to supersede the legislature’s express and unambiguous directives on this subject.

Nor does the City possess the authority to deny or condition the project unless the applicant agrees to pay fees or provide other mitigation beyond the duly adopted Level 1 fee. Under Government Code § 65995(a), a “local agency may not deny or refuse to approve a legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property ... on the basis of a person’s refusal to provide school facilities mitigation that exceeds the amounts authorized pursuant to [SB 50.]”

In short, payment of the Level 1 fee is “deemed to provide full and complete school facilities mitigation and, notwithstanding [Government Code] Section 65858, or [CEQA], or any other provision of state or local law, a state or local agency may not deny or refuse to approve [the] development of real property ... on the basis that school facilities are inadequate.”

Payment of the applicable impact fees from new development, and ongoing revenues that would come from taxes, would fund capital and labor costs associated with school services. The adequacy of fees is reviewed on an annual basis to ensure that the fee is commensurate with the service. Payment of the applicable impact fees, and ongoing revenues that would come from property taxes and other revenues generated by the proposed project, would fund improvements associated with school services.

The provisions of State law are considered full and complete mitigation for the purposes of analysis under CEQA for school construction needed to serve new development. In fact, State law

expressly precludes the City from reaching a conclusion under CEQA that payment of the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act school impact fees would not completely mitigate new development impacts on school facilities. Consequently, the City of Manteca is without the legal authority under CEQA to impose any fee, condition, or other exaction on the project for the funding of new school construction other than the fees allowed by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act. Additionally, local agencies are prohibited from using the inadequacy of school facilities as a basis for denying or conditioning approvals. Although MUSD may collect higher fees than those imposed by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act, no such fees are required to mitigate the impact under CEQA. Because the project would pay fees as required by The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act, this impact would be *less than significant*.

Parks

CEQA requires that the proposed project is analyzed to determine whether any substantial adverse impacts would be associated with any new or physically altered governmental facilities that may be required to serve the proposed project (in this case, for park and recreation facilities). The proposed project directly increases the number of persons in the area as a result of an increase in employment potential. The proposed project does not include any residential units.

The proposed project does not include the construction of residential uses, does not directly increase the need for additional parks. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **no impact** relative to this topic.

Other Public Facilities

The proposed project would not result in a need for other public facilities that are not addressed above, or in Section XVIII, Utilities and Service Systems. Implementation of the proposed project would have *no impact* relative to this issue.

XVI. RECREATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a): The proposed project is a warehouse project that is surrounded by light industrial, commercial, residential, and agricultural uses. However, as identified under *Impact XV. Public Services*, the proposed project does not include the construction of residential uses, and therefore does not generate additional direct demand on park services. Thus, the potential impact would be reduced to a **less than significant** level.

Responses b): The proposed project does not include the construction of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Implementation of the proposed project would have **no impact** relative to this topic.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?		X		
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?		X		
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): The project site is located on the outskirts of the City of Manteca, within the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Area, with a relatively low volume of traffic occurring on nearby roadways. The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with the nearby Northwest Airport Way Master Plan.

Construction

Construction traffic would be temporary and minor. The proposed project is a warehouse project that would not include extensive construction activities beyond what would normally be required for a project of this type. Specifically, the bulk of project construction activities would include the construction of the proposed project building (i.e. warehouse), as well as paving and other basic infrastructure within the project site including to construct the on-site parking spots and internal roadways. In addition, the proposed project is required to implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-7, which requires the project applicant to develop and submit a Construction Traffic Control Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan is required to identify the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network. The plan must encourage the use of Interstate 5 (I-5), Roth Road, Airport Way, and Lathrop Road, wherever practical. Additionally, if necessary, construction equipment and materials deliveries would be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation. The plan would also be required to identify suitable locations for construction worker parking.

Overall, due to the temporary and minor nature of construction activities, potential construction impacts to this topic would be ***less than significant***.

Operational

According to the traffic consultant (Fehr & Peers), and as provided in Appendix C of this IS/MND, the proposed project would generate approximately 494 total daily trips. Approximately 246 of these trips would be generated by passenger vehicles, while approximately 248 of these vehicles would be generated by heavy-duty truck trips. Table TR-1 provides the project trip generation for all vehicles; Table TR-2 provides project trip generation for passenger vehicles only; and Table TR-3 provides project trip generation for heavy-duty trucks only.

Table TR-1: Project Trip Generation (All Vehicles)

Land Use	ITE Code	Gross Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)	Daily (All Vehicles)	AM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)			PM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)		
			Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Proposed Facility A	110	52,029	258	36	32	4	33	4	29
Proposed Facility B	110	47,485	236	33	29	4	30	4	26
CenterPoint South Project		99,514	494	69	61	8	63	8	55

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Table TR-2: Project Trip Generation (Employee Vehicles - Passenger Cars/SUVs/Light-duty Trucks)

Land Use	ITE Code	Gross Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)	Daily (All Vehicles)	AM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)			PM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)		
			Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Total
Proposed Facility A	110	52,029	128	18	18	0	17	0	17
Proposed Facility B	110	47,485	118	17	17	0	15	0	15
CenterPoint South Project		99,514	246	35	35	0	32	0	32

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Table TR-3: Project Trip Generation (CA Legal and STAA Trucks)

Land Use	ITE Code	Gross Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)	Daily (All Vehicles)	AM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)			PM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)		
			Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Proposed Facility A	110	52,029	130	18	14	4	16	4	12
Proposed Facility B	110	47,485	118	16	12	4	15	4	11
CenterPoint South Project		99,514	99,514	248	34	26	8	31	8

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

It should also be noted that the City of Manteca has recently (July 2020) completed an updated Truck Route Analysis, as part of the update to the General Plan, that identifies California Legal and Surface Transport Assistance Act (STAA) Truck Routes. These include truck routes to and from NWAAMP using Airport Way, Roth Road, and Lathrop Road. The City of Manteca has initiated discussions with the City of Lathrop to update the Lathrop-Manteca Traffic Study (August 28, 2008) that was completed as part of the City of Manteca and City of Lathrop Settlement Agreement.

CenterPoint South Vehicle Miles Travelled Analysis (VMT)

The CenterPoint South Project does not qualify as a small project for screening purposes, and it is not located in a low VMT area. Therefore, consistent with SB 743, vehicle travel was evaluated using VMT as the primary metric. The following describes the baseline VMT levels for industrial land uses in the City of Manteca. The Baseline VMT and Cumulative Project VMT was developed using the City of Manteca travel demand model that was derived from the San Joaquin Council of Government's (SJCOG) Regional Travel Demand Model (Fehr & Peers, 2020).

Roadway improvements and land use projections consistent with the SJCOG Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), City of Manteca General Plan, and City of Lathrop General Plan were added to the Cumulative Conditions Model (Fehr & Peers, 2020).

Table TR-4 presents modeled “Baseline Citywide and Cumulative with Project VMT” (inclusive of all project-generated VMT) prorated per industrial employee. The proposed project will result in a decrease in VMT when compared to baseline citywide, from 37.9 to 32.9 vehicle miles per employee. This represents a 13.2% decrease when compared to baseline city-wide average. Therefore, the construction of the proposed project will improve the jobs to housing balance in the City of Manteca and provide an overall benefit to reducing VMT on a per employee basis.

Table TR-4: Project Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis

Scenario	VMT Per Industrial Employee	VMT Reduction Per Industrial Employee	Percentage Reduction Per Industrial Employee
Baseline Citywide	37.9		
Cumulative With CenterPoint South Project	32.9	-5.0	-13.2

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Note: Citywide VMT includes All industrial land Uses in the City of Manteca

Roadway Segment Level of Service (LOS) Analysis

In addition to VMT, the secondary measure analyzed for the transportation analysis was segment level of service for “Existing (Year 2020)” and “Existing Plus Project” weekday average daily traffic (ADT) conditions.

The Transportation Impact Analysis studied the projected ADT volumes for twenty-six (26) study roadway segments in the project study area (Fehr & Peers, 2020). The “Existing Plus Project” Level of Service (LOS) analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers shows that the proposed project would add a low of 5 vehicles to a high of 345 vehicles on the external roadway system. The results of the roadway segment LOS analysis showed that the proposed project would not result in any impacts to the surrounding transportation network. All twenty-six roadway segments would continue to operate at acceptable Level of Service C or D under “Existing Plus Project” conditions.

Roadway Segment Level of Service Analysis – Cumulative Conditions

Similar to the “Existing Plus Project” conditions scenario, the results of the roadway segment LOS analysis prepared by Fehr & Peers under the “Cumulative Plus Project” conditions shows that the proposed project would not result in any impacts to the surrounding transportation network under this condition. All twenty-six roadway segments would continue to operate at acceptable Level of Service C or D under the “Cumulative Plus Project” conditions. This would ensure that potential impacts to this impact would be **less than significant**.

Conclusion

The proposed project improves the jobs to housing balance in the City of Manteca and provide an overall benefit to reducing VMT per employee. In addition, under all conditions (including cumulative plus project conditions), the proposed project would not result in any impacts to the surrounding transportation network. Lastly, Fehr & Peers maintains a continually updated traffic model that is consistent with all applicable plans, ordinances, and policies that address the circulation system. Therefore, the transportation modeling conducted by Fehr & Peers is consistent with all applicable plans, ordinances, and policies that address the circulation system.

Nevertheless, to ensure that the project is consistent with the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan EIR, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1, TRANS-4a, TRANS-6a, TRANS-6b, TRANS-6c, and TRANS-7, as applicable. With implementation of these mitigation measure, the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to these topics.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TRANS-1: *Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay all transportation-related fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule at the time permits are sought. Such fees shall include, but not be limited to, the City of Manteca Public Facilities Implementation Plan fee and the San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Impact Fee.*

Mitigation Measure TRANS-4a: *Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about appropriate frontage improvements. All necessary frontage improvements shall be depicted on the final site plan and implemented as part of site development.*

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a: *Prior to site plan review, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department, Manteca Transit, and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District about the inclusion of appropriate transit facilities (turnouts, shelters, etc.) or services (e.g., an employee shuttle). If transit facilities are deemed to be necessary, they shall be provided on the final site plan. If transit services are deemed to be necessary, the applicant shall prepare a service plan and submit it to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The approved plan shall be incorporated into the project. To the extent feasible, transit facilities and services shall be coordinated among Master Plan uses to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.*

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b: *Prior to site plan review, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate bicycle facilities (racks, lockers, etc.). If bicycle facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.*

Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c: *Prior to site plan review, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate pedestrian facilities. If pedestrian facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.*

Mitigation Measure TRANS-7: *Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a Construction Traffic Control Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall identify the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network. The plan shall encourage the use of Interstate 5 (I-5), Roth Road, Airport Way, and Lathrop Road wherever practical. Anticipated temporary road closures should be identified, along with safety measures and detours. If necessary, construction equipment and materials deliveries shall be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation. The plan shall also identify suitable locations for construction worker parking.*

Responses c), d): The proposed project would develop the Centerpoint South project, which is a warehouse project, which would build out a portion of the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan area, as planned for. No site circulation or access issues have been identified that would cause a

traffic safety problem/hazard or any unusual traffic congestion or delay within the proposed project. The volumes on the internal roadways would be relatively low.

However, during construction, the predominant vehicle routes (for haul trucks) would follow either Roth Road or Lathrop Road from I-5 and then, if necessary, turn onto Airport Way. The presence of large and slow-moving vehicles and construction equipment on streets in the vicinity of the project site may result in potential hazards to motorists. Additionally, project construction activities may result in temporary lane closures along Roth Road, Airport Way, and Lathrop Road. Accordingly, mitigation is proposed requiring the project applicant to implement a Construction Traffic Control Plan during construction activities to minimize impacts on surrounding roadways and nearby parking areas, as provided under Mitigation Measure TRANS-7. The implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to this topic to a level of less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-7, there is a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?		X		
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resources to a California Native American tribe.		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions

Responses a), b): AB 52 Tribal Consultation is a requirement by which public agencies are required to consult with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project that is subject to CEQA, if the tribes request formal notification and subsequently consultation.

In order to participate in AB 52 tribal consultation, a tribe must specifically request, in writing, to be notified by lead agencies through formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area with which the tribe is traditionally and culturally affiliated. However, there are no tribes that have requested such formal notification of proposed projects in the City of Manteca. Therefore, according to AB 52, there is no requirement that a lead agency (i.e. City of Manteca) engage in AB 52 tribal consultation.

No Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) have been documented in the project site. Nevertheless, the project is located in a region where significant cultural resources have been recorded and there remains a potential that undocumented archaeological resources that may meet the TCR definition could be unearthed or otherwise discovered during ground-disturbing and construction activities. Examples of significant archaeological discoveries that may meet the TCR definition would include villages and cemeteries. Due to the possible presence of undocumented TCRs within the project site, construction-related impacts on tribal cultural resources would be potentially significant. With implementation of the following mitigation measure, the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact related to tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-4.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X		
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?		X		
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?		X		
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?		X		
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		X		

Responses to Checklist Questions**Response a-c):****Water**

It is anticipated that water supply for the proposed project would be local groundwater and treated surface water from SSJID's South County Water Supply Program (SCWSP). Water distribution will be by an underground distribution system to be installed as per the City of Manteca standards and specifications. The applicant for the proposed project will provide their proportionate share of required funding to the City for the acquisition and delivery of treated potable water supplies to the proposed project site through connection fees.

The City has adequate water supplies to support existing demand in the City in addition to the proposed project under average daily and maximum daily demand conditions. According to the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), water demand for current and proposed uses in the City of Manteca is 21,894 acre-feet per year (AFY). The City has a projected total supply of 26,428 AFY in the year 2020, leaving 4,534 AFY available. The City's 2015 UWMP Planning Area corresponds with the City SOI established in the City's 2023 General Plan. The City's 2015 UWMP included existing and projected water demands for existing and projected future land uses to be developed within the City's Sphere of Influence through 2030. The water demand projections in the City's 2015 UWMP included existing City water demands, future water demands for developments within the existing City limit, and future water demands for future service areas outside the existing City limit.

The City's General Plan designates the project site as LI, which allows for the uses proposed for the project. Therefore, the City's 2023 General Plan anticipated the project. The analysis included in the City's UWMP assumed that the site would be developed with LI uses. The project would not increase demand beyond the levels assumed for the site in the City's UWMP.

The proposed project would not result in insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, a ***less than significant*** impact would occur related to water supply and water infrastructure.

Wastewater

The City of Manteca owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system, and provides sanitary sewerage service to the City of Manteca and a portion of the City of Lathrop. On April 17, 2015, the RWQCB adopted Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R5-2015-0026 NPDES NO. CA0081558, prescribing waste discharge requirements for the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility (WQCF) and allowing expansion of the plant up to 17.5 mgd.

The City's Wastewater Quality Control Facility Master Plan Update includes projected wastewater generation factors for various land uses. Based on these calculations it was determined that the City will have flows totaling 19.5 mgd as of the General Plan horizon of 2023 with a buildout capacity of 23.0 mgd. The study includes a reduction of industrial and general commercial wastewater generation factors to reflect historical water use data from local businesses.

According to the City's 2012 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan Update, Light Industrial uses are estimated to generate 1000 gallons per acre per day. The project site includes 23.5 acres of Light Industrial. Using this rate, the proposed Light Industrial uses on the project site would generate approximately 23,500 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater. Accordingly, the proposed project would increase the amount of wastewater requiring treatment. The wastewater would be treated at the WQCF. Occupancy of the proposed project would be prohibited without sewer allocation.

The City's available capacity would ensure that there would not be a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider that there is inadequate capacity to serve the proposed project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Additionally, any planned expansion to the WQCF (such as a planned expansion to a total capacity of 27 mgd) with a subsequent allocation of capacity to the proposed project would ensure that there would not be a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider that there is inadequate capacity to serve the proposed Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

As noted above, the City's 2023 General Plan designates the project site as LI, which allows for the uses proposed by the project. Therefore, the City's 2023 General Plan anticipated the uses associated with the proposed project on the project site.

Because the project applicant would pay City Public Facilities Improvement Plan (PFIP) fees to develop the site, and adequate long-term wastewater treatment capacity is available to serve full build-out of the project, a ***less than significant*** impact would occur related to requiring or resulting in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Nevertheless, to ensure consistency with the Northwest Airport Way Master Plan, the proposed project is

required to implement the following mitigation measures, which would ensure water efficiency within the project site.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure PSU-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying a non-potable irrigation system that is separate from the potable water systems. The non-potable irrigation system shall use non-potable well water until recycled water is available, at which point it shall be converted to use recycled water.

Mitigation Measure PSU-3b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying that all appropriate and feasible water conservation measures are incorporated into the proposed use(s). The approved measures shall be incorporated into the final development plans. Examples of water conservation measures include but are not limited to:

- Drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping
- Water efficient irrigation systems (drip irrigation, bubbler/soaker systems, hydrozones, evapotranspiration controllers, etc.)
- Sensor-activated low-flow fixtures (e.g., faucets, urinals, and toilets)

Responses d), e): The City of Manteca Solid Waste Division (SWD) provides solid waste hauling service for the City of Manteca and would serve the proposed project. Solid waste from Manteca is primarily landfilled at the Forward Sanitary Landfill, located northeast of Manteca. Other landfills used include Foothill Sanitary and North County.

The permitted maximum disposal at the Forward Landfill is 8,668 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 51.04 million cubic yards. The remaining capacity is 23,700,000 cubic yards. Solid waste generated by the proposed project was estimated based on CalRecycle generation rate estimates by use.

Construction Waste Generation

Short-term construction waste generation is summarized in Table UTIL-1. The estimate of 194 tons was calculated using demolition and non-residential construction waste generation rates provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Table UTIL-1: Construction Solid Waste Generation

Activity	Waste Generation Rate	Square Feet	Waste Generation (Tons)
Construction – Proposed Building A	3.89 pounds per square foot	52,029	194
Construction – Proposed Building B	3.89 pounds per square foot	47,485	
Total	-	99,514	194

Mitigation Measure PSU-6a is proposed that would require construction debris recycling to be implemented. The implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a level of less than significant.

Operational Waste Generation

Operational solid waste generation estimates were calculated using a standard commercial waste generation rate provided by Cal Recycle. As shown in Table UTIL-2, the proposed project uses are estimated to generate 239 tons of solid waste annually.

Table UTIL-2: Operational Solid Waste Generation (Annual)

Waste Generation Rate	Square Feet	Waste Generation (Tons)
4.8 pounds per square foot	99,514	239
-	-	239

Regardless, Mitigation Measure PSU-6b is proposed that would require the installation recycling facilities prior to issuance of occupancy permits. The implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce solid waste generation and reduce demand for landfill capacity. Therefore, solid waste impacts would be reduced to a level of **less than significant**.

Landfill

The City’s solid waste per capita generation has decreased since 2007 due to the waste diversion efforts of the City. The permitted maximum disposal at the Forward Landfill is 8,668 tons per day. Currently, the average daily disposal is 620 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 51.04 million cubic yards. The addition of solid waste associated with the proposed project, approximately 0.93 tons per day at total buildout, to the Forward Landfill would not exceed the landfill’s remaining capacity. The City will need to secure a new location of disposal of all solid waste generated in the City when the Forward landfill is ultimately closed. There are several options that the City will have to consider for solid waste disposal at that time which is estimated to be 2020. Because the project would increase the local waste stream, the project would subject to the City’s waste connection fee.

Development of the site for industrial uses was assumed in the City’s General Plan EIR. The project would not interfere with regulations related to solid waste (i.e. the State-mandated waste target of not less than 75 percent of solid **waste** generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted), or generate waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Mitigation Adopted by the City

Mitigation Measure PSU-6a: *Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to perform construction debris recycling. Following the completion of construction activities, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the satisfaction of the City of Manteca demonstrating that construction debris was recycled.*

Mitigation Measure PSU-6b: *Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which recycling and waste diversion activities shall be achieved. This information shall include but is not limited to the type and location of facilities necessary to collect and store recyclable materials, contractors who would pick-up recyclable and reusable materials, and how recycling and waste diversion activities would be integrated into operational practices. To the extent feasible, centralized recycling facilities are encouraged to enhance the ease and efficiency of such practices. The approved facilities and practices shall be incorporated into the uses envisioned by the project.*

XX. WILDFIRE

<i>Would the project:</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
d) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X	

Existing Setting

There are no State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) within the vicinity of the Manteca Planning Area. In addition, there are no areas within the City of Manteca that are categorized as a "Very High" Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) by CalFire or a local agency. Although this CEQA topic only applies to areas within a SRA or Very High FHSZ, out of an abundance of caution, these checklist questions are analyzed below.

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): The project site will connect to the existing Airport Way. The proposed circulation improvements would allow for sufficient emergency access. The project site would provide adequate emergency vehicular access via driveway connections with adjoining roadways and an internal circulation network. All driveways and internal roadways would be designed to accommodate large emergency vehicles such as fire engines. These improvements would contribute to effective emergency response and evacuation, and they would promote efficient circulation in the project vicinity. Furthermore, the proposed project does not propose any permanent road closures, lane reductions, or other adverse circulation conditions that may adversely affect emergency response or evacuation in the project vicinity. Furthermore, the City of Manteca does not maintain an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts from project implementation would be considered **less than significant** relative to this topic.

Response b): The risk of wildfire is related to a variety of parameters, including fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidity levels and fuel moisture contents) and topography (degree of slope). Steep slopes contribute to fire hazard by intensifying the effects of wind and making fire suppression difficult. Fuels such as grass are highly flammable because they have a high surface area to mass ratio and require less heat to reach the ignition point. San

Joaquin County has areas with an abundance of flashy fuels (i.e. grassland) in the foothill areas of the eastern and western portion of the County. The project site is located in an area that is predominately agricultural and urban, which is not considered at a significant risk of wildfire. Therefore, impacts from project implementation would be considered *less than significant* relative to this topic.

Response c): The proposed project would develop the Centerpoint South project, which is a warehouse project. The development of the proposed project exacerbate fire risks, nor would there be installation or maintenance of any other infrastructure associated with the project that would significantly exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Therefore, impacts from project implementation would be considered *less than significant* relative to this topic.

Response d): Landslides include rockfalls, deep slope failure, and shallow slope failure. Factors such as the geological conditions, drainage, slope, vegetation, and others directly affect the potential for landslides. One of the most common causes of landslides is construction activity that is associated with road building (i.e. cut and fill). The project site is relatively flat; therefore, the potential for a landslide, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, in the project site is essentially non-existent.

Therefore, impacts from proposed project implementation would be considered *less than significant* relative to this topic.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Responses to Checklist Questions

Response a): This Initial Study includes an analysis of the project impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. The analysis covers a broad spectrum of topics relative to the potential for the proposed project to have environmental impacts. This includes the potential for the proposed project to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. It was found that the proposed project would have either no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures. For the reasons presented throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. With the implementation of mitigation measures presented in this Initial Study, the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Response b): In evaluating the cumulative effects of the project, Section 21100(e) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that "previously approved land use documents including, but not limited to, general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans, may be used in cumulative impact analysis."

The City of Manteca maintains a list of ongoing commercial and industrial development, as provided in the “Ongoing Projects” list in Appendix F.

The 2018 RTP/SCS analyzed the region’s transportation system, future growth projections, and potential funding sources in order to develop a long-term framework for transportation improvements and maintenance. The RTP includes policies and regulations set forth to ensure development within the SJCOG regional area is within planned and forecast socioeconomic projections. As part of the RTP, SJCOG developed an SCS, which was required by Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities Act of 2008. The SCS is intended to combine land use and transportation planning with the overall goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions generated by vehicle travel.

According to trip generation calculations, the proposed project would generate a total of 494 total vehicle trips per day, which is made up of 246 daily employee vehicles, and 248 heavy-duty trucks (Appendix C). As described in Section XVII. Transportation, the proposed project improves the jobs to housing balance in the City of Manteca and provide an overall benefit to reducing VMT on a per employee basis. In addition, under all conditions (including cumulative plus project conditions), the proposed project would not result in any impacts to the surrounding transportation network.

Although the potential exists for the proposed project to result in population growth through employment opportunities, the project is not expected to exceed growth projections or generate any increase in population that otherwise would not have been planned for in the City or by SCAG.

As discussed in Section III. Air Quality, construction and operation of the project would not generate criteria pollutants in excess of the SJVAPCD emissions thresholds. Therefore, the project would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts for any air quality pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment. As for cumulative impacts to regional air quality, the discussion in Section III. Air Quality indicates the proposed project would not jeopardize the region’s attainment of air quality standards. The SJVAPCD uses project-level significance thresholds to determine whether a project’s emissions are cumulatively considerable. Because the project’s emissions do not exceed the SJVAPCD’s regional significance thresholds, as detailed in Section III. Air Quality, the SJVAPCD does not consider the project to contribute significantly to a cumulative air quality impact.

As detailed in Section XIII. Noise, for the cumulative conditions, a less than significant offsite noise impact from Master Plan-related vehicle traffic noise would occur along the study area roadways.

Finally, as detailed throughout Section XIX., Utilities and Service Systems, sufficient utility facilities and resources are available to serve the project in addition to existing entitlements.

Conclusion

This Initial Study includes an analysis of the project impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. The analysis covers a broad spectrum of topics relative to the potential for the proposed project to have environmental impacts. It was found that the proposed project would have either no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with the implementation of mitigation

measures. These mitigation measures would also function to reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts.

The project would increase the population and use of public services and systems; however, it was found that there is adequate capacity to accommodate the project.

The proposed project has no impact or a less than significant impact with respect to all environmental issues. Therefore, a *less than significant* cumulative impact would occur, and mitigation is not required.

Responses c): The construction phase could affect surrounding neighbors through increased air emissions, noise, and traffic; however, the construction effects are temporary and are not substantial. The operational phase could also affect surrounding neighbors through increased air emissions, noise, and traffic; however, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed project that would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Implementation of the proposed project would have a *less than significant* impact relative to this topic.

REFERENCES

- Army Corps of Engineers. 1987. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual.
- Barbour and Major 1988. Terrestrial Vegetation of California.
- C Donald Ahrens. 2006. Meteorology Today: An Introduction to Weather, Climate, & the Environment.
- City of Manteca. Adopted December 17, 1991. City of Manteca Comprehensive General Plan.
- City of Manteca, 2003. Manteca General Plan 2023 Draft Environmental Impact Report. Certified October 6, 2003.
- City of Manteca, 2004. Central Manteca Specific Plan.
- City of Manteca, 2004. Central Manteca Specific Plan Draft EIR.
- City of Manteca. 2010. Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- City of Manteca. 2010. Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- City of Manteca. 2011. City of Manteca General Plan 2023. Policy Document. Adopted October 6, 2003. Housing Element Amended June 15, 2010. Circulation Element Amended April 5, 2011. Available:
<https://www.ci.manteca.ca.us/CommunityDevelopment/Documents/City%20of%20Manteca%20General%20Plan.pdf>
- City of Manteca, 2013. 2012 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan Update. January 2013. Available:
<https://www.ci.manteca.ca.us/pwt/Documents/Wastewater%20Collection%20System%20Master%20Plan%20-%20Complete.pdf>
- City of Manteca. 2018. Municipal Service Review and Sphere Of Influence Plan.
- City of Manteca. 2019. Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Addendum.
- City of Manteca. 2020. Manteca Municipal Code.
- California Air Resources Board. Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles. October 2000. Available at:
<<https://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpFinal.pdf>>.
- California Air Resources Board. 2016. ARB Databases: Aerometric Data Analysis and Management System (ADAM). Available at: <<http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/databases.htm>>.
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection Conservation Program Support. 2018. San Joaquin County Williamson Act FY 2016/2017. The Williamson Act. Available at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wa/Pages/stats_reports.aspx

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection. 2018. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. San Joaquin County Important Farmland 2016. Available: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/SanJoaquin.aspx>
- California Department of Conversation. 2012. Author: Smith, J.D. and Clinkenbeard J.P. Special Report 199. Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Stockton-Lodi Production-Consumption Region, San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, California. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_199/
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2007. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area (SRA). Adopted by CAL FIRE on October 2, 2007. Available at: http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_joaquin/fhszs_map.39.pdf
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2007. Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. Adopted by CAL FIRE on November 7, 2007. Available: http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_joaquin/fhszl06_1_map.39.pdf
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2017. EnviroStor database. Accessed on May 1, 2020. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
- California Energy Commission. 2005. Global Climate Change: In Support of the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report. (CEC-600-2005-007.) Available at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005publications/CEC-100-2005-007/CEC-100-2005-007-CMF.PDF>.
- California Energy Commission. 2006. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990 to 2004. (CEC-600-2006-013-SF.) Available at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-600-2006-013/CEC-600-2006-013-SF.PDF>.
- California Energy Commission. 2021. California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory – 2016 Edition. Available at: <https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). 2020. Version 03/2020. Accessed in April 2020.
- City of Manteca. 2013. City of Manteca Climate Action Plan. Adopted October 15, 2013. <http://www.ci.manteca.ca.us/communitydevelopment/Documents/Final%20Climate%20Action%20Plan.pdf>.
- City of Manteca. 2016. Final Draft City of Manteca 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. July 2016. Available: https://www.ci.manteca.ca.us/Engineering/Documents/Manteca_2015_UWMP-FinalDraft.pdf#search=uwmp
- Fehr & Peers. 2020. Traffic Impact Analysis for the CenterPoint South Project. November 2020.
- Hickman, James C. 1993. Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California.
- Huffman Broadway. 2020. Email correspondence Senior Wetland Regulatory Scientist Robert F. Perrera, at 4:59pm on 4/30/2020.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2013. "Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policymakers." Available at: http://www.climatechange2013.org/images/report/WG1AR5_SPM_FINAL.pdf

Pacific Gas & Electric. 2019. Where your Electricity Comes From. 2018 Power Mix. Available at: https://www.pge.com/pge_global/common/pdfs/your-account/your-bill/understand-your-bill/bill-inserts/2019/1019-Power-Content-Label.pdf

Sawyer, John and Todd Keeler-Wolf. 1995. A Manual of California Vegetation.

Skinner, Mark W. and Bruce M. Pavlik, Eds. 2001. California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. Climate Change Indicators in the United States: Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Updated May 2014. Available at: www.epa.gov/climatechange/indicators

This page left intentionally blank.

APPENDIX A: CALEEMOD RESULTS

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

**Centerpoint South
San Joaquin County, Annual**

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	52.03	1000sqft	1.19	52,029.00	0
Parking Lot	6.58	Acre	6.58	286,624.80	0
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	47.49	1000sqft	1.09	47,485.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.7	Precipitation Freq (Days)	51
Climate Zone	2			Operational Year	2022
Utility Company	Pacific Gas & Electric Company				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MW hr)	641.35	CH4 Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail (since project contains no cold storage). Building 1: 52,029 sf. Building 2: 47,485 sf. Remaining area modeled as parking lot.

Construction Phase -

Grading - Site is relatively flat.

Vehicle Trips - Trip rate as provided by Traffic Impact Analysis (Fehr & Peers)

Fleet Mix - Fleet mix adjusted to reflect vehicle fleet mix from Traffic Impact Analysis.

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblFleetMix	HHD	0.06	0.50
tblFleetMix	LDA	0.56	0.36
tblFleetMix	LDT1	0.04	0.02
tblFleetMix	LDT2	0.18	0.12
tblFleetMix	LHD1	0.02	0.00
tblFleetMix	LHD2	4.6870e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	MCY	5.0550e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	MDV	0.12	0.00
tblFleetMix	MH	8.1800e-004	0.00
tblFleetMix	MHD	0.02	0.00
tblFleetMix	OBUS	1.1900e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	SBUS	6.1000e-004	0.00
tblFleetMix	UBUS	1.4530e-003	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	10.00	8.85
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	1.68	4.96
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	1.68	4.96
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	1.68	4.96

2.0 Emissions Summary

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2020	0.0319	0.3313	0.1843	3.4000e-004	0.1234	0.0167	0.1401	0.0654	0.0154	0.0808	0.0000	29.5543	29.5543	9.2300e-003	0.0000	29.7851
2021	0.3459	3.0941	2.7854	6.9400e-003	0.2359	0.1266	0.3625	0.0725	0.1188	0.1913	0.0000	621.7454	621.7454	0.0901	0.0000	623.9966
2022	0.7548	0.0148	0.0257	5.0000e-005	2.5500e-003	8.3000e-004	3.3800e-003	6.8000e-004	8.3000e-004	1.5100e-003	0.0000	4.6511	4.6511	2.2000e-004	0.0000	4.6565
Maximum	0.7548	3.0941	2.7854	6.9400e-003	0.2359	0.1266	0.3625	0.0725	0.1188	0.1913	0.0000	621.7454	621.7454	0.0901	0.0000	623.9966

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	tons/yr										MT/yr					
2020	0.0319	0.3313	0.1843	3.4000e-004	0.1234	0.0167	0.1401	0.0654	0.0154	0.0808	0.0000	29.5543	29.5543	9.2300e-003	0.0000	29.7850
2021	0.3459	3.0941	2.7854	6.9400e-003	0.2359	0.1266	0.3625	0.0725	0.1188	0.1913	0.0000	621.7450	621.7450	0.0901	0.0000	623.9962
2022	0.7548	0.0148	0.0257	5.0000e-005	2.5500e-003	8.3000e-004	3.3800e-003	6.8000e-004	8.3000e-004	1.5100e-003	0.0000	4.6511	4.6511	2.2000e-004	0.0000	4.6565
Maximum	0.7548	3.0941	2.7854	6.9400e-003	0.2359	0.1266	0.3625	0.0725	0.1188	0.1913	0.0000	621.7450	621.7450	0.0901	0.0000	623.9962

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Quarter	Start Date	End Date	Maximum Unmitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)	Maximum Mitigated ROG + NOX (tons/quarter)
1	11-9-2020	2-8-2021	0.7474	0.7474
2	2-9-2021	5-8-2021	0.8683	0.8683
3	5-9-2021	8-8-2021	0.8950	0.8950
4	8-9-2021	11-8-2021	0.8969	0.8969
5	11-9-2021	2-8-2022	1.1656	1.1656
		Highest	1.1656	1.1656

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.4824	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003
Energy	3.2800e-003	0.0298	0.0250	1.8000e-004		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003	0.0000	194.7996	194.7996	7.9600e-003	2.1100e-003	195.6286
Mobile	0.2199	6.7789	1.6052	0.0194	0.5720	0.0155	0.5874	0.1548	0.0147	0.1695	0.0000	1,838.5513	1,838.5513	0.1278	0.0000	1,841.7472
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	18.9878	0.0000	18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	7.3006	36.2232	43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878
Total	0.7057	6.8087	1.6312	0.0196	0.5720	0.0177	0.5897	0.1548	0.0170	0.1718	26.2883	2,069.5760	2,095.8643	2.0094	0.0202	2,152.1069

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

2.2 Overall Operational

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Area	0.4824	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003
Energy	3.2800e-003	0.0298	0.0250	1.8000e-004		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003	0.0000	194.7996	194.7996	7.9600e-003	2.1100e-003	195.6286
Mobile	0.2199	6.7789	1.6052	0.0194	0.5720	0.0155	0.5874	0.1548	0.0147	0.1695	0.0000	1,838.5513	1,838.5513	0.1278	0.0000	1,841.7472
Waste						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	18.9878	0.0000	18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414
Water						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	7.3006	36.2232	43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878
Total	0.7057	6.8087	1.6312	0.0196	0.5720	0.0177	0.5897	0.1548	0.0170	0.1718	26.2883	2,069.5760	2,095.8643	2.0094	0.0202	2,152.1069

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	12/5/2020	12/18/2020	5	10	
2	Grading	Grading	12/19/2020	1/15/2021	5	20	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	1/16/2021	12/3/2021	5	230	
4	Paving	Paving	12/4/2021	12/31/2021	5	20	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	1/1/2022	1/28/2022	5	20	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 8.85

Acres of Paving: 6.58

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 149,271; Non-Residential Outdoor: 49,757; Striped Parking Area: 17,197 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	162.00	63.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	32.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.2 Site Preparation - 2020

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0903	0.0000	0.0903	0.0497	0.0000	0.0497	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0204	0.2121	0.1076	1.9000e-004		0.0110	0.0110		0.0101	0.0101	0.0000	16.7153	16.7153	5.4100e-003	0.0000	16.8505
Total	0.0204	0.2121	0.1076	1.9000e-004	0.0903	0.0110	0.1013	0.0497	0.0101	0.0598	0.0000	16.7153	16.7153	5.4100e-003	0.0000	16.8505

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.6000e-004	2.6000e-004	2.5400e-003	1.0000e-005	7.2000e-004	0.0000	7.2000e-004	1.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0000e-004	0.0000	0.6358	0.6358	2.0000e-005	0.0000	0.6362
Total	3.6000e-004	2.6000e-004	2.5400e-003	1.0000e-005	7.2000e-004	0.0000	7.2000e-004	1.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0000e-004	0.0000	0.6358	0.6358	2.0000e-005	0.0000	0.6362

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.2 Site Preparation - 2020

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0903	0.0000	0.0903	0.0497	0.0000	0.0497	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0204	0.2121	0.1076	1.9000e-004		0.0110	0.0110		0.0101	0.0101	0.0000	16.7153	16.7153	5.4100e-003	0.0000	16.8505
Total	0.0204	0.2121	0.1076	1.9000e-004	0.0903	0.0110	0.1013	0.0497	0.0101	0.0598	0.0000	16.7153	16.7153	5.4100e-003	0.0000	16.8505

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.6000e-004	2.6000e-004	2.5400e-003	1.0000e-005	7.2000e-004	0.0000	7.2000e-004	1.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0000e-004	0.0000	0.6358	0.6358	2.0000e-005	0.0000	0.6362
Total	3.6000e-004	2.6000e-004	2.5400e-003	1.0000e-005	7.2000e-004	0.0000	7.2000e-004	1.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0000e-004	0.0000	0.6358	0.6358	2.0000e-005	0.0000	0.6362

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.3 Grading - 2020

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0318	0.0000	0.0318	0.0154	0.0000	0.0154	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0109	0.1187	0.0722	1.3000e-004		5.7300e-003	5.7300e-003		5.2700e-003	5.2700e-003	0.0000	11.7264	11.7264	3.7900e-003	0.0000	11.8213
Total	0.0109	0.1187	0.0722	1.3000e-004	0.0318	5.7300e-003	0.0375	0.0154	5.2700e-003	0.0207	0.0000	11.7264	11.7264	3.7900e-003	0.0000	11.8213

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.7000e-004	1.9000e-004	1.9100e-003	1.0000e-005	5.4000e-004	0.0000	5.4000e-004	1.4000e-004	0.0000	1.5000e-004	0.0000	0.4768	0.4768	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4771
Total	2.7000e-004	1.9000e-004	1.9100e-003	1.0000e-005	5.4000e-004	0.0000	5.4000e-004	1.4000e-004	0.0000	1.5000e-004	0.0000	0.4768	0.4768	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4771

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.3 Grading - 2020

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0318	0.0000	0.0318	0.0154	0.0000	0.0154	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0109	0.1187	0.0722	1.3000e-004		5.7300e-003	5.7300e-003		5.2700e-003	5.2700e-003	0.0000	11.7264	11.7264	3.7900e-003	0.0000	11.8212
Total	0.0109	0.1187	0.0722	1.3000e-004	0.0318	5.7300e-003	0.0375	0.0154	5.2700e-003	0.0207	0.0000	11.7264	11.7264	3.7900e-003	0.0000	11.8212

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.7000e-004	1.9000e-004	1.9100e-003	1.0000e-005	5.4000e-004	0.0000	5.4000e-004	1.4000e-004	0.0000	1.5000e-004	0.0000	0.4768	0.4768	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4771
Total	2.7000e-004	1.9000e-004	1.9100e-003	1.0000e-005	5.4000e-004	0.0000	5.4000e-004	1.4000e-004	0.0000	1.5000e-004	0.0000	0.4768	0.4768	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.4771

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.3 Grading - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0378	0.0000	0.0378	0.0187	0.0000	0.0187	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0126	0.1361	0.0872	1.6000e-004		6.3800e-003	6.3800e-003		5.8700e-003	5.8700e-003	0.0000	14.3295	14.3295	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.4454
Total	0.0126	0.1361	0.0872	1.6000e-004	0.0378	6.3800e-003	0.0442	0.0187	5.8700e-003	0.0246	0.0000	14.3295	14.3295	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.4454

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.0000e-004	2.1000e-004	2.1200e-003	1.0000e-005	6.6000e-004	0.0000	6.6000e-004	1.7000e-004	0.0000	1.8000e-004	0.0000	0.5608	0.5608	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.5612
Total	3.0000e-004	2.1000e-004	2.1200e-003	1.0000e-005	6.6000e-004	0.0000	6.6000e-004	1.7000e-004	0.0000	1.8000e-004	0.0000	0.5608	0.5608	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.5612

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.3 Grading - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Fugitive Dust					0.0378	0.0000	0.0378	0.0187	0.0000	0.0187	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0126	0.1361	0.0872	1.6000e-004		6.3800e-003	6.3800e-003		5.8700e-003	5.8700e-003	0.0000	14.3295	14.3295	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.4454
Total	0.0126	0.1361	0.0872	1.6000e-004	0.0378	6.3800e-003	0.0442	0.0187	5.8700e-003	0.0246	0.0000	14.3295	14.3295	4.6300e-003	0.0000	14.4454

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	3.0000e-004	2.1000e-004	2.1200e-003	1.0000e-005	6.6000e-004	0.0000	6.6000e-004	1.7000e-004	0.0000	1.8000e-004	0.0000	0.5608	0.5608	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.5612
Total	3.0000e-004	2.1000e-004	2.1200e-003	1.0000e-005	6.6000e-004	0.0000	6.6000e-004	1.7000e-004	0.0000	1.8000e-004	0.0000	0.5608	0.5608	1.0000e-005	0.0000	0.5612

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.2186	2.0047	1.9062	3.1000e-003		0.1102	0.1102		0.1037	0.1037	0.0000	266.3829	266.3829	0.0643	0.0000	267.9895
Total	0.2186	2.0047	1.9062	3.1000e-003		0.1102	0.1102		0.1037	0.1037	0.0000	266.3829	266.3829	0.0643	0.0000	267.9895

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0240	0.7760	0.1600	2.0300e-003	0.0479	2.2100e-003	0.0501	0.0138	2.1100e-003	0.0159	0.0000	192.7909	192.7909	0.0114	0.0000	193.0758
Worker	0.0686	0.0475	0.4795	1.4000e-003	0.1484	9.7000e-004	0.1494	0.0395	9.0000e-004	0.0404	0.0000	126.6382	126.6382	3.2300e-003	0.0000	126.7191
Total	0.0927	0.8236	0.6395	3.4300e-003	0.1963	3.1800e-003	0.1994	0.0533	3.0100e-003	0.0563	0.0000	319.4291	319.4291	0.0146	0.0000	319.7948

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.2186	2.0047	1.9062	3.1000e-003		0.1102	0.1102		0.1037	0.1037	0.0000	266.3826	266.3826	0.0643	0.0000	267.9892
Total	0.2186	2.0047	1.9062	3.1000e-003		0.1102	0.1102		0.1037	0.1037	0.0000	266.3826	266.3826	0.0643	0.0000	267.9892

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0240	0.7760	0.1600	2.0300e-003	0.0479	2.2100e-003	0.0501	0.0138	2.1100e-003	0.0159	0.0000	192.7909	192.7909	0.0114	0.0000	193.0758
Worker	0.0686	0.0475	0.4795	1.4000e-003	0.1484	9.7000e-004	0.1494	0.0395	9.0000e-004	0.0404	0.0000	126.6382	126.6382	3.2300e-003	0.0000	126.7191
Total	0.0927	0.8236	0.6395	3.4300e-003	0.1963	3.1800e-003	0.1994	0.0533	3.0100e-003	0.0563	0.0000	319.4291	319.4291	0.0146	0.0000	319.7948

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.5 Paving - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0126	0.1292	0.1465	2.3000e-004		6.7800e-003	6.7800e-003		6.2400e-003	6.2400e-003	0.0000	20.0235	20.0235	6.4800e-003	0.0000	20.1854
Paving	8.6200e-003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0212	0.1292	0.1465	2.3000e-004		6.7800e-003	6.7800e-003		6.2400e-003	6.2400e-003	0.0000	20.0235	20.0235	6.4800e-003	0.0000	20.1854

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	5.5000e-004	3.8000e-004	3.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1900e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.2000e-004	0.0000	1.0196	1.0196	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0203
Total	5.5000e-004	3.8000e-004	3.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1900e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.2000e-004	0.0000	1.0196	1.0196	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0203

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.5 Paving - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Off-Road	0.0126	0.1292	0.1465	2.3000e-004		6.7800e-003	6.7800e-003		6.2400e-003	6.2400e-003	0.0000	20.0235	20.0235	6.4800e-003	0.0000	20.1854
Paving	8.6200e-003					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total	0.0212	0.1292	0.1465	2.3000e-004		6.7800e-003	6.7800e-003		6.2400e-003	6.2400e-003	0.0000	20.0235	20.0235	6.4800e-003	0.0000	20.1854

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	5.5000e-004	3.8000e-004	3.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1900e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.2000e-004	0.0000	1.0196	1.0196	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0203
Total	5.5000e-004	3.8000e-004	3.8600e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1900e-003	1.0000e-005	1.2000e-003	3.2000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.2000e-004	0.0000	1.0196	1.0196	3.0000e-005	0.0000	1.0203

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.7517					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.0500e-003	0.0141	0.0181	3.0000e-005		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004	0.0000	2.5533	2.5533	1.7000e-004	0.0000	2.5574
Total	0.7537	0.0141	0.0181	3.0000e-005		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004	0.0000	2.5533	2.5533	1.7000e-004	0.0000	2.5574

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.0900e-003	7.3000e-004	7.5100e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5500e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5700e-003	6.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	6.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0979	2.0979	5.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0991
Total	1.0900e-003	7.3000e-004	7.5100e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5500e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5700e-003	6.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	6.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0979	2.0979	5.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0991

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Archit. Coating	0.7517					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	2.0500e-003	0.0141	0.0181	3.0000e-005		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004	0.0000	2.5533	2.5533	1.7000e-004	0.0000	2.5574
Total	0.7537	0.0141	0.0181	3.0000e-005		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004		8.2000e-004	8.2000e-004	0.0000	2.5533	2.5533	1.7000e-004	0.0000	2.5574

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.0900e-003	7.3000e-004	7.5100e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5500e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5700e-003	6.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	6.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0979	2.0979	5.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0991
Total	1.0900e-003	7.3000e-004	7.5100e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5500e-003	2.0000e-005	2.5700e-003	6.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	6.9000e-004	0.0000	2.0979	2.0979	5.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0991

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.2199	6.7789	1.6052	0.0194	0.5720	0.0155	0.5874	0.1548	0.0147	0.1695	0.0000	1,838.5513	1,838.5513	0.1278	0.0000	1,841.7472
Unmitigated	0.2199	6.7789	1.6052	0.0194	0.5720	0.0155	0.5874	0.1548	0.0147	0.1695	0.0000	1,838.5513	1,838.5513	0.1278	0.0000	1,841.7472

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	258.06	258.06	258.06	753,420	753,420
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	235.53	235.53	235.53	687,620	687,620
Total	493.59	493.59	493.59	1,441,040	1,441,040

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No	9.50	7.30	7.30	59.00	0.00	41.00	92	5	3
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No	9.50	7.30	7.30	59.00	0.00	41.00	92	5	3

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Parking Lot	0.556917	0.035296	0.183646	0.120139	0.017882	0.004687	0.016156	0.056151	0.001190	0.001453	0.005055	0.000610	0.000818
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.358900	0.022700	0.118400	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.500000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Electricity Mitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	162.3528	162.3528	7.3400e-003	1.5200e-003	162.9889
Electricity Unmitigated						0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	162.3528	162.3528	7.3400e-003	1.5200e-003	162.9889
NaturalGas Mitigated	3.2800e-003	0.0298	0.0250	1.8000e-004		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003	0.0000	32.4468	32.4468	6.2000e-004	5.9000e-004	32.6396
NaturalGas Unmitigated	3.2800e-003	0.0298	0.0250	1.8000e-004		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003		2.2700e-003	2.2700e-003	0.0000	32.4468	32.4468	6.2000e-004	5.9000e-004	32.6396

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	290133	1.5600e-003	0.0142	0.0120	9.0000e-005		1.0800e-003	1.0800e-003		1.0800e-003	1.0800e-003	0.0000	15.4826	15.4826	3.0000e-004	2.8000e-004	15.5746
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	317897	1.7100e-003	0.0156	0.0131	9.0000e-005		1.1800e-003	1.1800e-003		1.1800e-003	1.1800e-003	0.0000	16.9642	16.9642	3.3000e-004	3.1000e-004	17.0650
Total		3.2700e-003	0.0298	0.0250	1.8000e-004		2.2600e-003	2.2600e-003		2.2600e-003	2.2600e-003	0.0000	32.4468	32.4468	6.3000e-004	5.9000e-004	32.6396

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	317897	1.7100e-003	0.0156	0.0131	9.0000e-005		1.1800e-003	1.1800e-003		1.1800e-003	1.1800e-003	0.0000	16.9642	16.9642	3.3000e-004	3.1000e-004	17.0650
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	290133	1.5600e-003	0.0142	0.0120	9.0000e-005		1.0800e-003	1.0800e-003		1.0800e-003	1.0800e-003	0.0000	15.4826	15.4826	3.0000e-004	2.8000e-004	15.5746
Total		3.2700e-003	0.0298	0.0250	1.8000e-004		2.2600e-003	2.2600e-003		2.2600e-003	2.2600e-003	0.0000	32.4468	32.4468	6.3000e-004	5.9000e-004	32.6396

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

5.3 Energy by Land Use - Electricity

Unmitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Parking Lot	100319	29.1839	1.3200e-003	2.7000e-004	29.2982
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	218431	63.5441	2.8700e-003	5.9000e-004	63.7931
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	239333	69.6248	3.1500e-003	6.5000e-004	69.8976
Total		162.3528	7.3400e-003	1.5100e-003	162.9889

Mitigated

	Electricity Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kWh/yr	MT/yr			
Parking Lot	100319	29.1839	1.3200e-003	2.7000e-004	29.2982
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	218431	63.5441	2.8700e-003	5.9000e-004	63.7931
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	239333	69.6248	3.1500e-003	6.5000e-004	69.8976
Total		162.3528	7.3400e-003	1.5100e-003	162.9889

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Mitigated	0.4824	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003
Unmitigated	0.4824	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0752					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.4072					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	9.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003
Total	0.4824	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	tons/yr										MT/yr					
Architectural Coating	0.0752					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Consumer Products	0.4072					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Landscaping	9.0000e-005	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003
Total	0.4824	1.0000e-005	9.8000e-004	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.9000e-003	1.9000e-003	1.0000e-005	0.0000	2.0200e-003

7.0 Water Detail

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	MT/yr			
Mitigated	43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878
Unmitigated	43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878

7.2 Water by Land Use

Unmitigated

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Parking Lot	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	23.0117 / 0	43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878
Total		43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

7.2 Water by Land Use

Mitigated

	Indoor/Outdoor Use	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	Mgal	MT/yr			
Parking Lot	0 / 0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	23.0117 / 0	43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878
Total		43.5238	0.7515	0.0180	67.6878

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

Category/Year

	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	MT/yr			
Mitigated	18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414
Unmitigated	18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

8.2 Waste by Land Use

Unmitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	93.54	18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414
Total		18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414

Mitigated

	Waste Disposed	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	tons	MT/yr			
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	93.54	18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414
Total		18.9878	1.1222	0.0000	47.0414

9.0 Operational Offroad

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Annual

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

11.0 Vegetation

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

Centerpoint South
San Joaquin County, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	52.03	1000sqft	1.19	52,029.00	0
Parking Lot	6.58	Acre	6.58	286,624.80	0
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	47.49	1000sqft	1.09	47,485.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.7	Precipitation Freq (Days)	51
Climate Zone	2			Operational Year	2022
Utility Company	Pacific Gas & Electric Company				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MW hr)	641.35	CH4 Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (lb/MW hr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail (since project contains no cold storage). Building 1: 52,029 sf. Building 2: 47,485 sf. Remaining area modeled as parking lot.

Construction Phase -

Grading - Site is relatively flat.

Vehicle Trips - Trip rate as provided by Traffic Impact Analysis (Fehr & Peers)

Fleet Mix - Fleet mix adjusted to reflect vehicle fleet mix from Traffic Impact Analysis.

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblFleetMix	HHD	0.06	0.50
tblFleetMix	LDA	0.56	0.36
tblFleetMix	LDT1	0.04	0.02
tblFleetMix	LDT2	0.18	0.12
tblFleetMix	LHD1	0.02	0.00
tblFleetMix	LHD2	4.6870e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	MCY	5.0550e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	MDV	0.12	0.00
tblFleetMix	MH	8.1800e-004	0.00
tblFleetMix	MHD	0.02	0.00
tblFleetMix	OBUS	1.1900e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	SBUS	6.1000e-004	0.00
tblFleetMix	UBUS	1.4530e-003	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	10.00	8.85
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	1.68	4.96
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	1.68	4.96
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	1.68	4.96

2.0 Emissions Summary

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2020	4.1561	42.4640	22.0873	0.0395	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	3,837.564 3	3,837.564 3	1.1961	0.0000	3,867.465 7
2021	2.7670	24.7713	22.5769	0.0581	6.6146	1.1607	7.7753	3.3936	1.0678	4.4614	0.0000	5,745.668 7	5,745.668 7	0.9320	0.0000	5,764.508 8
2022	75.4909	1.4746	2.6646	5.4900e-003	0.2629	0.0833	0.3462	0.0697	0.0832	0.1529	0.0000	532.9820	532.9820	0.0243	0.0000	533.5898
Maximum	75.4909	42.4640	22.5769	0.0581	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	5,745.668 7	5,745.668 7	1.1961	0.0000	5,764.508 8

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2020	4.1561	42.4640	22.0873	0.0395	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	3,837.564 3	3,837.564 3	1.1961	0.0000	3,867.465 7
2021	2.7670	24.7713	22.5769	0.0581	6.6146	1.1607	7.7753	3.3936	1.0678	4.4614	0.0000	5,745.668 7	5,745.668 7	0.9320	0.0000	5,764.508 8
2022	75.4909	1.4746	2.6646	5.4900e-003	0.2629	0.0833	0.3462	0.0697	0.0832	0.1529	0.0000	532.9820	532.9820	0.0243	0.0000	533.5898
Maximum	75.4909	42.4640	22.5769	0.0581	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	5,745.668 7	5,745.668 7	1.1961	0.0000	5,764.508 8

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Energy	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455
Mobile	1.2572	36.9997	8.7913	0.1097	3.2342	0.0833	3.3175	0.8729	0.0794	0.9523		11,441.0750	11,441.0750	0.7378		11,459.5189
Total	3.9192	37.1631	8.9394	0.1106	3.2342	0.0958	3.3299	0.8729	0.0919	0.9648		11,637.0791	11,637.0791	0.7416	3.5900e-003	11,656.6891

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Energy	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455
Mobile	1.2572	36.9997	8.7913	0.1097	3.2342	0.0833	3.3175	0.8729	0.0794	0.9523		11,441.0750	11,441.0750	0.7378		11,459.5189
Total	3.9192	37.1631	8.9394	0.1106	3.2342	0.0958	3.3299	0.8729	0.0919	0.9648		11,637.0791	11,637.0791	0.7416	3.5900e-003	11,656.6891

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	12/5/2020	12/18/2020	5	10	
2	Grading	Grading	12/19/2020	1/15/2021	5	20	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	1/16/2021	12/3/2021	5	230	
4	Paving	Paving	12/4/2021	12/31/2021	5	20	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	1/1/2022	1/28/2022	5	20	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 8.85

Acres of Paving: 6.58

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 149,271; Non-Residential Outdoor: 49,757; Striped Parking Area: 17,197 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	162.00	63.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	32.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.2 Site Preparation - 2020

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					18.0663	0.0000	18.0663	9.9307	0.0000	9.9307			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380		2.1974	2.1974		2.0216	2.0216		3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975
Total	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380	18.0663	2.1974	20.2637	9.9307	2.0216	11.9523		3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0796	0.0467	0.5737	1.5300e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		152.4627	152.4627	4.2200e-003		152.5682
Total	0.0796	0.0467	0.5737	1.5300e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		152.4627	152.4627	4.2200e-003		152.5682

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.2 Site Preparation - 2020

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					18.0663	0.0000	18.0663	9.9307	0.0000	9.9307			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380		2.1974	2.1974		2.0216	2.0216	0.0000	3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975
Total	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380	18.0663	2.1974	20.2637	9.9307	2.0216	11.9523	0.0000	3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0796	0.0467	0.5737	1.5300e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		152.4627	152.4627	4.2200e-003		152.5682
Total	0.0796	0.0467	0.5737	1.5300e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		152.4627	152.4627	4.2200e-003		152.5682

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2020

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297		1.2734	1.2734		1.1716	1.1716		2,872.4851	2,872.4851	0.9290		2,895.7106
Total	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297	6.4914	1.2734	7.7648	3.3609	1.1716	4.5325		2,872.4851	2,872.4851	0.9290		2,895.7106

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0663	0.0389	0.4781	1.2800e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		127.0523	127.0523	3.5200e-003		127.1402
Total	0.0663	0.0389	0.4781	1.2800e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		127.0523	127.0523	3.5200e-003		127.1402

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2020

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297		1.2734	1.2734		1.1716	1.1716	0.0000	2,872.4851	2,872.4851	0.9290		2,895.7106
Total	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297	6.4914	1.2734	7.7648	3.3609	1.1716	4.5325	0.0000	2,872.4851	2,872.4851	0.9290		2,895.7106

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0663	0.0389	0.4781	1.2800e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		127.0523	127.0523	3.5200e-003		127.1402
Total	0.0663	0.0389	0.4781	1.2800e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		127.0523	127.0523	3.5200e-003		127.1402

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296		1.1599	1.1599		1.0671	1.0671		2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495
Total	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296	6.4914	1.1599	7.6513	3.3609	1.0671	4.4280		2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361
Total	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.3 Grading - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296		1.1599	1.1599		1.0671	1.0671	0.0000	2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495
Total	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296	6.4914	1.1599	7.6513	3.3609	1.0671	4.4280	0.0000	2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361
Total	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.2049	6.6648	1.2889	0.0179	0.4268	0.0189	0.4457	0.1229	0.0181	0.1410		1,871.9222	1,871.9222	0.1037		1,874.5150
Worker	0.6612	0.3739	4.7128	0.0133	1.3308	8.4600e-003	1.3393	0.3530	7.8000e-003	0.3608		1,320.3826	1,320.3826	0.0339		1,321.2295
Total	0.8661	7.0387	6.0017	0.0311	1.7576	0.0273	1.7850	0.4759	0.0259	0.5017		3,192.3048	3,192.3048	0.1376		3,195.7445

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.2049	6.6648	1.2889	0.0179	0.4268	0.0189	0.4457	0.1229	0.0181	0.1410		1,871.9222	1,871.9222	0.1037		1,874.5150
Worker	0.6612	0.3739	4.7128	0.0133	1.3308	8.4600e-003	1.3393	0.3530	7.8000e-003	0.3608		1,320.3826	1,320.3826	0.0339		1,321.2295
Total	0.8661	7.0387	6.0017	0.0311	1.7576	0.0273	1.7850	0.4759	0.0259	0.5017		3,192.3048	3,192.3048	0.1376		3,195.7445

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.5 Paving - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.2556	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235		2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573
Paving	0.8620					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	2.1175	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235		2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361
Total	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.5 Paving - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.2556	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235	0.0000	2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573
Paving	0.8620					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	2.1175	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235	0.0000	2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361
Total	0.0612	0.0346	0.4364	1.2300e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		122.2577	122.2577	3.1400e-003		122.3361

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	75.1652					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	75.3698	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1211	0.0661	0.8510	2.5200e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		251.5339	251.5339	5.9900e-003		251.6837
Total	0.1211	0.0661	0.8510	2.5200e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		251.5339	251.5339	5.9900e-003		251.6837

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	75.1652					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	75.3698	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1211	0.0661	0.8510	2.5200e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		251.5339	251.5339	5.9900e-003		251.6837
Total	0.1211	0.0661	0.8510	2.5200e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		251.5339	251.5339	5.9900e-003		251.6837

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	1.2572	36.9997	8.7913	0.1097	3.2342	0.0833	3.3175	0.8729	0.0794	0.9523		11,441.0750	11,441.0750	0.7378		11,459.5189
Unmitigated	1.2572	36.9997	8.7913	0.1097	3.2342	0.0833	3.3175	0.8729	0.0794	0.9523		11,441.0750	11,441.0750	0.7378		11,459.5189

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	258.06	258.06	258.06	753,420	753,420
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	235.53	235.53	235.53	687,620	687,620
Total	493.59	493.59	493.59	1,441,040	1,441,040

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No	9.50	7.30	7.30	59.00	0.00	41.00	92	5	3
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No	9.50	7.30	7.30	59.00	0.00	41.00	92	5	3

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Parking Lot	0.556917	0.035296	0.183646	0.120139	0.017882	0.004687	0.016156	0.056151	0.001190	0.001453	0.005055	0.000610	0.000818
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.358900	0.022700	0.118400	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.500000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	794.886	8.5700e-003	0.0779	0.0655	4.7000e-004		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		93.5160	93.5160	1.7900e-003	1.7100e-003	94.0717
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	870.951	9.3900e-003	0.0854	0.0717	5.1000e-004		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		102.4649	102.4649	1.9600e-003	1.8800e-003	103.0738
Total		0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7500e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.794886	8.5700e-003	0.0779	0.0655	4.7000e-004		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		93.5160	93.5160	1.7900e-003	1.7100e-003	94.0717
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.870951	9.3900e-003	0.0854	0.0717	5.1000e-004		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		102.4649	102.4649	1.9600e-003	1.8800e-003	103.0738
Total		0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7500e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Unmitigated	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.4119					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	2.2311					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.0100e-003	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Total	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.4119					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	2.2311					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.0100e-003	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Total	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248

7.0 Water Detail

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Summer

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water**8.0 Waste Detail**

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste**9.0 Operational Offroad**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

11.0 Vegetation

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

Centerpoint South
San Joaquin County, Winter

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	52.03	1000sqft	1.19	52,029.00	0
Parking Lot	6.58	Acre	6.58	286,624.80	0
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	47.49	1000sqft	1.09	47,485.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	Wind Speed (m/s)	2.7	Precipitation Freq (Days)	51
Climate Zone	2			Operational Year	2022
Utility Company	Pacific Gas & Electric Company				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	641.35	CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	0.029	N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail (since project contains no cold storage). Building 1: 52,029 sf. Building 2: 47,485 sf. Remaining area modeled as parking lot.

Construction Phase -

Grading - Site is relatively flat.

Vehicle Trips - Trip rate as provided by Traffic Impact Analysis (Fehr & Peers)

Fleet Mix - Fleet mix adjusted to reflect vehicle fleet mix from Traffic Impact Analysis.

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblFleetMix	HHD	0.06	0.50
tblFleetMix	LDA	0.56	0.36
tblFleetMix	LDT1	0.04	0.02
tblFleetMix	LDT2	0.18	0.12
tblFleetMix	LHD1	0.02	0.00
tblFleetMix	LHD2	4.6870e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	MCY	5.0550e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	MDV	0.12	0.00
tblFleetMix	MH	8.1800e-004	0.00
tblFleetMix	MHD	0.02	0.00
tblFleetMix	OBUS	1.1900e-003	0.00
tblFleetMix	SBUS	6.1000e-004	0.00
tblFleetMix	UBUS	1.4530e-003	0.00
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	10.00	8.85
tblVehicleTrips	ST_TR	1.68	4.96
tblVehicleTrips	SU_TR	1.68	4.96
tblVehicleTrips	WD_TR	1.68	4.96

2.0 Emissions Summary

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2020	4.1540	42.4741	22.0232	0.0394	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	3,821.3835	3,821.3835	1.1957	0.0000	3,851.2747
2021	2.7615	24.7788	22.2657	0.0561	6.6146	1.1607	7.7753	3.3936	1.0678	4.4614	0.0000	5,548.5597	5,548.5597	0.9317	0.0000	5,567.6390
2022	75.4879	1.4888	2.5636	5.2300e-003	0.2629	0.0833	0.3462	0.0697	0.0832	0.1529	0.0000	506.3089	506.3089	0.0237	0.0000	506.9016
Maximum	75.4879	42.4741	22.2657	0.0561	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	5,548.5597	5,548.5597	1.1957	0.0000	5,567.6390

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Year	lb/day										lb/day					
2020	4.1540	42.4741	22.0232	0.0394	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	3,821.3835	3,821.3835	1.1957	0.0000	3,851.2747
2021	2.7615	24.7788	22.2657	0.0561	6.6146	1.1607	7.7753	3.3936	1.0678	4.4614	0.0000	5,548.5597	5,548.5597	0.9317	0.0000	5,567.6390
2022	75.4879	1.4888	2.5636	5.2300e-003	0.2629	0.0833	0.3462	0.0697	0.0832	0.1529	0.0000	506.3089	506.3089	0.0237	0.0000	506.9016
Maximum	75.4879	42.4741	22.2657	0.0561	18.2141	2.1984	20.4125	9.9699	2.0225	11.9924	0.0000	5,548.5597	5,548.5597	1.1957	0.0000	5,567.6390

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

2.2 Overall Operational

Unmitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Energy	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455
Mobile	1.2220	37.0449	9.4922	0.1041	3.2342	0.0874	3.3216	0.8729	0.0833	0.9562		10,863.0323	10,863.0323	0.8285		10,883.7452
Total	3.8839	37.2083	9.6403	0.1051	3.2342	0.0999	3.3340	0.8729	0.0958	0.9687		11,059.0363	11,059.0363	0.8323	3.5900e-003	11,080.9154

Mitigated Operational

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Area	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Energy	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455
Mobile	1.2220	37.0449	9.4922	0.1041	3.2342	0.0874	3.3216	0.8729	0.0833	0.9562		10,863.0323	10,863.0323	0.8285		10,883.7452
Total	3.8839	37.2083	9.6403	0.1051	3.2342	0.0999	3.3340	0.8729	0.0958	0.9687		11,059.0363	11,059.0363	0.8323	3.5900e-003	11,080.9154

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio-CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Percent Reduction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Site Preparation	Site Preparation	12/5/2020	12/18/2020	5	10	
2	Grading	Grading	12/19/2020	1/15/2021	5	20	
3	Building Construction	Building Construction	1/16/2021	12/3/2021	5	230	
4	Paving	Paving	12/4/2021	12/31/2021	5	20	
5	Architectural Coating	Architectural Coating	1/1/2022	1/28/2022	5	20	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 8.85

Acres of Paving: 6.58

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 149,271; Non-Residential Outdoor: 49,757; Striped Parking Area: 17,197 (Architectural Coating – sqft)

OffRoad Equipment

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	1	6.00	78	0.48
Grading	Excavators	1	8.00	158	0.38
Building Construction	Cranes	1	7.00	231	0.29
Building Construction	Forklifts	3	8.00	89	0.20
Building Construction	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Paving	Pavers	2	8.00	130	0.42
Paving	Rollers	2	8.00	80	0.38
Grading	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Grading	Graders	1	8.00	187	0.41
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	8.00	97	0.37
Paving	Paving Equipment	2	8.00	132	0.36
Site Preparation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	4	8.00	97	0.37
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8.00	247	0.40
Building Construction	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Site Preparation	7	18.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Grading	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Building Construction	9	162.00	63.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Paving	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Architectural Coating	1	32.00	0.00	0.00	10.80	7.30	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.2 Site Preparation - 2020

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					18.0663	0.0000	18.0663	9.9307	0.0000	9.9307			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380		2.1974	2.1974		2.0216	2.0216		3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975
Total	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380	18.0663	2.1974	20.2637	9.9307	2.0216	11.9523		3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0775	0.0567	0.5096	1.3700e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		136.2820	136.2820	3.8100e-003		136.3772
Total	0.0775	0.0567	0.5096	1.3700e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		136.2820	136.2820	3.8100e-003		136.3772

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.2 Site Preparation - 2020

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					18.0663	0.0000	18.0663	9.9307	0.0000	9.9307			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380		2.1974	2.1974		2.0216	2.0216	0.0000	3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975
Total	4.0765	42.4173	21.5136	0.0380	18.0663	2.1974	20.2637	9.9307	2.0216	11.9523	0.0000	3,685.1016	3,685.1016	1.1918		3,714.8975

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0775	0.0567	0.5096	1.3700e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		136.2820	136.2820	3.8100e-003		136.3772
Total	0.0775	0.0567	0.5096	1.3700e-003	0.1479	9.8000e-004	0.1488	0.0392	9.0000e-004	0.0401		136.2820	136.2820	3.8100e-003		136.3772

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.3 Grading - 2020

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297		1.2734	1.2734		1.1716	1.1716		2,872.4851	2,872.4851	0.9290		2,895.7106
Total	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297	6.4914	1.2734	7.7648	3.3609	1.1716	4.5325		2,872.4851	2,872.4851	0.9290		2,895.7106

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0646	0.0473	0.4247	1.1400e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		113.5683	113.5683	3.1800e-003		113.6477
Total	0.0646	0.0473	0.4247	1.1400e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		113.5683	113.5683	3.1800e-003		113.6477

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.3 Grading - 2020

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297		1.2734	1.2734		1.1716	1.1716	0.0000	2,872.485 1	2,872.485 1	0.9290		2,895.710 6
Total	2.4288	26.3859	16.0530	0.0297	6.4914	1.2734	7.7648	3.3609	1.1716	4.5325	0.0000	2,872.485 1	2,872.485 1	0.9290		2,895.710 6

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0646	0.0473	0.4247	1.1400e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		113.5683	113.5683	3.1800e-003		113.6477
Total	0.0646	0.0473	0.4247	1.1400e-003	0.1232	8.1000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.5000e-004	0.0334		113.5683	113.5683	3.1800e-003		113.6477

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.3 Grading - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296		1.1599	1.1599		1.0671	1.0671		2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495
Total	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296	6.4914	1.1599	7.6513	3.3609	1.0671	4.4280		2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580
Total	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.3 Grading - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Fugitive Dust					6.4914	0.0000	6.4914	3.3609	0.0000	3.3609			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296		1.1599	1.1599		1.0671	1.0671	0.0000	2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495
Total	2.2903	24.7367	15.8575	0.0296	6.4914	1.1599	7.6513	3.3609	1.0671	4.4280	0.0000	2,871.9285	2,871.9285	0.9288		2,895.1495

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580
Total	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013		2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.2165	6.7298	1.5207	0.0173	0.4268	0.0196	0.4464	0.1229	0.0188	0.1416		1,814.8928	1,814.8928	0.1166		1,817.8084
Worker	0.6441	0.4543	4.1698	0.0119	1.3308	8.4600e-003	1.3393	0.3530	7.8000e-003	0.3608		1,180.3030	1,180.3030	0.0305		1,181.0663
Total	0.8606	7.1841	5.6905	0.0292	1.7576	0.0281	1.7857	0.4759	0.0266	0.5024		2,995.1958	2,995.1958	0.1472		2,998.8747

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.4 Building Construction - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643
Total	1.9009	17.4321	16.5752	0.0269		0.9586	0.9586		0.9013	0.9013	0.0000	2,553.3639	2,553.3639	0.6160		2,568.7643

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.2165	6.7298	1.5207	0.0173	0.4268	0.0196	0.4464	0.1229	0.0188	0.1416		1,814.8928	1,814.8928	0.1166		1,817.8084
Worker	0.6441	0.4543	4.1698	0.0119	1.3308	8.4600e-003	1.3393	0.3530	7.8000e-003	0.3608		1,180.3030	1,180.3030	0.0305		1,181.0663
Total	0.8606	7.1841	5.6905	0.0292	1.7576	0.0281	1.7857	0.4759	0.0266	0.5024		2,995.1958	2,995.1958	0.1472		2,998.8747

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.5 Paving - 2021

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.2556	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235		2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573
Paving	0.8620					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	2.1175	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235		2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580
Total	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.5 Paving - 2021

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Off-Road	1.2556	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235	0.0000	2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573
Paving	0.8620					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Total	2.1175	12.9191	14.6532	0.0228		0.6777	0.6777		0.6235	0.6235	0.0000	2,207.2109	2,207.2109	0.7139		2,225.0573

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580
Total	0.0596	0.0421	0.3861	1.1000e-003	0.1232	7.8000e-004	0.1240	0.0327	7.2000e-004	0.0334		109.2873	109.2873	2.8300e-003		109.3580

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	75.1652					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	75.3698	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817		281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1181	0.0803	0.7500	2.2600e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		224.8608	224.8608	5.3900e-003		224.9955
Total	0.1181	0.0803	0.7500	2.2600e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		224.8608	224.8608	5.3900e-003		224.9955

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

3.6 Architectural Coating - 2022

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Archit. Coating	75.1652					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Off-Road	0.2045	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062
Total	75.3698	1.4085	1.8136	2.9700e-003		0.0817	0.0817		0.0817	0.0817	0.0000	281.4481	281.4481	0.0183		281.9062

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000
Worker	0.1181	0.0803	0.7500	2.2600e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		224.8608	224.8608	5.3900e-003		224.9955
Total	0.1181	0.0803	0.7500	2.2600e-003	0.2629	1.6200e-003	0.2645	0.0697	1.4900e-003	0.0712		224.8608	224.8608	5.3900e-003		224.9955

4.0 Operational Detail - Mobile

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	1.2220	37.0449	9.4922	0.1041	3.2342	0.0874	3.3216	0.8729	0.0833	0.9562		10,863.03 23	10,863.03 23	0.8285		10,883.74 52
Unmitigated	1.2220	37.0449	9.4922	0.1041	3.2342	0.0874	3.3216	0.8729	0.0833	0.9562		10,863.03 23	10,863.03 23	0.8285		10,883.74 52

4.2 Trip Summary Information

Land Use	Average Daily Trip Rate			Unmitigated	Mitigated
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual VMT	Annual VMT
Parking Lot	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	258.06	258.06	258.06	753,420	753,420
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	235.53	235.53	235.53	687,620	687,620
Total	493.59	493.59	493.59	1,441,040	1,441,040

4.3 Trip Type Information

Land Use	Miles			Trip %			Trip Purpose %		
	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	H-W or C-W	H-S or C-C	H-O or C-NW	Primary	Diverted	Pass-by
Parking Lot	9.50	7.30	7.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No	9.50	7.30	7.30	59.00	0.00	41.00	92	5	3
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No	9.50	7.30	7.30	59.00	0.00	41.00	92	5	3

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

4.4 Fleet Mix

Land Use	LDA	LDT1	LDT2	MDV	LHD1	LHD2	MHD	HHD	OBUS	UBUS	MCY	SBUS	MH
Parking Lot	0.556917	0.035296	0.183646	0.120139	0.017882	0.004687	0.016156	0.056151	0.001190	0.001453	0.005055	0.000610	0.000818
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.358900	0.022700	0.118400	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.500000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000

5.0 Energy Detail

Historical Energy Use: N

5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
NaturalGas Mitigated	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455
NaturalGas Unmitigated	0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7600e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

5.2 Energy by Land Use - NaturalGas

Unmitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	794.886	8.5700e-003	0.0779	0.0655	4.7000e-004		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		93.5160	93.5160	1.7900e-003	1.7100e-003	94.0717
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	870.951	9.3900e-003	0.0854	0.0717	5.1000e-004		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		102.4649	102.4649	1.9600e-003	1.8800e-003	103.0738
Total		0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7500e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455

Mitigated

	NaturalGas Use	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Land Use	kBTU/yr	lb/day										lb/day					
Parking Lot	0	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.794886	8.5700e-003	0.0779	0.0655	4.7000e-004		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		5.9200e-003	5.9200e-003		93.5160	93.5160	1.7900e-003	1.7100e-003	94.0717
Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail	0.870951	9.3900e-003	0.0854	0.0717	5.1000e-004		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		6.4900e-003	6.4900e-003		102.4649	102.4649	1.9600e-003	1.8800e-003	103.0738
Total		0.0180	0.1633	0.1372	9.8000e-004		0.0124	0.0124		0.0124	0.0124		195.9808	195.9808	3.7500e-003	3.5900e-003	197.1455

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

6.0 Area Detail

6.1 Mitigation Measures Area

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Category	lb/day										lb/day					
Mitigated	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Unmitigated	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

6.2 Area by SubCategory

Unmitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.4119					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	2.2311					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.0100e-003	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Total	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248

Mitigated

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total	Bio- CO2	NBio- CO2	Total CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
SubCategory	lb/day										lb/day					
Architectural Coating	0.4119					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Consumer Products	2.2311					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000			0.0000			0.0000
Landscaping	1.0100e-003	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248
Total	2.6440	1.0000e-004	0.0109	0.0000		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		4.0000e-005	4.0000e-005		0.0232	0.0232	6.0000e-005		0.0248

7.0 Water Detail

Centerpoint South - San Joaquin County, Winter

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water**8.0 Waste Detail**

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste**9.0 Operational Offroad**

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Days/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-----------

10.0 Stationary Equipment

Fire Pumps and Emergency Generators

Equipment Type	Number	Hours/Day	Hours/Year	Horse Power	Load Factor	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	-----------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

Boilers

Equipment Type	Number	Heat Input/Day	Heat Input/Year	Boiler Rating	Fuel Type
----------------	--------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------

User Defined Equipment

Equipment Type	Number
----------------	--------

11.0 Vegetation

This page left intentionally blank.

APPENDIX B: AIR TOXICS SCREENING ASSESSMENT

EMFAC2017 (v1.0.2) Emission Rates

Region Type: County

Region: SAN JOAQUIN

Calendar Year: 2022

Season: Annual

Vehicle Classification: EMFAC2011 Categories

Units: miles/day for VMT, g/mile for RUNEX, PMBW and PMTW. Note 'day' in the unit is operation day.

Region	Calendar Year	Vehicle Category	Model Year	Speed	Fuel	VMT	PM10_RUNEX
SAN JOAQUIN	2022	T7 tractor	Aggregated	10	DSL	3354.587	0.052040548

Mobile Truck Emissions

On-site Pickup, Loading, and Return for Storage

pounds per gram: 0.002205

hours per day: 24

Line Source Volume #1:

Assumptions:

1. Total travel distance per truck trip (one-day):
2. # of trucks trips per day:
3. PM10 Mobile Emissions Factor:
(San Joaquin County, 10 MPH, Year 2022, T7 Tractor)

Factor:

0.189394 miles

248 trucks

0.052040548 g/mile

Source:

As measured by Google Maps

Fehr & Peers

EMFAC2017

Therefore:

Total daily PM10 mobile emissions generated by the project along this line volume source:

2.444329545 g/day-24 vehicles

0.005388818 lbs/day-24 vehicles

1.966918497 lbs/year-24 vehicles

Max Hr Emissions

24.00 Peak hour truck trips (assumes all trips occur in the same hour, for a highly conservative estimate)

0.23654802 g/hr-24 vehicles

0.000521498 lbs/hr-24 vehicles

Truck Idling Emission Rates

Idling Emission Rates taken from tables 3.2-41 and 42, of the EMFAC2014 Volume III - Technical Documentation Guidebook:

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/downloads/emfac2014/emfac2014-vol3-technical-documentation-052015.pdf>

Idling Emissions:

Table 3.2-40: Revised HHD Diesel Truck Low Idle Emission Rates (after 2009)	PM10	0.001 g/hr-truck
Table 3.2-41: High Idle Emissions Rates for Summer (2009 and later)	PM10	0.003 g/hr-truck
Table 3.2-42: High Idle Emissions Rates for Winter (2009 and later)	PM10	0.004 g/hr-truck

pounds per gram: 0.00220462

Note: the following calculation uses an average of the summer and winter high idle emissions rates for the emission factor calcs.

0.000291667 g/5 minutes-truck
0.000291667 g/day-truck
24 hours in day
248 # of trucks

Note: Trucks are equipped with 5-min auto shutoff.

Source: Fehr & Peers


Therefore:

0.072333333 g/day-all trucks
26.40166667 g/year-all trucks
0.058205642 lbs/year-all trucks

This page left intentionally blank.

APPENDIX C: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS REPORT



FOR THE
CENTERPOINT SOUTH
PROJECT
ON
AIRPORT WAY
AND
PINNACLE STREET
IN
MANTECA, CA

Prepared for
De Novo Planning
Group
City of Manteca

Prepared by
Fehr & Peers
Transportation Consultants

November 9, 2020



INTRODUCTION

This report documents the results of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) conducted for the proposed CenterPoint South Project in Manteca, California. The proposed project would construct two (2) industrial warehousing building on the south-west area of the Airport Way / Pinnacle Street intersection. This TIA was prepared under contract to the City of Manteca Community Development Department.

PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

Table presents the projected trips generated by the proposed CenterPoint South Project for Weekday Daily (Table 1), AM Peak Hour (Table 2) and PM Peak Hour (Table 3) Conditions for All Vehicles, Employee Vehicles – Passenger Cars, SUV and Light Duty Trucks, and Trucks (CA Legal and STAA trucks). Trips generated are based on trip rates from the *Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017) and the City of Manteca Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) Model being developed for the General Plan 2020/2040 Update.

Table 1: Project Trip Generation (All Vehicles)									
Land Use	ITE Code	Gross Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			(All Vehicles)	(All Vehicles)			(All Vehicles)		
			Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Facility # 1	110	52,029	258	36	32	4	33	4	29
Facility # 2	110	47,485	236	33	29	4	30	4	26
CenterPoint South Project		99,514	494	69	61	8	63	8	55

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Table 2: Project Trip Generation (Employee Vehicles – Passenger Cars, SUV and Light Duty Trucks)									
Land Use	ITE Code	Gross Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			(All Vehicles)	(All Vehicles)			(All Vehicles)		
			Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Facility # 1	110	52,029	128	18	18	0	17	0	17
Facility # 2	110	47,485	118	17	17	0	15	0	15
CenterPoint South Project		99,514	246	35	35	0	32	0	32

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Table 3: Project Trip Generation (CA Legal and STAA Trucks)									
Land Use	ITE Code	Gross Floor Area (Sq. Ft.)	Daily (All Vehicles)	AM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)			PM Peak Hour (All Vehicles)		
			Total	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Facility # 1	110	52,029	130	18	14	4	16	4	12
Facility # 2	110	47,485	118	16	12	4	15	4	11
CenterPoint South Project		99,514	248	34	26	8	31	8	23

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

SENATE BILL 743 AND VEHICLES MILES TRAVELED (VMT)

SB 743 creates or encourages several statewide changes to the evaluation of transportation and traffic impacts under CEQA. First, it directs OPR to amend the CEQA Guidelines to establish new metrics for determining the significance of transportation impacts of projects within transit priority areas (TPAs) and allows OPR to extend use of the new metrics beyond TPAs. The California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted the amended CEQA Guidelines in December 2018. In the amended CEQA Guidelines, OPR selected Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the preferred transportation impact metric and applied their discretion to recommend its use statewide. The amended CEQA Guidelines state that “generally, VMT is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts” and the provisions requiring the use of VMT shall apply statewide as of July 1, 2020. The amended CEQA Guidelines further state that land use “projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact.”

Second, SB 743 establishes that aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center projects on an infill site within a TPA shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.

Third, SB 743 added section 21099 to the Public Resources Code, which states that automobile delay, as described by level of service (LOS) or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment upon certification of the CEQA Guidelines by the Natural Resources Agency. Since the amended CEQA Guidelines were certified in December 2018, LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion are not considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA.

Lastly, SB 743 establishes a new CEQA exemption for a residential, mixed-use, and employment center project a) within a TPA, b) consistent with a specific plan for which an EIR has been certified, and c) consistent with an SCS. This exemption requires further review if the project or circumstances changes significantly.

Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts

To aid in SB 743 implementation, in December 2018 OPR released a *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Technical Advisory). The Technical Advisory provides advice and recommendations to CEQA lead agencies on how to implement the SB 743 changes. This includes technical recommendations regarding the assessment of VMT, thresholds of significance, VMT mitigation measures, and

screening thresholds for certain land use projects. Lead agencies may consider and use these recommendations at their discretion and with the provision of substantial evidence to support alternative approaches.

The Technical Advisory identifies “screening thresholds” to quickly identify when a project should be expected to cause a less-than-significant impact without conducting a detailed study. The Technical Advisory suggests that projects meeting one or more of the following criteria should be expected to have a less-than-significant impact on VMT.

Small projects – projects consistent with a SCS and local general plan that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day.

Projects near major transit stops – certain projects (residential, retail, office, or a mix of these uses) proposed within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor.

Affordable residential development – a project consisting of a high percentage of affordable housing may be a basis to find a less-than-significant impact on VMT.

Local-serving retail – local-serving retail development tends to shorten trips and reduce VMT. The Technical Advisory encourages lead agencies to decide when a project will likely be local-serving, but generally acknowledges that retail development including stores larger than 50,000 square feet might be considered regional-serving. The Technical Advisory suggests lead agencies analyze whether regional-serving retail would increase or decrease VMT (i.e., not presume a less-than-significant).

Projects in low VMT areas – residential and office projects that incorporate similar features (i.e., density, mix of uses, transit accessibility) as existing development in areas with low VMT will tend to exhibit similarly low VMT.

The Technical Advisory also identifies recommended numeric VMT thresholds for residential, office, and retail projects, as described below.

Residential development that would generate vehicle travel exceeding 15 percent below existing (baseline) residential VMT per capita may indicate a significant transportation impact. Existing VMT per capita may be measured as a regional VMT per capita or as city VMT per capita.

Office projects that would generate vehicle travel exceeding 15 percent below existing regional VMT per employee may indicate a significant transportation impact.

Retail projects (and other non-residential/non-office projects) that results in a net increase in total VMT may indicate a significant transportation impact.

For mixed-use projects, the Technical Advisory suggests evaluating each component independently and applying the significance threshold for each project type included. Alternatively, the lead agency may consider only the project’s dominant use.

The Technical Advisory also provides guidance on impacts to transit. Specifically, the Technical Advisory suggests that lead agencies generally should not treat the addition of new transit users as an adverse impact. As an example, the Technical Advisory suggests that “an infill development may add riders to transit systems and the additional boarding and alighting may slow transit vehicles, but it also adds destinations, improving proximity and accessibility. Such development also improves regional vehicle flow by adding less vehicle travel onto the regional network.”

VMT-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide

On May 20, 2020, the VMT-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide (TISG) was adopted. The TISG provides guidance on how Caltrans will review land use projects, with focus on VMT analysis and supporting state land use goals, state planning priorities, and GHG emission reduction goals; as well as identifying land use projects' possible transportation impacts to the State Highway System and potential non-capacity increasing mitigation measures.

The TISG emphasizes that VMT analysis is Caltrans' primary review focus, and references OPR's Technical Advisory as a basis for the guidance in the TISG. Notably, the TISG recommends the use of the recommended thresholds in the Technical Advisory for land use projects. The TISG also references the Technical Advisory for screening thresholds that would identify projects and areas presumed to have a less-than-significant transportation impact. Caltrans supports streamlining for projects that meet these screening thresholds because they help achieve VMT reduction and mode shift goals.

CENTERPOINT SOUTH VEHICLES MILES TRAVELED ANALYSIS

The CenterPoint South Project does not qualify as a small project for screening purposes, and it is not located in a low VMT area. Therefore, consistent with the discussion of SB 743 provided above vehicle travel is evaluated using VMT as the primary metric. The following describes the baseline VMT levels for industrial land uses in the City of Manteca. The Baseline VMT and Cumulative Project VMT was developed using the City of Manteca travel demand model that was derived from the San Joaquin Council of Government's (SJCOG) Regional Travel Demand Model. The model was developed in 2020 and calibrated to adjusted pre COVID-19 traffic counts.

Roadway improvements and land use projections consistent with the SJCOG Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), City of Manteca General Plan, and City of Lathrop General Plan were added to the Cumulative Conditions Model.

A model-wide analysis was performed to obtain daily trips and travel distance for all Industrial Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs), and the product of daily trips and travel distance was summed up to obtain VMT estimates. **Table 4** presents modeled Baseline Citywide and Cumulative With CenterPoint South Project VMT per industrial employee. The proposed CenterPoint South Project will result in a decrease in VMT when compared to baseline citywide, from 37.9 to 32.9 vehicle miles per employee. This represents a 13.2% decrease when compared to baseline city-wide average. Therefore, the construction of the CenterPoint south project will improve the jobs to housing balance in the City of Manteca and provide an overall benefit to reducing VMT per employee, fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, there is a ***less than significant*** impact relative to this topic.

Table 4: CenterPoint South Project Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis			
Scenario	VMT Per Industrial Employee	VMT Reduction Per Industrial Employee	Percentage Reduction Per Industrial Employee
Baseline Citywide	37.9		
Cumulative With CenterPoint South Project	32.9	-5.0	-13.2

Note: Citywide VMT includes All industrial land Uses in the City of Manteca
Source: City of Manteca Travel Demand Model - Fehr & Peers, 2020

ROADWAY SEGMENT LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS – EXISTING CONDITIONS

In addition to Vehicle Miles Traveled, the secondary measure analyzed for the transportation analysis was segment level of service for Existing (Year 2020) and Existing With CenterPoint South Project Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Conditions. It should be noted that the Existing volumes were developed for pre-COVID 19 conditions using traffic counts completed in August 2019 and adjusted up to represent Year 2020 ADT volumes.

Table presents the projected ADT volumes for twenty-six (26) study roadway segments in the project study area. The Project Trip Generation analysis showed that the proposed CenterPoint South Project would add a total of 494 vehicles to the surrounding transportation network. The Existing Plus Project Level of Service Analysis shows that the proposed CenterPoint South Project would add a low of 15 vehicles to a high of 238 vehicles on the external roadway system. The proposed CenterPoint South Project would add 149 vehicles on Pinnacle Drive and 345 vehicles on Intermodal Way.

The results of the roadway segment level of service analysis showed that the proposed CenterPoint South Project would not result in any impacts to the surrounding transportation network. All twenty-six roadway segments would continue to operate at acceptable Level of Service C or D under Existing With Project Conditions. Therefore, there is a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Table 5: Existing Level of Service Analysis – No Project versus With CenterPoint South Project						
Average Daily Traffic Volumes						
Roadway Segment - Location	Existing (No Project)		Existing With Project		With Project - No Project	
	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	Percentage Change
1. Roth Road – Between Intermodal Way and Airport Way	9,500	D	9,533	D	+33	+0.3%
2. Roth Road – Between Intermodal Way and McKinley Avenue	9,300	D	9,538	D	+238	+2.6%
3. Roth Road – Between McKinley Avenue and Harlan Road	9,500	D	9,738	D	+238	+2.5%
4. Roth Road – Between Harlan Road and NB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	14,400	D	14,638	D	+238	+1.7%
5. Roth Road – Between NB I-5 Off/On-Ramps and SB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	8,300	C	8,518	C	+218	+2.6%
6. Airport Way – Between French Camp Road and Roth Road	7,100	C	7,148	C	+48	+0.7%
7. Airport Way – Between Roth Road and Lovelace Road	6,500	C	6,515	C	+15	+0.2%
8. Airport Way – Between Lovelace Road and Tactical Way	6,800	C	6,815	C	+15	+0.2%
9. Airport Way – Between Tactical Way and Daisywood Drive	7,200	C	7,215	C	+15	+0.2%

Note: LOS = Level of Service based on Segment Level of Service Thresholds from Manteca General Plan Update and Lathrop General Plan Update
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Table 5 (Continued): Existing Level of Service Analysis – No Project versus With CenterPoint South Project						
Average Daily Traffic Volumes						
Roadway Segment - Location	Existing (No Project)		Existing With Project		With Project - No Project	
	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	LOS
10. Airport Way – Between Daisywood Drive and Pinnacle Drive	7,600	C	7,615	C	+15	+0.2%
11. Airport Way – Between Pinnacle Drive and Lathrop Road	8,500	D	8,634	D	+134	+1.6%
12. Airport Way – Between Lathrop Road and Northgate Drive	9,500	D	9,574	D	+74	+0.8%
13. Airport Way – Between Northgate Drive and Louise Avenue	10,200	D	10,274	D	+74	+0.7%
14. Airport Way – Between Louise Avenue and Crom Avenue	14,300	D	14,354	D	+54	+0.4%
15. Airport Way – Between Crom Avenue and Yosemite Avenue	15,100	D	15,154	D	+54	+0.4%
16. Lathrop Road – Between Union Road and Airport Way	16,200	D	16,220	D	+20	+0.1%
17. Lathrop Road – Between Airport Way and McKinley Avenue	20,800	D	20,860	D	+60	+0.3%
18. Lathrop Road – Between McKinley Avenue and 5 th Street	20,400	D	20,460	D	+60	+0.3%
19. Lathrop Road – Between 5 th Street and Harlan Road	20,000	D	20,060	D	+60	+0.3%
20. Lathrop Road – Between Harlan Road and NB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	23,800	D	23,860	D	+60	+0.3%
21. Lathrop Road – Between NB I-5 Off /On-Ramps and SB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	15,700	C	15,745	C	+45	+0.3%
22. Spartan Way – Between SB I-5 Off/On -Ramps and Golden Valley Parkway	8,900	C	8,905	C	+5	+0.1%
23. Intermodal Way – Between Roth Road and 5.11 Tactical Building	1,600	C	1,945	C	+345	+21.6%
24. Intermodal Way – Between 5.11 Tactical Building and Tactical Way	900	C	1,245	C	+345	+38.3%
25. Intermodal Way – Between Tactical Way and Pinnacle Drive	500	C	845	C	+345	+69.0%
26. Pinnacle Way – Between Intermodal Way and Airport Way	500	C	649	C	+149	+29.8%

Note: LOS = Level of Service based on Segment Level of Service Thresholds from Manteca General Plan Update and Lathrop General Plan Update

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

ROADWAY SEGMENT LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS – CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

In addition to Vehicle Miles Traveled, the secondary measure analyzed for the transportation analysis was segment level of service for Cumulative No Project and Cumulative With CenterPoint South Project Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Conditions. **Table** presents the projected ADT volumes for twenty-six (26) study roadway segments in the project study area using the City of Manteca / City of Lathrop Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) Model.

The Project Trip Generation analysis showed that the proposed CenterPoint South Project would add a total of 494 vehicles to the surrounding transportation network. Cumulative Level of Service Analysis shows that the proposed CenterPoint South Project would add a low of 15 vehicles to a high of 238 vehicles on the external roadway system. The proposed CenterPoint South Project would add 149 vehicles on Pinnacle Drive and 345 vehicles on Intermodal Way.

The results of the roadway segment level of service analysis showed that the proposed CenterPoint South Project would not result in any impacts to the surrounding transportation network. All twenty-six roadway segments would continue to operate at acceptable Level of Service C or D under Cumulative With Project Conditions. Therefore, there is a **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Table 6: Cumulative Level of Service Analysis – No Project versus With CenterPoint South Project						
Average Daily Traffic Volumes						
Roadway Segment - Location	No Project		With Project		With Project - No Project	
	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	Percentage Change
1. Roth Road – Between Intermodal Way and Airport Way	18,402	D	18,435	D	+33	+0.2%
2. Roth Road – Between Intermodal Way and McKinley Avenue	17,772	D	18,010	D	+238	+1.3%
3. Roth Road – Between McKinley Avenue and Harlan Road	21,722	D	21,960	D	+238	+1.1%
4. Roth Road – Between Harlan Road and NB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	24,972	D	25,210	D	+238	+1.0%
5. Roth Road – Between NB I-5 Off/On-Ramps and SB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	32,532	D	32,750	D	+218	+0.7%
6. Airport Way – Between French Camp Road and Roth Road	18,207	C	18,255	C	+48	+0.3%
7. Airport Way – Between Roth Road and Lovelace Road	21,345	C	21,360	C	+15	+0.1%
8. Airport Way – Between Lovelace Road and Tactical Way	20,095	C	20,110	C	+15	+0.1%
9. Airport Way – Between Tactical Way and Daisywood Drive	22,430	D	22,445	D	+15	+0.1%

Note: LOS = Level of Service based on Segment Level of Service Thresholds from Manteca General Plan Update and Lathrop General Plan Update
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

Table 6 (Continued): Cumulative Level of Service Analysis – No Project versus With CenterPoint South Project						
Average Daily Traffic Volumes						
Roadway Segment - Location	No Project		With Project		Delta	
	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	LOS	ADT Volume	Percentage Change
10. Airport Way – Between Daisywood Drive and Pinnacle Drive	23,875	D	23,890	D	+15	+0.1%
11. Airport Way – Between Pinnacle Drive and Lathrop Road	26,911	D	27,045	D	+134	+0.5%
12. Airport Way – Between Lathrop Road and Northgate Drive	21,691	D	21,765	D	+74	+0.3%
13. Airport Way – Between Northgate Drive and Louise Avenue	20,486	D	20,560	D	+74	+0.4%
14. Airport Way – Between Louise Avenue and Crom Avenue	24,421	D	24,475	D	+54	+0.2%
15. Airport Way – Between Crom Avenue and Yosemite Avenue	23,241	D	23,295	D	+54	+0.2%
16. Lathrop Road – Between Union Road and Airport Way	29,240	D	29,260	D	+20	+0.1%
17. Lathrop Road – Between Airport Way and McKinley Avenue	27,900	D	27,960	D	+60	+0.2%
18. Lathrop Road – Between McKinley Avenue and 5 th Street	27,295	D	27,355	D	+60	+0.2%
19. Lathrop Road – Between 5 th Street and Harlan Road	29,005	D	29,065	D	+60	+0.2%
20. Lathrop Road – Between Harlan Road and NB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	38,955	D	39,015	D	+60	+0.2%
21. Lathrop Road – Between NB I-5 Off /On-Ramps and SB I-5 Off/On-Ramps	36,765	D	36,810	D	+45	+0.1%
22. Spartan Way – Between SB I-5 Off/On -Ramps and Golden Valley Parkway	34,035	D	34,040	D	+5	+0.0%
23. Intermodal Way – Between Roth Road and 5.11 Tactical Building	3,395	C	3,745	C	+345	+10.1%
24. Intermodal Way – Between 5.11 Tactical Building and Tactical Way	655	C	1,005	C	+345	+52.3%
25. Intermodal Way – Between Tactical Way and Pinnacle Drive	3,785	C	4,135	C	+345	+9.1%
26. Pinnacle Way – Between Intermodal Way and Airport Way	7,601	D	7,750	D	+149	+2.0%

Note: LOS = Level of Service based on Segment Level of Service Thresholds from Manteca General Plan Update and Lathrop General Plan Update
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2020

This page left intentionally blank.

APPENDIX D: MMRP FOR THE NORTHWEST AIRPORT WAY MASTER PLAN

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
for the
Northwest Airport Way Master Plan
City of Manteca, San Joaquin County, California**

State Clearinghouse No. 2010022024

Prepared for:



City of Manteca
Community Development Department
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337
209.456.8516

Contact: Rochelle Henson, Senior Planner

Prepared by:

Michael Brandman Associates
Bishop Ranch 3
2633 Camino Ramon, Suite 460
San Ramon, CA 94583
925.830.2733

Contact: Jason Brandman, Project Director



October 7, 2010

Table 1: Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
2. Agricultural Resources					
MM AG-1: At the time building permits are sought for any Master Plan contemplated use, the project applicant shall pay the required City of Manteca agricultural mitigation fee to help offset the conversion of Important Farmland pursuant to Manteca Municipal Code Chapter 13.42.	Receipt of fees	At the time building permits are sought	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
3. Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
<p>MM AIR-1a: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which the following measures will be complied with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-road equipment used onsite shall achieve a fleet average emissions equal to or less than the Tier II emissions standard of 4.8 grams of NO_x per horsepower hour. This can be achieved through any combination of engine standards. Tier II emission standards are set forth in Section 2423 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and Part 89 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations. • Construction equipment shall be properly maintained at an offsite location; maintenance shall include proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and data sheets of equipment design specifications shall be kept on-site during construction. • Onsite construction equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes in any one hour. • During the building phase, onsite electrical hook ups shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, to eliminate the need for diesel powered electric generators. • Construction workers shall be encouraged to carpool to and from the construction site to the greatest extent practical. Workers shall be informed in writing and a letter shall be placed on file in the City office documenting efforts to carpool. 	Notes on construction plans; submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works Engineering		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM AIR-1b: During the architectural coating phase for all Master Plan uses, paints with a volatile organic compound content less than 10 grams per liter shall be used.</p>	Notes on construction plans; site inspection	During the architectural coating phase for all Master Plan uses	City of Manteca Community Development Department Building Division		
<p>MM AIR-1c: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan building, the project applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable requirements of San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, Rule 9510 via the submittal of a Rule 9510 Implementation Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The implementation plan shall achieve a 33-percent reduction in NO_x and a 45-percent reduction in PM₁₀ over the first 10 years of operations through the use of onsite emissions reduction measures or through the payment of offsite mitigation fees to the SJVAPCD for purchase of emission reductions. The requirements of the approved implementation plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.</p>	Submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan building	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
<p>MM AIR-1d: Prior to approval of the final site plan for each Master Plan building that would receive 10 more truck deliveries per week, the project applicant shall demonstrate that the following anti-idling measures would be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide available electricity hookups for trucks in the loading dock areas. • Signs shall be posted in dock areas advising drivers that idling shall not occur for more than 3 minutes. • Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the California Air Resources Board shall be posted on signs at truck entrances to report idling violations. 	Approval of plans	Prior to approval of the final site plan for each Master Plan building that would receive 10 more truck deliveries per week	City of Manteca Community Development Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM AIR-6: Prior to final site plan approval for any Master Plan use that includes food service (i.e., restaurants, cafeterias, etc.), the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with SJVAPCD Rules 4102 (Nuisance) and 4692 (Commercial Charbroiling) to the extent that these rules are applicable. Compliance may entail the installation of kitchen exhaust vents, exhaust filtration systems, or other odor-reduction measures in accordance with accepted engineering practice. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project.</p>	Approval of plans	Prior to final site plan approval for any Master Plan use that includes food service (i.e., restaurants, cafeterias, etc.)	City of Manteca Community Development Department Building Division		
<p>4. Biological Resources</p>					
<p>MM BIO-1a: If ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31), then pre-construction surveys for nesting birds shall be conducted in all area suitable for nesting that are located within 250 feet of the Master Plan area. Surveys shall be conducted no more than 15 days prior to the beginning of ground disturbance. If an active nest is located, a 250-foot buffer shall be delineated and maintained around the nest until a qualified biologist has determined that fledging has occurred. Alternatively, CDFG may be consulted to determine if the protective buffer can be reduced based upon individual species responses to disturbance. This mitigation measure does not apply if ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur outside of the nesting season (September 1 through February 14).</p>	Site inspection; submittal of documentation	If ground clearing or vegetation removal activities occur during the nesting season (February 15 through August 31),	City of Manteca Community Development Department; California Department of Fish and Game		
<p>MM BIO-1b: No more than 30 day prior to the beginning of ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in general accordance with the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium. Should the surveys be scheduled to occur during the period extending from February 1 through May 1, then surveys shall be conducted</p>	Site inspection; submittal of documentation	No more than 30 day prior to the beginning of ground disturbance	City of Manteca Community Development Department; California Department of Fish and Game		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
no more than 15 days prior to the start of ground disturbance. Surveys shall be conducted from 2 hours before sunset to 1 hour after sunset, or from 1 hour before sunrise to 2 hours after sunrise, and shall be conducted during weather conducive to observing owls outside of their burrows. No surveys shall occur during heavy rain, high winds, or dense fog. If occupied burrows are found, mitigation for potential impacts shall follow the guidelines outlined by the Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, including passive relocation.					
MM BIO-2: Prior to issuance of grading permits within any impacted resource area, the project applicant shall obtain all required authorization from agencies with jurisdiction over the drainage canals within the Master Plan area. Such agencies may include but are not limited to the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Impacted resources shall be offset through onsite restoration, offsite restoration, or purchase of credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank in the region at no less than a 1:1 ratio.	Submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of grading permits within any impacted resource area	City of Manteca Community Development Department; United States Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game; Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board		
MM BIO-3: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall obtain all required authorization from agencies with jurisdiction over the drainage canals within the Master Plan area. This authorization may involve approvals from the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Impacted features shall be offset through onsite restoration, offsite restoration, or purchase of credits at an agency-approved mitigation bank in the region at no less than a 1:1 ratio.	Submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of grading permits	City of Manteca Community Development; United States Army Corps of Engineers, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
MM BIO-5: Prior to issuance of grading permits for any activities that would remove one or more trees subject to City of Manteca Ordinance 17.19.060, the applicant shall prepare and submit a tree removal and replacement plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall identify all trees proposed for removal and proposed replacement tree species and locations. Replacement shall occur at no less than a 1:1 ratio. All replacement trees shall be no less than a 24-inch box size species.	Approval of plan	Prior to issuance of grading permits for any activities that would remove one or more trees subject to City of Manteca Ordinance 17.19.060	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
MM BIO-6: Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit for the Master Plan, the project applicant shall obtain coverage under the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan. Coverage shall consist of approval of the Master Plan-specific “Section 8.2.1 (10) Checklist for Unmapped SJMSCP Projects” by the San Joaquin Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee. The applicant shall pay all required fees to the San Joaquin Council of Governments prior to the commencement of construction activities.	Approval of application; receipt of fees	Prior to issuance of the first grading or building permit for the Master Plan	City of Manteca Community Development Department Planning and building Divisions, Public Works Engineering; San Joaquin Council of Governments		
5. Cultural Resources					
MM CUL-1: If potentially significant historic resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities for any Master Plan use, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and	Site inspection; submittal of documentation	During subsurface excavation activities	City of Manteca Community Development Department Planning and Building Division & Public Works Engineering		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.</p>					
<p>MM CUL-2: If potentially significant archaeological resources are encountered during subsurface excavation activities, all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the resource shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the resource requires further study. The City shall require that the applicant include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation forms and evaluated for significance in terms of California Environmental Quality Act criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. If the resource is</p>	<p>Site inspection; submittal of documentation</p>	<p>During subsurface excavation activities</p>	<p>City of Manteca Community Development Department Planning and Building Division & Public Works Engineering</p>		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
determined to be significant under CEQA, the City and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether preservation in place is feasible. Such preservation in place is the preferred mitigation. If such preservation is infeasible, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the resource. The archaeologist shall also conduct appropriate technical analyses, prepare a comprehensive written report and file it with the appropriate information center (California Historical Resources Information System), and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.					
MM CUL-3: In the event that plant or animal fossils are discovered during subsurface excavation activities for the proposed project, all excavation within 50 feet of the fossil shall cease until a qualified paleontologist has determined the significance of the find and provides recommendations in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The paleontologist shall notify the City of Manteca to determine procedures to be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the find is determined to be significant and the City determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall design and implement a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. Upon approval, the plan shall be incorporated into the project.	Site inspection; submittal of documentation	During subsurface excavation activities	City of Manteca Community Development Department Planning and Building Division & Public Works Engineering		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM CUL-4: If previously unknown human remains are encountered during construction activities, Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code applies, and the following procedures shall be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code Section 5097.98 must be followed. Once project-related ground disturbance begins and if there is accidental discovery of human remains, the following steps shall be taken: • There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the San Joaquin County Coroner’s Office is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation into cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. 	Site inspection; submittal of documentation	During construction activities	City of Manteca Community Development Department Planning and Building Division & Public Works Engineering		
6. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity					
<p>MM GEO-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the project applicant shall submit a design-level geotechnical study and building plans to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable</p>	Approval of plans	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department Building Division		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
recommendations of the design-level geotechnical study and comply with all applicable requirements of the most recent version of the California Building Standards Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. The approved plans shall be incorporated into the proposed project. All onsite soil engineering activities shall be conducted under the supervision of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.					
7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
MM HAZ-1a: Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use in areas where THP-D has been detected, the applicant shall conduct soil sampling to delineate the horizontal and vertical extent of the TPH-D in order to implement a soil remediation program. Soil remediation shall be conducted in accordance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) guidelines. Contaminated soil shall be excavated and disposed of at an approved disposal facility. Following excavation, confirmation sampling shall be conducted to confirm whether remaining soil meets acceptable applicable regulatory levels. The excavation shall be backfilled with clean soil.	Submittal of documentation	Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use in areas where THP-D has been detected	City of Manteca Community Development Department, Public Works Engineering		
MM HAZ-1b: Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use, any onsite wells or septic systems intended to be removed shall be destroyed under permit and inspection with San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department.	Submittal of documentation	Prior to grading activities for any Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department; San Joaquin County Environmental Health Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM HAZ-1c: Prior to demolition activities of any structures located within the Master Plan area, the project applicant shall retain a certified hazardous waste contractor to determine the presence or absence of building materials or equipment that contains hazardous waste, including asbestos, lead-based paint, mercury, and PCBs. If such substances are found to be present, the contractor shall properly remove and dispose of these hazardous materials in accordance with federal and state law. All removal activities shall be completed prior to commencement of demolition activities.</p>	<p>Submittal of documentation</p>	<p>Prior to demolition activities of any structures located within the Master Plan area</p>	<p>City of Manteca Community Development Department Building Division</p>		
<p>8. Hydrology and Water Quality</p>					
<p>MM HYD-1: Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits for each proposed activities within the Master Plan area, the project applicant shall prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City of Manteca that identifies specific actions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify a practical sequence for BMP implementation, monitoring, and maintenance; site restoration; contingency measures; responsible parties; and agency contacts. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary erosion control measures shall be employed for disturbed areas. • Specific measures shall be identified to protect the onsite open drainages during construction of the proposed resort. • Specific measures shall be identified to protect the French Camp Outlet Canal and Drain 3 during any construction activities. 	<p>Approval of plan</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits for each proposed activities within the Master Plan area</p>	<p>City of Manteca Public Works</p>		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months. Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures. The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains. BMP performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (e.g., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination (such as inadvertent petroleum release) is required by the RWQCB to determine adequacy of the measure. In the event of significant construction delays or delays in final landscape installation, native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance, as an interim erosion control measure throughout the wet season. 					
<p>MM HYD-2: Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for any development activities that occur pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan and identify expected site-specific pollutants and required measures to treat those pollutants before they reach the regional detention basins and, ultimately, the French Camp Outlet Canal and San Joaquin River. The approved measures shall be incorporated</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits	City of Manteca Public Works		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>into the proposed project. The plan will describe monitoring and performance measures and standards required in order to ensure water quality is adequately protected during operation of all proposed sites within the project area. Examples of stormwater pollution prevention measures and practices to be incorporated into the plan include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategically placed bioswales and landscaped areas that promote percolation of runoff • Pervious pavement • Roof drains that discharge to landscaped areas • Trash enclosures with screen walls and roofs • Stenciling on storm drains • Curb cuts in parking areas to allow runoff to enter landscaped areas • Rock-lined areas along landscaped areas in parking lots • Catch basins • Oil/water separators • Regular sweeping of parking areas and cleaning of storm drainage facilities • Employee training to inform maintenance personnel of stormwater pollution prevention measures 					

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM HYD-4: Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit a stormwater quality control plan for the project as a whole to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall include a detailed drainage plan that demonstrates attainment of pre-project runoff requirements prior to release at the outlet canal and describes the volume reduction measures and treatment controls used to reach attainment. The drainage plan shall identify all expected flows from the project area and the location, size, and type of facilities used to retain and treat the runoff volumes and peak flows to meet pre-project conditions. The approved drainage plan shall be incorporated into the proposed project.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits	City of Manteca Public Works		
<p>MM HYD-5a: Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, the project applicant must revisit the status of the provisionally accredited levees providing 100-year level of flood protection to the Master Plan area to determine it is still the case and the Master Plan remains outside of the 100-year flood hazard.</p>	Submittal of documentation	Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		
<p>MM HYD-5b: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall either demonstrate that the developed portions of the Master Plan are outside of the anticipated 200-year flood hazard area or incorporate measures into the Master Plan to achieve a 200-year level of flood protection for any site installations that will occur in 2012 or later.</p>	Submittal of documentation	Prior to the issuance of grading permits	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
10. Noise					
<p>MM NOI-1: During construction activities for all Master Plan uses, the applicant shall require its construction contractors to adhere to the following noise attenuation requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily. The City of Manteca Director of Public Works shall have the discretion to permit construction activities to occur outside of allowable hours if compelling circumstances warrant such an exception (e.g., weather conditions necessary to pour concrete). • All construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer. If no noise-reduction features were installed by the manufacturer, then the contractor shall require that at least a muffler be installed on the equipment. • Construction staging and heavy equipment maintenance activities shall be performed a minimum distance of 300 feet from the nearest residence, unless safety or technical factors take precedence (e.g., an equipment breakdown). • A 10-foot-high construction noise barrier shall be installed along the edge of the Master Plan area within 300 feet of any offsite residence prior to start of grading activities. The noise barrier shall either be constructed of a minimum 0.5-inch plywood or utilize acoustical blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class of 12. The barrier shall remain in place until noise intensive aspects of construction are completed. 	Notes on construction plans; site inspection	During construction activities for all Master Plan uses	City of Manteca Community Development Department Building Division & Public Works		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
MM NOI-4: During Master Plan operations, the use of street sweepers and mechanical landscape maintenance equipment (lawnmowers, leaf blowers, etc.) shall be prohibited between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.	Site inspection	During Master Plan operations	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
11. Public Services and Utilities					
MM PSU-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for any Master Plan uses, the project applicant shall provide the City of Manteca will all applicable fire protection development fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule.	Receipt of fees	Prior to issuance of building permits for any Master Plan uses	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
MM PSU-3a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying a non-potable irrigation system that is separate from the potable water systems. The non-potable irrigation system shall use non-potable well water until recycled water is available, at which point it shall be converted to use recycled water.	Submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		
MM PSU-3b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall prepare and submit documentation to the City of Manteca for review and approval identifying that all appropriate and feasible water conservation measures are incorporated into the proposed use(s). The approved measures shall be incorporated into the final development plans. Examples of water conservation measures include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drought-tolerant landscaping or xeriscaping • Water efficient irrigation systems (drip irrigation, 	Submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
bubbler/soaker systems, hydrozones, evapotranspiration controllers, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensor-activated low-flow fixtures (e.g., faucets, urinals, and toilets) 					
MM PSU-6a: Prior to issuance of building permits for any building developed pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall retain a qualified contractor to perform construction and demolition debris recycling. Following the completion of construction activities, the project applicant shall provide documentation to the satisfaction of the City of Manteca demonstrating that construction and demolition debris was recycled.	Submittal of documentation	Prior to issuance of building permits for any building developed pursuant to the Master Plan	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
MM PSU-6b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each building developed pursuant to the Master Plan, the project applicant shall provide information to the City of Manteca describing the methods by which recycling and waste diversion activities shall be achieved. This information shall include but is not limited to the type and location of facilities necessary to collect and store recyclable materials, contractors who would pick-up recyclable and reusable materials, and how recycling and waste diversion activities would be integrated into operational practices. To the extent feasible, centralized recycling facilities are encouraged to enhance the ease and efficiency of such practices. The approved facilities and practices shall be incorporated into the uses envisioned by the Master Plan.	Approval of plan	Prior to issuance of building permits for each building developed pursuant to the Master Plan	City of Manteca Community Development Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
12. Transportation					
MM TRANS-1: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall pay all transportation-related fees in accordance with the latest adopted fee schedule at the time permits are sought. Such fees shall include, but not be limited to, the City of Manteca Public Facilities Implementation Plan fee and the San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Impact Fee.	Receipt of fees	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department Building Division		
MM TRANS-2a: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall provide fees to the City of Manteca for the installation of signals at the I-5 Northbound Ramps/Roth Road and I-5 Southbound Ramps/Roth Road intersections, provided that fee collection mechanism exists. Fee amounts shall be calculated in accordance with equitable share methodology. This mitigation measure shall be superseded by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 if no fee collection mechanism exists for this improvement at the time building permits are sought.	Receipt of fees	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		
MM TRANS-2b: Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall provide fees to the City of Manteca for improvements to the Roth Road/Harland Road intersection, provided that fee collection mechanism exists. The improvements shall consist of the installation of a signal and widening the westbound approach to include left-turn lane, through lane, and shared through/right lane. Fee amounts shall be calculated in accordance with equitable share methodology. This mitigation measure shall be superseded by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1 if no fee collection mechanism exists for this improvement at the time building permits are sought.	Receipt of fees	Prior to issuance of building permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM TRANS-4a: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about appropriate frontage improvements. All necessary frontage improvements shall be depicted on the final site plan and implemented as part of site development.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		
<p>MM TRANS-4b: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department and public Works about the following roadway access issues listed below. The access evaluations shall be performed in accordance with the City’s Transportation Impact Study Guidelines. All necessary improvements shall be depicted on the final site plan and implemented as part of site development. Issues include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for traffic signals at driveways • Traffic signal coordination and installation of associated signal conduits • Truck traffic volumes at driveways and associated lane storage requirements, right-turn deceleration needs, and curb return radii • Coordination and accommodation of driveways for future projects on the opposite side of the street • Pavement thickness 	Approval of plan	Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM TRANS-6a: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department, City of Manteca Public Works, Manteca Transit, and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District about the inclusion of appropriate transit facilities (turnouts, shelters, etc.) or services (e.g., an employee shuttle). If transit facilities are deemed to be necessary, they shall be provided on the final site plan. If transit services are deemed to be necessary, the applicant shall prepare a service plan and submit it to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The approved plan shall be incorporated into the project. To the extent feasible, transit facilities and services shall be coordinated among Master Plan uses to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		
<p>MM TRANS-6b: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate bicycle facilities (racks, lockers, etc.). If bicycle facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use	City of Manteca Community Development Department		
<p>MM TRANS-6c: Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use, the applicant shall consult with the City of Manteca Community Development Department about the inclusion of appropriate pedestrian facilities. If pedestrian facilities are deemed to be necessary, such facilities shall be provided on the final site plan.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to site plan review for each Master Plan light industrial use	City of Manteca Community Development Department		

Table 1 (cont.): Northwest Airport Way Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM TRANS-6d: Prior to site plan review for the Master Plan community commercial use, the applicant shall prepare and submit plans to the City of Manteca demonstrating access and facilities for public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. Public transit facilities shall consist of at least one bus turnout with shelter, lighting, trash receptacle, and direct pedestrian connection to the community commercial center. Bicycle facilities shall consist of racks near building entrances that provide storage equivalent to 2 percent of the minimum Municipal Code parking requirement. Pedestrian facilities shall consist of sidewalks along street frontages and direct connections between buildings. The approved facilities shall be incorporated in the community commercial center plans.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to site plan review for the Master Plan community commercial use	City of Manteca Community Development Department & Public Works		
<p>MM TRANS-7: Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use, the applicant shall submit a Construction Traffic Control Plan to the City of Manteca for review and approval. The plan shall identify the timing and routing of all major construction equipment and trucking to avoid potential traffic congestion and delays on the local street network. The plan shall encourage the use of Interstate 5 (I-5), Roth Road, Airport Way, and Lathrop Road wherever practical. Anticipated temporary road closures should be identified, along with safety measures and detours. If necessary, construction equipment and materials deliveries shall be limited to off-peak hours to avoid conflicts with local traffic circulation. The plan shall also identify suitable locations for construction worker parking.</p>	Approval of plan	Prior to issuance of grading permits for each Master Plan use	City of Manteca Public Works		

This page left intentionally blank.

APPENDIX E: SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITY OF MANTECA AND CITY OF LATHROP

MODIFICATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The agreement is made and entered into this 20th day of March, 2012 by and between the City of Manteca (MANTECA) and the City of Lathrop (LATHROP).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, LATHROP sued MANTECA under San Joaquin Superior Court case No.s CV025272 and CV025308; and

WHEREAS, both cases were settled by way of written settlement agreement, attached as exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, it was agreed that in consideration of Lathrop dismissing both cases without prejudice, both parties would commission a joint traffic study "...to avoid delays associated with such litigation and to avoid future litigation as subsequent projects are approved...(and) to create a comprehensive traffic model to assess needed transportation improvements over selected roads, intersections and interchanges;" and

WHEREAS, said joint traffic study has been prepared and extensively reviewed by both parties; and

WHEREAS, both parties are satisfied that all the concerns raised by the litigation have been addressed in the joint traffic study, attached as exhibit "B".


NOW THEREFORE the parties agree to modify their settlement agreement as follows:

1. Lathrop agrees to dismiss the within litigation with prejudice.

2. Both parties agree that the sums necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts at the sites examined in the joint traffic study are relatively equal and the small difference is waived.
3. It is finally agreed that MANTECA and projects approved by MANTECA shall pay zero to LATHROP to mitigate traffic impacts on Lathrop sites identified in the joint traffic study and LATHROP and projects approved by LATHROP shall pay zero to MANTECA to mitigate traffic impacts MANTECA sites identified in the joint traffic study.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties indicate their agreement with the terms of this Modified Settlement Agreement.

CITY OF MANTECA



Willie W. Weatherford, Mayor

CITY OF LATHROP



J. Chaka Santos, Mayor

Exhibit "A"

Manteca/Lathrop Traffic Study

Cooperative Agreement and Agreement To Settle Litigation

This cooperative agreement is made and entered into this 16th day of MAY, 2005, by and between the City of Manteca (MANTECA), the City of Lathrop (LATHROP) for selection and compensation of a qualified engineering consultant for the purpose of conducting a traffic study, the parameters of which are set forth below, and in order to settle litigation.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, MANTECA and LATHROP have determined the need to hire an engineering consultant to quantify traffic impacts associated with the approval of land use applications in each city; and

WHEREAS, LATHROP sued MANTECA in San Joaquin Superior Court over MANTECA's approval of two projects, Big League Dreams/Stadium Plaza Retail Center (Case No. CV025272) and Villa Ticino West (Case No. CV025308), alleging, among other things, that MANTECA did not properly evaluate the impacts of traffic due to the project as required by the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.); and

WHEREAS, in order to avoid the delays associated with such litigation and to avoid future litigation as subsequent projects are approved, LATHROP and MANTECA desire to create a comprehensive traffic model to assess needed transportation improvements over selected roads, intersections and interchanges; and

WHEREAS, the MANTECA and LATHROP city councils have committed to jointly funding the traffic study; and

WHEREAS, LATHROP has agreed to hire a qualified engineering consultant and administer the consultant contract for the feasibility study;

WHEREAS, in entering into this agreement, LATHROP does not concede or imply that the two lawsuits lack merit. Similarly, MANTECA does not concede or imply that the two lawsuits have merit. MANTECA and LATHROP enter into this Agreement in order to resolve the two lawsuits, and in the interest of seeking reasonable accommodation of each city's interests. By entering into this agreement, MANTECA and LATHROP desire to resolve entirely and finally the two lawsuits and to avoid litigation regarding similar issues in the future.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and undertakings herein made and the mutual benefits to be derived therefrom, the parties hereto represent, covenant and agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. **Study Purpose.** The purpose of the traffic study is to determine the type, timing, and triggers for roadway improvements, including, but not limited to, widening, signalization, and interchange design, for the following roadways or interchanges: McKinley Avenue; Airport Way; Roth Road; Louise Avenue; Lathrop Road; Yosemite Avenue; and interchanges of those roads with I-5, Highway 99 or Highway 120. These roadway improvements are to be identified as required mitigation measures for any and all projects approved by either MANTECA or LATHROP after January 31, 2005 that may potentially affect these roadways, intersections and interchanges as set forth in the pending traffic study. In addition, such roadway improvements shall be required of the Big League Dreams/Stadium Plaza Retail Center and Villa Ticino West projects.
2. **Scope of Services and Deliverables.** The scope of services and deliverables for the traffic study is shown in Exhibit A of this agreement.
3. **Commencement and Duration.** The study shall commence on, or around, June 1, 2005, and shall not take more than one year to complete.
4. **Staff Expenses.** Each party shall bear its own staff expenses for providing information to and administering the consultant contract.
5. **Dispute Resolution:**
 - A. **Mediation.** LATHROP and MANTECA agree to mediate any dispute or claim arising between them out of this agreement, before resorting to arbitration or court action
 - B. **Arbitration of Disputes.** LATHROP and MANTECA agree that any dispute or claim arising between them out of this agreement, which is not settled through mediation, shall be decided by neutral binding arbitration.
6. **Remedies Cumulative.** No remedy or election of remedies provided for in this agreement shall be deemed exclusive, but shall be cumulative with all other remedies at law or in equity. Each remedy shall be construed to give the fullest effect allowed by law.
7. **Applicable Law.** This agreement shall be governed by, and construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of California,

- 8. **Signator's Warranty.** Each party warrants to each other that he or she is fully authorized and competent to enter into this agreement in the capacity indicated by his or her signature and agrees to be bound by this agreement as of the day and year first mentioned above upon the execution of this agreement by each other party.
- 9. **Dismissal of Lawsuits.** Upon execution of this agreement, LATHROP shall dismiss without prejudice the two pending lawsuits. Said dismissal shall occur only after MANTECA shall provide fully executed tolling agreements, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit "B", to provide for the reinstatement of said actions in the event that the traffic study is not completed or its recommendations not imposed.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned parties have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first written above.

LATHROP
 City of Lathrop, a municipal corporation

MANTECA
 City of Manteca, a municipal corporation

By: *Pamela R Cerde*
 Its: *City Manager*

By: *[Signature]*
 Its: _____

Approved as to form:
[Signature]
 Susan Burns Cochran, City Attorney

Approved as to form:
[Signature] 5-19-05
 John Brinlon, City Attorney

EXHIBIT "A"
RFQ/RFP

Draft

(May 2, 2005)

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

**LATHROP / MANTECA
TRAFFIC MITIGATION STUDY**

Background

The City of Lathrop and the City of Manteca acknowledging the overlapping traffic impacts caused by growth in their respective cities have formed a partnership to address those impacts and to develop a mutual traffic impact mitigation plan and transportation impact fee.

Your proposal will be for services to assemble a comprehensive transportation model and fee structure which includes the following elements: Technical; Transportation DUE Forecast by Land Use; Transportation Improvement Classes; Transportation Project Summary and Worksheets and Fee Schedule.

Description

Develop an AB 1600 compliant local transportation element, which is consistent with the existing fee programs and encompasses the City of Lathrop's and City of Manteca's local and regional transportation responsibilities. The study needs to include all development that has not yet been approved as of February 8, 2005. In addition, the Villa Ticino and Big League Dreams/Stadium Plaza projects shall be included in both the impacts and needed improvements.

Project Goals

To develop a local transportation element which meets the "nexus study" elements of AB 1600 (Government Code Section 66000 et seq.).

Build upon the current transportation fees in each city which will supplement other local, state, and Federal funding programs by having new development in the City of Lathrop and the City of Manteca pay its proportional share for local and regional transportation projects.

Participate in the development of land use assumptions and growth forecasts.

Develop a dynamic transportation model encompassing both cities.

Develop a capital improvement project list and estimates.

Prepare an implementation schedule.

Develop a fee schedule.

Scope of Services to Achieve Project Goals

The services required by the City of Lathrop and the City of Manteca are outlined below. This scope of services is preliminary for the purpose of developing a proposal. Proposals should note any areas where the preliminary scope of services seems inadequate to achieve the project goals. The final scope of services will be formalized during the contract negotiations.

1. Update the current traffic models using the best available data, supplementing that data as necessary and develop a single comprehensive traffic model. The land use zone system that has each future project in question should have its own zone in order to accurately track traffic from each project to all parts of the roadway system.
2. Using the existing database from the traffic models develop a multi zone capital improvement project schedule which assigns zonal responsibility for local and regional traffic impacts. Also, "existing traffic" shall also include future projects that have received project entitlements as of February 8, 2005 but are not yet constructed.
3. Identify and analyze current level of service and year 2025 level of service.
4. Identify, analyze, and prioritize the transportation capital improvement projects for future years.
5. Prepare a detailed cost estimates for the transportation capital improvement projects. The cost estimate shall be prepared by a licensed Civil Engineer.
6. Develop the transportation impact fee.
7. Attend and participate in meetings with City of Lathrop and City of Manteca staff and other consultants on a monthly basis.
8. Present the plan at four (4) public meetings, two (2) Planning Commission and two (2) City Council meeting.

Project Deliverables

Project deliverables shall include the following:

1. All text documents shall be in Microsoft Word. All spreadsheets shall be in Microsoft Excel, except for outputs from proprietary software used in analysis.

2. Two (2) paper copy of the assumptions report.
3. Two (2) paper copy of the validation report.
4. Two (2) paper copy and two (2) electronic copy of all electronic files used to model the transportation system.
5. Four (4) copies of each draft of the transportation plan and capital improvement plan; eighty-eight (88) copies of the final plan and capital improvement plan (22 ea. for Planning Commission approval and City Council approval); two (2) electronic copy of the final plan and capital improvement plan.
6. Computer traffic model shall be compatible with each cities current traffic model and that of San Joaquin Council of Governments.

Proposal Guidelines

Include the following in the proposal:

Services to be provided for performance of the required Scope of Services (Discuss any areas of concern and recommendations for changes in scope of services);

Names and qualifications of persons to be assigned to the project, applicable experience, and a reference for each project used to describe experience;

List of subconsultants;

Project schedule showing task sequence;

List of Deliverables;

Acknowledgement of City's insurance requirements;

The following cost information is to be submitted.

- Total, not to exceed, cost to perform the work by task including labor, subconsultants, and other direct costs.
- Billing rate schedule for professional, technical, and administrative personnel.
- The markup on direct costs including subconsultants, travel, etc.

(Submit 8 copies of the proposal).

Agreement

The City of Lathrop / City of Manteca and the Consultant shall enter into an agreement provided by the City. A copy of said agreement is attached hereto for informational

purposes only. The agreement will reference the final scope of work, which shall become part of the parties' agreement.

Insurance

The Consultant shall carry during the life of the agreement insurance in accordance with the requirements of "City of Manteca Insurance Requirements for Consultants", a copy of the requirements is attached hereto for informational purposes. The City of Lathrop / City of Manteca will accept ACORD forms.

Proposal Submission Requirements

All proposal packages shall be firm offers, valid for a period of 90 days following the deadline for submission. Eight (8) copies of the Proposal shall be submitted in response to this Request for Qualifications. One (1) copy of the Cost Proposal shall be submitted sealed in a separate envelope identified as Cost Proposal.

The proposal must be sealed and delivered to the City of Lathrop / City of Manteca, City Clerk's Office with the following information placed on the sealed package containing the proposal:

LATHROP / MANTECA
TRAFFIC MITIAGTION STUDY
Firm: (Name of Consultant submitting proposal)

All proposals must be received no later than 4:00 p.m. on May xx, 2005. Proposals received later than the above date and time will be rejected and returned unopened.

Pre-Proposal Conference

No pre-proposal conference will be held.

Tentative Schedule

May 2005	Send out RFQ's
May/June 2005	Proposals due
June/July 2005	Consultant Short List
August 2005	Consultant Interviews
September 2005	Notice to Proceed
March 2006	Project complete

Qualification & Submittal

Consultants interested in providing the scope of services must submit their qualifications by the deadline date and time defined in this RFQ. Submittals must include, as a minimum:

- Cover Letter:** A letter describing the firm's interest in providing the scope of services for Traffic Study. The person authorized by the firm to negotiate a contract with the City of Lathrop / City of Manteca shall sign the cover letter. Include the name, phone number, fax number and e-mail address of a contact person for the proposal process.
- Location:** The address of the office where the project manager will reside and where a majority of the work will be performed.
- Project Team:** An organization chart showing the relationship between firm members, subcontractors, subconsultants and agencies involved in the project.
- Experience:** Resumes of the key personnel, subcontractors and subconsultants proposed for the project. Describe similar projects the team has completed. Describe the role of the project manager and key staff in those projects.
- Work load:** Indicate the workload of the project manager and key team members and their capacity to complete the scope of services through May 2007.
- References:** Provide three references for the project manager and key team members from their work on similar projects.
- DBE Goal:** The City of Manteca has an annual goal of 9% DBE participation in contracts. Proposals should include a description of how the firm/team will meet the 9% goal. If the goal cannot be met, describe the good faith effort made to attempt to achieve the goal. To be eligible as a DBE, a firm must meet current California Department of Transportation standards, as well as those in 49 CFR Part 23, Section 23.47, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
- The city of Lathrop has an annual goal of 10% DBE
- Local Participation:** Indicate if local firms will be included on the project team as either a prime or subconsultant. A local firm is defined as one having a staffed office in San Joaquin County as of March 1, 2005.

Qualifications Evaluation Criteria

Qualifications will be evaluated based upon the following criteria and points system:

- **General Qualifications and Experience of the Project Manager and Key Team Members.** A maximum of eleven (11) points will be awarded based on the general experience of the project manager and key team members in the field of transportation modeling, development of dynamic transportation models, land use assumptions, growth forecasts, transportation impact fees and other fields relevant to the scope of services.
- **Specific Qualifications and Experience of the Project Manager and Key Team Members on Similar Projects.** A maximum of seventeen (17) points will be awarded based on the experience of the project manager and key team members on projects similar to that described in this RFQ.
- **DBE Participation.** Four (4) points will be awarded to firms/teams that demonstrate they will meet the 9% DBE goal or demonstrate that they made a good faith effort to achieve the goal.
- **Local Participation.** Three (3) points will be awarded to firms/teams that include a local firm as a prime or subconsultant, as defined in Section V. Qualifications Submittal, of this RFQ.

Proposal Evaluation and Contracting Process

Consultant qualifications will be evaluated by a panel consisting of staff from the City of Lathrop / City of Manteca, the San Joaquin Council of Governments, San Joaquin County and Caltrans. A maximum of four of the highest ranked firms will be invited to interview with the panel to explain their relevant experience, project understanding, and their approach and methodology to perform the services described in this RFQ. The panel will rank the interviewed firms; contract negotiations will be initiated with the highest-ranking firm. If negotiations with the highest-ranking firm are unsuccessful, negotiations will be conducted with the next highest-ranking firm. This process will be repeated until an acceptable contract is negotiated.

Solicitation Disclaimer

All documents become the property of the City of Lathrop / City of Manteca upon submission. Cost for preparing, submitting and representing a proposal and participating in an interview is at the sole expense of the consultant. The City of Lathrop / City of Manteca has the right to reject any and all of the proposals received as a result of this solicitation. Solicitation of proposals in no way obligates the City of Lathrop / City of Manteca to contract with any firm or individual. The decision to award is at the discretion of the Lathrop / Manteca City Council.

Questions

Questions regarding this RFQ should be directed to City of Lathrop / City of Manteca staff? Jim Costantini - City of Lathrop

EXHIBIT "B"
TOLLING AGREEMENT FORM

BIG LEAGUE DREAMS TOLLING AGREEMENT

This AGREEMENT is made and entered into by and between the City of Lathrop ("Lathrop"), the City of Manteca ("Manteca"), and the City of Manteca Redevelopment Agency ("Redevelopment Agency"). Lathrop, Manteca and Redevelopment Agency are referred to collectively as the "parties" and individually as the "party." The purpose of this agreement is to toll the statute of limitations for filing a legal challenge to Manteca's approval of the Big League Dreams Sports Park/Stadium Plaza Retail Center ("Project") with respect to Lathrop.

RECITALS

- A. Manteca is the applicant and landowner for the Project.
- B. The Redevelopment Agency is the real-party-in-interest for the Project.
- C. On November 1, 2004, Manteca adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (04-22) and approved the Project.
- D. On or about November 3, 2004, Manteca posted with the County Clerk a "Notice of Determination" ("NOD") for the Project.
- E. On December 2, 2004, Lathrop timely filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate ("Petition") (*City of Lathrop v. City of Manteca*, San Joaquin County Superior Court No. CV025272) alleging that Manteca's adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project violated the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). Lathrop personally served the Petition on Manteca on December 9, 2004.
- F. On May 12, 2005, the parties entered a Settlement Agreement whereby Lathrop agreed to dismiss its Petition without prejudice.
- G. Under Public Resources Code section 21167, the statute of limitations within which a petitioner may commence a lawsuit challenging Manteca's decision to approve the Project under CEQA is 30 days from the date the County Clerk posted the

NOD. The statute of limitations for a CEQA challenge to Manteca's decision to approve the Project, therefore, expired on December 3, 2004. Under Government Code section 65009, subdivision (c), the time for personal service of such a petition is 90 days from the time of Project approval. The deadline for service of the Petition established by Government Code section 65009 therefore expired on January 20, 2005.

H. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties are conducting traffic studies. To allow further time for these studies, and ultimately, for the parties to reach an agreement on the allocation of funding responsibilities for potential road improvements pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties wish to enter into an agreement tolling the statute of limitations to provide the parties with a reasonable opportunity to resolve the matter without further litigation.

J. In the event the parties are unable to resolve the traffic issue as contemplated in the Settlement Agreement, the parties agree that Lathrop retains the ability to re-file a Petition for Writ of Mandate.

AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and/or covenants contained in this Agreement, the parties agree as follows:

1. Each recital set forth above is incorporated herein by reference and is made part of this agreement.
2. The statute of limitations or deadline for service for any claim or cause of action Lathrop has, or may have, that would otherwise have expired on or after the filing date, are hereby tolled and extended as to Lathrop. Any such statute of limitations or deadline for service shall, as to Lathrop, expire on the termination date. This agreement shall not affect the statute of limitations applicable to any association, entity, or person other than Lathrop.
3. Manteca and the Redevelopment Agency waive any defense they have, or may have, to any claim or cause of action commenced by Lathrop based on the expiration

of any statute of limitations, laches, estoppel or waiver regarding the passage of time, action or inaction between the filing date and the termination date. Manteca and the Redevelopment Agency do not waive any defenses other than those regarding the passage of time, action, or inaction between the filing date and the termination date and Manteca and the Redevelopment Agency do not waive any defenses other than as to Lathrop.

4. For purposes of this agreement:

a. "Filing date" means December 2, 2004.

b. "Termination date" means the earlier of: (1) 30 days after any party provides written notice to all other parties of the termination of this agreement, or (2) December 31, 2005.

5. The approval of this agreement does not constitute, and shall not be construed as, an admission by any party of any liability regarding claims arising out of Manteca's approval of the Project. This agreement shall not be admissible in any proceeding as an admission of any factual matter against any party, except as to the agreement and waiver set forth in this agreement.

6. The parties recognize that, under limited circumstances, certain statutes of limitations enacted for the benefit of the public cannot be waived or tolled by agreement. The parties to this agreement agree that no such statute of limitations is involved in or implicated by this agreement and that they will not raise any defense based upon such ground.

7. This agreement may be executed in counterpart originals.

8. The individuals signing this agreement on behalf of each party represent and warrant that they are authorized to do so on behalf of their respective parties. The parties to this agreement further represent and warrant that this agreement is valid upon execution by the parties, and that no other person or entity has an interest in this matter such that he/she/it must sign this agreement in order for it to be valid.

9. This agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties hereto

regarding the tolling of the statutes of limitations and defenses related to the passage of time. There are no other such agreements, warranties, or representations regarding the statutes of limitations other than those expressly set forth in this agreement. Any amendments to this agreement shall be in writing, and shall be signed by all the parties.

10. Notice pursuant to this agreement shall be provided in writing by first class United States mail, shall be accompanied by proof of service, and shall be provided as follows:

City of Lathrop:

City of Manteca:

City of Manteca Redevelopment Agency:

Any party may, at its discretion, change the address at which such notice is to be provided by providing written notice of such change to all other parties.

11. The invalidity of any portion of this agreement shall not invalidate the remainder.

12. Except as set forth herein, nothing contained herein shall constitute a waiver of any claims, demands, causes of action, positions, rights, remedies, and defenses, in law and in equity, of any of the parties.

13. The parties acknowledge that each party and its counsel have reviewed and revised this agreement and that no rule of construction to the effect that any ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting party shall be employed in the interpretation of this agreement.


///

///

///

DATE: May __, 2005

City of Lathrop


By: 

Name: Susan Burns Cochran

Title: Attorney

DATE: May 16, 2005

City of Manteca


By: 

Name:

Title:

DATE: May 16, 2005

City of Manteca Redevelopment Agency

By: 

Name:

Title:

30213201.002

VILLA TICINO WEST TOLLING AGREEMENT

This AGREEMENT is made and entered into by and between the City of Lathrop ("Lathrop"), the City of Manteca ("Manteca"), and A. Rossi, Inc. Lathrop, Manteca and A. Rossi, Inc. are referred to collectively as the "parties" and individually as the "party." The purpose of this agreement is to toll the statute of limitations for filing a legal challenge to Manteca's approval of the Villa Ticino West project ("Project") with respect to Lathrop.

RECITALS

- A. A. Rossi, Inc. is the property owner, applicant, and real party in interest for the Project.
- B. On November 1, 2004, Manteca approved an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") and approved the Project.
- C. On or about November 3, 2004, Manteca posted with the County Clerk a "Notice of Determination" ("NOD") for the Project.
- D. On December 2, 2004, Lathrop timely filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate ("Petition") (*City of Lathrop v. City of Manteca*, San Joaquin County Superior Court No. CV025308) alleging that Manteca's adoption of an EIR for the Project violated the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). Lathrop personally served the Petition on Manteca on December 9, 2004.
- E. On May 16, 2005, the parties entered a Settlement Agreement whereby Lathrop agreed to dismiss its Petition without prejudice.
- F. Under Public Resources Code section 21167, the statute of limitations within which a petitioner may commence a lawsuit challenging Manteca's decision to approve the Project under CEQA is 30 days from the date the County Clerk posted the NOD. The statute of limitations for a CEQA challenge to Manteca's decision to approve the Project, therefore, expired on December 3, 2004. Under Government Code section

65009, subdivision (c), the time for personal service of such a petition is 90 days from the time of Project approval. The deadline for service of the Petition established by Government Code section 65009 therefore expired on January 20, 2005.

G. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties are conducting traffic studies. To allow further time for these studies, and ultimately, for the parties to reach an agreement on the allocation of funding responsibilities for potential road improvements pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties wish to enter into an agreement tolling the statute of limitations to provide the parties with a reasonable opportunity to resolve the matter without further litigation.

H. In the event the parties are unable to resolve the traffic issue as contemplated in the Settlement Agreement, the parties agree that Lathrop retains the ability to re-file a Petition for Writ of Mandate.

AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and/or covenants contained in this Agreement, the parties agree as follows:

1. Each recital set forth above is incorporated herein by reference and is made part of this agreement.
2. The statute of limitations or deadline for service for any claim or cause of action Lathrop has, or may have, that would otherwise have expired on or after the filing date are hereby tolled and extended as to Lathrop. Any such statute of limitations or deadline for service shall, as to Lathrop, expire on the termination date. This agreement shall not affect the statute of limitations or deadline for service applicable to any association, entity, or person other than Lathrop.
3. Manteca and A. Rossi, Inc. waive any defense they have, or may have, to any claim or cause of action commenced by Lathrop based on the expiration of any statute of limitations, laches, estoppel or waiver regarding the passage of time, action or inaction between the filing date and the termination date. Manteca and A. Rossi, Inc. do not waive

any defenses other than those regarding the passage of time, action, or inaction between the filing date and the termination date and Manteca and A. Rossi, Inc. do not waive any defenses other than as to Lathrop.

4. For purposes of this agreement:

a. "Filing date" means December 2, 2004.

b. "Termination date" means the earlier of: (1) 30 days after any party provides written notice to all other parties of the termination of this agreement, or (2) December 31, 2005.

5. The approval of this agreement does not constitute, and shall not be construed as, an admission by any party of any liability regarding claims arising out of Manteca's approval of the Project. This agreement shall not be admissible in any proceeding as an admission of any factual matter against any party, except as to the agreement and waiver set forth in this agreement.

6. The parties recognize that, under limited circumstances, certain statutes of limitations enacted for the benefit of the public cannot be waived or tolled by agreement. The parties to this agreement agree that no such statute of limitations is involved in or implicated by this agreement and that they will not raise any defense based upon such ground.

7. This agreement may be executed in counterpart originals.

8. The individuals signing this agreement on behalf of each party represent and warrant that they are authorized to do so on behalf of their respective parties. The parties to this agreement further represent and warrant that this agreement is valid upon execution by the parties, and that no other person or entity has an interest in this matter such that he/she/it must sign this agreement in order for it to be valid.

9. This agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties hereto regarding the tolling of the statutes of limitations and defenses related to the passage of time. There are no other such agreements, warranties, or representations regarding the

statutes of limitations other than those expressly set forth in this agreement. Any amendments to this agreement shall be in writing, and shall be signed by all the parties.

10. Notice pursuant to this agreement shall be provided in writing by first class United States mail, shall be accompanied by proof of service, and shall be provided as follows:

City of Lathrop:

City of Manteca:

City of Manteca Redevelopment Agency:

Any party may, at its discretion, change the address at which such notice is to be provided by providing written notice of such change to all other parties.

11. The invalidity of any portion of this agreement shall not invalidate the remainder.

12. Except as set forth herein, nothing contained herein shall constitute a waiver of any claims, demands, causes of action, positions, rights, remedies, and defenses, in law and in equity, of any of the parties.

13. The parties acknowledge that each party and its counsel have reviewed and revised this agreement and that no rule of construction to the effect that any ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting party shall be employed in the interpretation of this agreement.


June
DATE: ~~May~~ 16, 2005

City of Lathrop

By: 
Name: Susan Burns Cochran
Title: Attorney


DATE: May 16, 2005

City of Manteca

By: 
Name:
Title:

June
DATE: ~~May~~ 6, 2005

A. Rossi, Inc.

By: 
Name: Patricia Teunissen
Title: President

50206252.001

By: 
Name: Toinette Rossi
Title: Secretary/Treasurer

Exhibit "B"

TJKM
Transportation
Consultants

Vision That Moves Your Community

Revised Draft

**Lathrop-Manteca
Traffic Study**

In City of Lathrop and
City of Manteca

August 28, 2008

Pleasanton
Fresno
Sacramento
Santa Rosa



www.tjkm.com

This page left intentionally blank.

APPENDIX F: ONGOING PROJECTS IN MANTECA

This page left intentionally blank.