AGENDA

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #6

Monday, March 5, 2018 – 6:00 pm

Manteca Transit Center Meeting Room, 220 Moffat Boulevard, Manteca, CA

6:00 PM - GPAC Workshop

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Summary Minutes Meeting 5 – February 5, 2018
4. General Plan Update: Economic Development and Fiscal Discussion
5. Review of Public Comment Items from Previous Meeting
   a. Schools
   b. Flooding and wastewater
6. Public Comment
7. Adjournment

The next scheduled meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee of the City of Manteca is
Monday, April 2, 2018, at 6:00 p.m. in the Manteca Transit Center, 220 Moffat Boulevard, Manteca,
CA.

I hereby certify that the agenda for the above stated meeting was posted at a location accessible to
members of the public at City Hall, 1001 W. Center Street, Manteca, CA prior to Friday, March 2,
2018, by 5:00 pm.

[Signature]
LISA SCHIMMELFENNIG
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III

In Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to
participate in this meeting, please call (209) 456 8017. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting
will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR
35.102 35.104 ADA Title II).
MEMORANDUM

Meeting 6 – March 5, 2018

TO: Manteca General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)
FROM: Beth Thompson and Martti Eckert, De Novo Planning Group
SUBJECT: General Plan Economic Development and Fiscal Discussion
DATE: March 5, 2018

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The March 5th GPAC meeting will focus on the topic of economic development. This meeting packet identifies specific reading materials related to economic development and raises key issues to consider in preparation for the GPAC meeting.

The Economic Development Element is an optional element of the General Plan. The Manteca General Plan 2023 includes an Economic Development Element that addresses economic development issues related to land use, labor force, business sector, housing, quality of life, and infrastructure. The General Plan Update will also include a component that addresses fiscal sustainability. For the purposes of the General Plan discussion, economic development generally refers to the economic health of the City in terms of business attraction and retention, provision of high-quality jobs and services, and the community’s place in the regional economy while fiscal sustainability refers to the financial health of the City as an agency and the City’s ability to fund necessary services and infrastructure.

Public comments received to date are provided for the General Plan Advisory Committee to review via the General Plan Update website at: https://manteca.generalplan.org/content/public-comments.

REQUIRED READING

Prior to the meeting on March 5th, please read the following items:

- Existing Conditions Report, Chapter 1.0, Section 1.3 Economic and Fiscal Background Analysis – please note that the Existing Conditions Report was provided previously in the Meeting Packet for November 6, 2017

- City of Manteca General Plan 2023, Chapter 5 – Economic Development Element – please note that the General Plan 2023 was provided previously in the Meeting Packet for October 2, 2017
WORK EXERCISE
After reading the materials identified above, please consider the following questions and be prepared to discuss.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1. In developing a goal and policy framework to address economic development, what top three issues or actions should the City prioritize?

2. In reviewing the existing General Plan goals, policies, and action programs (pages 5-3 through 6-15) related to economic development:
   a. Which existing General Plan goals, policies, and action programs best address the concerns you identified?
   b. What additional issues or priorities are not addressed in the existing General Plan?

3. In developing a goal and policy framework to address fiscal sustainability, what top three issues or actions should the City prioritize?

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FROM FEBRUARY 5, 2018 MEETING

RIPON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT: PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES POLICY SET
During the February 5th GPAC meeting, the committee requested that the consultant team research three policy issues pertaining to the Ripon Unified School District. A brief description of each issue and our recommendation for how to modify the Public Facilities and Services policy set is as follows:

- Several GPAC members and Kit Oase, Board Member of the Ripon Unified School District, requested that implementation measure PF-I-33 be modified to make specific reference to the school district. The policy set currently refers to the school districts serving the Planning Area in general terms. If the GPAC supports specifically referencing the Ripon Unified School District, the consultant team proposes listing the district, along with the Manteca Unified School District, where the term “school districts” first appears in the policy set, policy PF-P-46, and continuing to use “school districts” for the remainder of the document.

- Mr. Oase also requested that the General Plan require the City to adequately designate land for school sites in the Sphere of Influence to complement the Ripon Unified School District’s possible desire to acquire land for future school sites prior to annexation. The GPAC is referred to Policy PF-P-47 and implementation measures PF-I-33, 34, and 36 (see the February 5, 2018 GPAC meeting packet) which generally address collaboration between the City and school districts on the siting of new schools. The policy and implementation measures do not distinguish between the parcels within city limits and the Sphere of Influence, so they adequately address the matter in both locations.
• In addition, Mr. Oase requested that the General Plan account for the Ripon Unified School District and Manteca Unified School District’s unique school development criteria and differing standards for school sizes. The GPAC is referred to Policy PF-P-47 and implementation measure PF-I-33 (see the February 5, 2018 GPAC meeting packet) which encourage the City to work with school districts to develop criteria for the designation of school sites.

MARTIN HARRIS, TERRA LAND GROUP

• Mr. Harris identified concerns with the impacts of flooding and impacts associated with the San Joaquin River drainage system and provided a letter with attachments that described his concerns. The GPAC is referred to the Flood Hazard section of the Safety Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures document, particularly Policy S-P-28 which requires development projects to demonstrate how stormwater runoff will be handled and further requires that projects will not result in increases in peak flow runoff to adjacent lands or drainage facilities that would exceed the design capacity of the drainage facility or result in increased potential for offsite flooding, Implementation Measure S-I-8 which requires the City to consider the need for levee setbacks, dam failure risks, and comments from local flood protection and emergency response agencies when reviewing new development plans, and Implementation Measure S-I-28 which requires periodic coordination with flood protection agencies to discuss and address flood protection facilities and improvements (see the February 5, 2018 GPAC meeting packet for the referenced policies and measures). The following revisions (shown in underline/strikethrough) are recommended to address the commentor’s concerns:

  o Policy S-P-28: S-P-28 Require all development and infrastructure projects to demonstrate how storm water runoff will be detained or retained on-site, treated, and/or conveyed to the nearest drainage facility as part of the development review process. Project applicants shall demonstrate that project implementation would not result in increases in the peak flow runoff to adjacent lands or drainage facilities that would exceed the design capacity of the drainage facility or result in an increased potential for offsite flooding.

  o New Policy: Require new infrastructure and facilities in the 100-year floodplain to meet the Flood-Resistant Construction standards contained in the California Building Code.

  o New Policy: Continue to work closely with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board, the City of Lathrop, and San Joaquin County in defining and identifying solutions for existing and potential flood problem areas, including consideration of the long-term ability of the San Joaquin River and other receiving waters to accommodate 100- and 200-year flood conditions.

  o Implementation Measure S-I-28 Periodically coordinate with local flood protection agencies, including the reclamation districts, to discuss the status of flood protection facilities and improvements and the adequacy of flood protection facilities, strategize
future improvements, consider potential climate change effects, financing for improvements, emergency response plans, and worker training for emergency response situations.

- Mr. Harris described concerns regarding wastewater treatment, indicating that the City releases treated and untreated wastewater. The City releases treated wastewater consistent with the requirements of its NPDES, which provides for discharge of treated wastewater to the San Joaquin River and for application of treated wastewater to specific land areas. The NPDES permit also provides for recycling of water. The NPDES permit identifies specifications that the treated wastewater must meet prior to discharge, land application, or recycling. The Public Facilities and Services policy set includes policies and implementation measures to ensure that the wastewater collection and treatment system is adequate to serve existing and future development and safely dispose of waste (PF-P-20), that the City maintains the ability to handle peak discharge flows while meeting State standards (PF-P-20), investigate methods to improve the quality of effluent and consider options for reuse of treated wastewater (PF-I-16), and to promote reduced wastewater system demand (PF-I-17). In addition, the policies discussed above would apply to any wastewater treatment facilities.

**ATTACHMENT**

1. Summary Notes - GPAC Meeting #6, February 5, 2018
ATTACHMENT 1

GPAC MEETING #5 – SUMMARY MINUTES
Summary Minutes

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting 5 – February 5, 2018

These meeting notes provide an overview and summary of the input received during the February 5, 2018 General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting which addressed Policy Set Review #1: Safety, Resource Conservation, and Public Facilities and Services.

Attendance

GPAC Members Present: Daryll Quaresma (Chair), Victoria Brunn (Vice Chair), Bill Barnhart, Joann Beattie, Wendy Benavides, Ronald Cheek, James DuClair, Demetri Filios, Ronald Light, Parminder Singh Sahi, Richard Paz, Jack Snyder, David Tenney, Stephen Tompkins

GPAC Member Absent: Jose Nuno

GPAC Alternates Present: Benjamin Cantu, Jason Laughlin, John Reilla

GPAC Alternates Absent: David Cushman, Marco Galeazzi

GPAC Safety Policy Set Discussion

- All references to “public development” or “private development” should be changed to “public and private development.”

- Geologic and Seismic Hazards
  - S-P-1 – the policy should be amended to qualify that public facilities are structurally sound based upon California Building Code requirements.
  - S-P-5 – If possible, the policy’s action should be changed from “encourage” to “prohibit.” The consultant team should also confirm whether fire and policy facilities qualify as critical versus noncritical facilities.

- Flood Hazards
  - S-P-10 – The GPAC inquired about what consists the periodic review of the Safety Element. The At minimum, the General Plan is reviewed on an annual basis. The document may also be modified on a more frequent basis to reflect changes to state law, engineering best practices, and staff implementation of project review.
  - S-P-11 – The GPAC discussed whether development should be allowed in floodplains.
  - S-P-13 – The GPAC requested that “urban” be defined.
  - S-P-14 – Given the creation of a new joint powers authority, the policy should reference Stockton and San Joaquin County. The request was also made that the policy describe adequate language and include maps that show the 200-year floodplain.
  - S-P-21 – The GPAC requested that the policy also include “water release” as a risk.
  - S-P-24 – Change “require” to “encourage.”
- S-P-26 – After discussing the risks associated with development being constructed in floodplains, the policy was referenced as required notice to potential home and landowners.

○ Hazardous Materials
  - S-P-30 – The GPAC sought clarification on whether the policy referred to state or federal requirements. The policy refers to both.
  - S-P-31 – Consider referencing state requirements and/or criteria.

○ Emergency Procedures and Critical Facilities
  - S-P-31 – Consider referencing state requirements and/or criteria.
  - S-P-37 – Expand to include the school districts that serve the Planning Area.

○ Noise
  - S-P-42-49 – Properly reference the tables in this section.

**GPAC Resource Conservation Policy Set Discussion**

○ Water Resources
  - RC-P-3 – The GPAC requested that “pursue” be changed to “require.”
  - RC-P-12 – A member of the GPAC asked about how hardpan effects the implementation of the policy. This is addressed by the Parks Master Plan.
  - RC-I-2 – Members of the GPAC asked for clarification on the City department responsible for implementing the measure. The responsible departments for all implementation measures will appear in the General Plan’s implementation matrix.
  - RC-I-7 – Members of the GPAC requested confirmation that “creek” is an appropriate term for waterways as it pertains to the implementation measure.

○ Water Quality
  - RC-I-15 – The implementation measure has been completed, so it should be updated.
  - RC-I-18 – The implementation measure is reviewed on an annual, ongoing basis, that includes providing the state with monthly samples. Members of the GPAC mentioned that issues associated with the measure may representing a growing concern as the water table recedes.

○ Soils and Erosion Control
  - No items discussed.

○ Energy Conservation
  - RC-I-25 – Use another, strong term in place of “encourage.”
  - RC-1-31 – The GPAC inquired about whether the City is actively implementing the measure. It is through the construction of the solid waste generator and similar initiatives. For future implementation efforts, the suggestion was made that staff utilize a template to meet state requirements.

○ Air Quality
  - RC-P-32 – Define/spell out Air District where the agency first appears in the Element.

○ Open Space
  - No items discussed.

○ Agricultural Resources
  - RC-P-51 and 52 – Appear merged in the policy set document.
  - RC-I-51 – A member of the GPAC inquired about the practicality of maintaining a permanent buffer between urban uses and lands designated Agriculture. Yes, because roads and setbacks can be used to satisfy the requirement.
Cultural Heritage
- RC-I-76 – The GPAC discussed if 100 feet is sufficient setback from cultural resources or human remains, and requested that the consultant team modify the distance to reflect a larger federal or state requirement, if it exists.

GPAC Public Facilities and Services Policy Set Discussion
- General Services
  - No items discussed.
- Water
  - No items discussed.
- Sewer
  - No items discussed.
- Drainage
  - No items discussed.
- Electricity and Natural Gas
  - No items discussed.
- Telecommunications
  - No items discussed.
- Solid Waste
  - No items discussed.
- Education
  - PF-P-48 – Remove “and to” from end of sentence.
  - PF-P-51 – Consider including language that encourages school districts to participate in process, if appropriate.
  - PF-I-33 – Change “should” to “will.”
- Police
  - A policy should be included that addresses community policing through the SPARK volunteer program.
  - PF-P-55 – Replace range with minimum of 1 officer per 1,000 population. In addition, consider the economic impact associated with the policy. Greater priority should be placed on providing adequate policing and public safety than other less essential services, such as parks.
- Fire Protection and Emergency Services
  - PF-P-61 – Omit “Endeavor to.”
  - PF-P-62 – Cite maximum response time of five minutes.
- Parks and Recreation
  - PF-P-75 – The GPAC discussed the division of development fees between neighborhood and community parks. The Park Master Plan requires development to provide neighborhood parks, so the development fee can only apply to the provision of community parks. The consultant team should consider amending the policy to maintain consistency with the Park Master Plan.
  - PF-P-78 – Include Ripon Unified School District.
  - PF-I-51 – The GPAC requested that the policy omit reference to commercial recreation uses.
Public Comment

- **Martin Harris**
  - Reflective of the packet that he shared with the GPAC, Mr. Harris voiced concerns about how flooding will impact the release of waste water.
  - The GPAC requested that a discussion item be included on the next meeting agenda to address the matter.

- **Kit Oase, Ripon Unified School District Board Member**
  - PF-I-33 – supports the inclusion of Ripon Unified School District.
  - It is important for the City to include the Sphere of Influence in school site-related policies and implementation measures, because the school district may acquire land prior to annexation.
  - The City should consider Manteca and Ripon’s different school size standards.

- **May Memindu (sp.), resident**
  - Takes issue with exceptions to noise requirements along truck routes. The City Council should not allow this.