AGENDA

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #13

Monday, February 4, 2019 – 6:00 pm

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

6:00 PM - GPAC Meeting #13

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. GPAC Discussion: Confirmation of Preferred Land Use Alternative for Recommendation to Planning Commission and City Council
4. Discussion of General Plan Policy Sets
5. Public Comment
6. Adjournment

The next scheduled meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee of the City of Manteca is March 4, 2019, 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, February 1, 2019, by 5:00 pm.

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).
The February 4th GPAC meeting will focus on the GPAC’s:

- Confirmation of the land use concepts presented on the Preferred Land Use Alternative Map; and

- Discussion, feedback, and input on the Draft General Plan Land Use, Growth Management, and Circulation Policy Sets.

**Preferred Land Use Alternative**

During the December 3rd and 10th GPAC meetings, the GPAC discussed the three land use alternatives included in the Land Use Alternatives Report, received informal requests from members of the public to consider land designations to certain properties, and identified the group’s preferred land use alternative for recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Following the meetings, the consultant team synthesized the GPAC’s direction into the Preferred Land Use Alternative Map. The map is based upon Land Use Alternative A, the alternative that emphasizes economic growth and employment-focused development, but includes the following key modifications:

- Consolidates alternative A’s three commercial designations into a single Commercial (C) designation;

- Removes the Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) designation from potential school sites in growth areas unless the school is planned by Manteca Unified School District or Ripon Unified School District;

- Applies the PQP designation to additional religious facilities and planned and developed school sites;

- Within the Planning Area’s northwestern quadrant:
  - Intensifies the large area designated for Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR);
Relocates and expands upon the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) designation along the eastern side of Airport Way;

Expands urbanized development, in the form of the Business Industrial Park (BIP) designation, in the area north of Roth Road and west of Union Road; and

Expands the Planning Area boundary to include the parcels south of French Camp Road, east of Airport Way, north of Roth Road, and west of the railroad tracks that form much of the city and the Planning Area’s western boundary. The area includes a significant concentration of Industrial (I) and BIP-designated properties, along with the extension of SFR, C, and CMU parcels through the middle of the area. Note: This change was not discussed by the GPAC and is presented for the GPAC’s consideration. This area is within the City of Stockton Sphere of Influence; Manteca City staff has conferred with Stockton City staff and understands that Stockton City staff anticipate that their decision-makers would not object to transferring this area to Manteca’s SOI.

- Replaces the Industrial (I) designation on parcels west of the Family Entertainment Zone with CMU to support future rail service in the area and increase synergy with Big League Dreams;
- Reflects current planned and developed uses in the Oakwood Landing and Hat Ranch project areas;
- Reflects existing multifamily and mobile home park developments;
- Designates the Austin Road Business Park Master Plan area and Villa Ticino project area as policy areas to reflect the differences between the preferred land use alternative map’s designations and the uses approved by the City for the areas;
- Expands the presence of the CMU designation along the south side of Highway 120 east around the Main Street interchange and east of the The Promenade shopping center;
- In the northcentral portion of the Planning Area, extends the I and BIP designation, in combination with the Urban Reserve Overlay, eastward across Castle Road;
- Replaces a portion of the CMU designation on parcels east of the Austin Road/Graves Road intersection with LDR; and
- Replaces the Medium Density Residential (MDR) designation within the Yosemite Square Master Plan with LDR.

The Preferred Land Use Alternative Map, which identifies the parcels modified from their Land Use Alternative A designation, is included as Attachment 3.

The following table summarizes the land use designations by acreage for Alternative A (used as the starting point by the GPAC in developing the preferred map), Alternative C (the existing General Plan), the GPAC Preferred Land Use Alternative Map based on the existing Planning Area, and the GPAC Preferred Land Use Alternative Map with the staff-recommended addition to the Planning Area.
### Land Use Comparison Between Alternative A, Preferred GPAC Map, and Alternative C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Alternative A: Economic/Employment</th>
<th>Alternative C: Existing General Plan</th>
<th>Preferred GPAC Map: Existing Plan Area Only</th>
<th>Preferred GPAC Map: Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Density Residential</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>1,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>9,468</td>
<td>8,592</td>
<td>9,605</td>
<td>9,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Residential</strong></td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>12,175</td>
<td>12,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Mixed-Use</td>
<td>3712</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Mixed-Use</strong></td>
<td>533</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Commercial</strong></td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>24,593</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Professional</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Industrial Park</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Industrial</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Industrial and Employment</strong></td>
<td>34,743</td>
<td>51,658</td>
<td>30,851</td>
<td>31,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-public</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Public/Quasi-Public and Park</strong></td>
<td>71,458</td>
<td>105,150</td>
<td>63,810</td>
<td>64,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>5,677</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>4,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Open Space and Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>148,056</td>
<td>216,454</td>
<td>132,607</td>
<td>134,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Designation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ACREAGE</strong></td>
<td>24,397</td>
<td>24,397</td>
<td>24,397</td>
<td>24,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve Overlay</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>2,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE, GROWTH MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION POLICY SETS

The Draft Land Use, Growth Management, and Circulation Policy Sets includes goals, policies, and implementation measures related to each topic addressed within the sets. These goals, policies, and implementation measures represent the core of the General Plan Land Use, Growth Management, and Circulation Elements.

The Land Use Policy Set includes goals, policies, and implementation measures that address the Land Use Map, growth patterns and capacity, residential areas, commercial uses, employment- and revenue-generating uses, mixed use development, public and quasi-public uses, environmental justice, recreation and open space, and agricultural heritage. The Land Use Policy Set is included as Attachment 4.

The Growth Management Policy Set includes goals, policies, and implementation measures that address the City’s approach to growth management, including recommendations to update the Growth Management Program in the City’s Municipal Code to address a broader range of public services and facilities, to establish level of service standards, to prepare an annual report regarding growth trends and consistency with level of service standards, and consideration of a growth management committee to review development applications for consistency with the Growth Management Program. The Growth Management Policy Set is included as Attachment 5.

The Circulation Policy Set includes goals, policies, and implementation measures that address multimodal accessibility, the Major Streets Master Plan, parking, bikeway and pedestrian systems, public transit, goods movement, and transportation demand management. The Circulation Policy Set is included as Attachment 6.

The final Land Use, Growth Management, and Circulation Elements will include the Policy Set, which will be revised based on tonight’s discussion and input from City staff, and will include introductory language explaining the purpose, intent, and scope of the element. The final elements will also include graphics, maps, and other items, such as call-out boxes to illustrate key concepts and define key terms. The Land Use Element will also include a description of the land use designations, specific and master plans, and policy areas.

Please note that Draft Policy Sets for the Safety, Resource Conservation, and Public Facilities were previously discussed at the February 2018 GPAC meeting, and the Draft Policy Set for Economic Development was discussed at the October 2018 GPAC meeting.

When reading the policy set, please keep in mind that the General Plan is a blueprint for a city’s growth and development. The General Plan provides high-level, long-range policy guidance on a range of issues, including land use, housing, open space, circulation, noise, safety, and conservation. The General Plan is implemented through a number of City plans and regulations (see Meeting Memo 4, December 4, 2017, Attachment 2).
The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research has prepared General Plan Guidelines that identify the requirements of State law regarding the General Plan, including required content for each element, as well as recommendations of information and policy approaches to be considered during a General Plan Update. The General Plan Guidelines are available online at: http://opr.ca.gov/planning/general-plan/

EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT – ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE CHAPTER

Chapter 6, Environmental Justice, is added to the Existing Conditions Report to describe conditions associated with environmental justice, including an overview of existing environmental conditions for disadvantaged communities (DACs) in Manteca and a description of components of the built environment that may impact human health disproportionately. This chapter includes information from CalEnviroScreen 3.0, a California Environmental Protection Agency model used to identify DACs and environmental and socioeconomic factors at the Census Tract level. Figure 6.1-1 identifies the location of DACs within and around the City of Manteca and identifies the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 percentile ranking that is based on each Census Tract’s exposure to environmental concerns as well as socioeconomic factors.

REMAINING SCHEDULE

The final GPAC meeting, focusing on the GPAC’s review of the Public Review Draft General Plan, will take place on March 4, 2019.

REQUIRED READING

Prior to the meeting on February 4th, please review and consider the following items, which are included as attachments to this memo:

- Preferred Land Use Alternative Map
- Draft Land Use Policy Set
- Draft Growth Management Policy Set
- Draft Circulation Policy Set
- Existing Conditions Report Chapter 6, Environmental Justice

WORK EXERCISE

After reading the materials identified above, please consider the following questions and be prepared to discuss.

PREFERRED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE

1. Are there new or modified land use designations and/or overlays that you disagree with?
2. Are there additional modifications that should be made to the land use designations and/or overlays?

3. Are there additional land use concepts that should be considered for inclusion on the preferred alternative?

**DRAFT LAND USE POLICY SET**

1. In reviewing the Draft Land Use Policy Set, do you feel that all of the key issues raised by the GPAC related to this topic have been adequately addressed? Please provide details regarding any additional policy guidance that should be provided or revisions to the policy set.

**DRAFT GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY SET**

1. In reviewing the Draft Land Use Policy Set, do you feel that all of the key issues raised by the GPAC related to this topic have been adequately addressed? Please provide details regarding any additional policy guidance that should be provided or revisions to the policy set.

**DRAFT CIRCULATION POLICY SET**

1. In reviewing the Draft Circulation Policy Set do you feel that all of the key issues raised by the GPAC related to this topic have been adequately addressed? Please provide details regarding any additional policy guidance that should be provided or revisions to the policy set.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Summary Minutes - GPAC Meeting #11, December 3, 2018
2. Summary Minutes - GPAC Meeting #12, December 10, 2018
3. GPAC Preferred Land Use Alternative Map
4. Draft Land Use Policy Set
5. Draft Growth Management Policy Set
6. Draft Circulation Policy Set
7. Existing Conditions Report, Chapter 6: Environmental Justice
ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY MINUTES - GPAC MEETING #11, DECEMBER 3, 2018
Summary Minutes

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting 11 – December 3, 2018

These meeting notes provide an overview and summary of the input received during the December 3, 2018 General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting which focused on the review of the Land Use Alternatives and selection of the GPAC’s Preferred Alternative for recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

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, Jack Snyder, David Tenney, Stephen Tompkin

GPAC Member Absent: Jose Nuno, Richard Paz

GPAC Alternates Present: Jason Laughlin, John Reilla

GPAC Alternates Absent: Benjamin Cantu, David Cushman, Marco Galeazzi

Item 5 – Public Comment

- Steve Herum, attorney representing the Delicato Winery Conditional Use Permit Application
  - Mr. Herum shared a map that showed the location of the winery and surrounding uses. He indicated that:
    - The map provides adequate buffers and an industrial corridor.
    - The winery has been in its location for 100 years, so there is little sense in locating residential uses next to the business at this time.
    - He would bring forward policies that require agricultural buffers for residential uses.
    - He would be meeting with the affected property owners on Wednesday, December 5.
  - Bill Barnhart asked for clarification on what was the primary concern associated with the winery’s operation – discharge water or smell.
    - Mr. Herum confirmed that the primary concern, based upon his experience working on behalf of wineries and canneries, is discharge water.
  - Bill Barnhart observed that the map’s buffering approach takes up considerable land, and suggested that another approach to could limit the extent of such buffering.
- Lou Tallerico, property owner and proponent of developing Manteca Village in the Planning Area’s northwestern quadrant
  - Has a contract with Frank and Tony Indelicato to grow grapes.
  - Mentioned his recollection of previous General Plan updates.
    - The Indelicatos did not pursue growth to the north.
    - Wrote widely distributed paper about land use issues in northwestern Manteca. The Delicato Winery was not included.
  - Mentioned his request that two memos, dated November 9 and 25, be included in the packet. Because they were omitted, he requested that they be provided to the GPAC.
  - Discussed the Manteca Village project.
    - He previously helped develop the Del Webb and Carter Point, and wants to give the city Manteca Village.
    - He is near the beginning of the development process, visioning, and asked for the GPAC’s feedback. The land use configuration associated with the vision varies in location from the Land Use Alternatives.

- Martin Harris, Terra Land Group
  - Shared letter that he sent to the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors. The letter refers to the County’s approach to obtaining Federal support for flooding/natural disasters.
  - Mentioned that he written a number of letters to different public entities during the past 4 years. This began with his response to State Bill 5.
    - He opinioned that Manteca has not addressed flooding issues.
    - He requested that the City not approve anything before the State of California makes a decision on flooding on December 12, and not certify anything until 2019.

- Joanne Edward, owner of Zotorelli Ranch
  - Her property is located adjacent to Delicato Winery. They are good neighbors and their operations have not impacted her property.
  - She has been attempting to sell the property for years and finally has an offer. She is hoping to develop the ranch into some residential use, and is concerned that Delicato is suggesting her property be used for industrial development. She indicated that Delicato had the opportunity to purchase the property in the past, but did not and it is now too late.

- Robert Garcin, farmer
  - Owns land north of Delicato Winery. Does not consider Indelicatos enemies, but hopes to develop land, possibly with senior housing, resulting in agricultural uses being relocated further to the north.
Gurpreet Singh, owner of former Kmart site
- Just acquired the site. Understands that vandalism, homelessness, and similar issues affect the community’s perception of the property. Requested that the property be redesignated from Neighborhood Commercial (NC) to General Commercial (GC) or Commercial Mixed Use (CMU).

Toni Raymus, developer
- Requested the following land use designation changes:
  - Villa Ticino – currently designated and entitled for residential development. Requested that the site be change to Business Industrial Park (BIP), Industrial (I), and Park (P).
  - Yosemite Avenue – change from I to Medium Density Residential (MDR)
  - Jacob’s Fruit Stand Property – change to GC.

Bill Filios, developer
- Northwestern corner of Union and Woodward – planned development and park of shopping center – change to CMU.

Zotorelli Ranch owner and occupant
- Has known the Indelicato family for years. Has never experienced Delicato Winery creating smell or water discharge issues.
- Sent numerous letters to developers and Indelicatos, expressing interest in selling the property, 20 years ago.

**Item 6 – GPAC Discussion**

GPAC selected Alternative A (8 votes) as the basis for the Preferred Alternative over Alternatives B (5 votes) and C (0 votes).

**Changes to Land Use Designations**
- Commercial designations consolidated into the single Commercial (C) designation.
- The GPAC discussed combining all of the residential designations into a single designation, but decided against doing so.

**Review of Land Use Designations in the area located south of French Camp Road, west of the City/SOI boundary, east of Highway 99, and north of Lathrop Road**
(Note: Designation changes to parcels are shown on the Designation Change Map. This section documents the conversation associated with key issues relating to the topic.)

- Northwestern Quadrant/Manteca Village – the GPAC expressed support for accommodating Mr. Tellerico’s vision for the Manteca Village project, along with the extension of Roth Road to the east towards the Highway 99 frontage road, on the Preferred Alternative.
- The GPAC expressed support for removing the designation of Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) from proposed school sites.
  - Victoria Brunn requested that the Manteca and Ripon Unified School Districts be consulted in the selection of future school sites.
  - The consultant indicated this approach can be accommodated by permitting-by-right schools in the residential designations and including policies that require the City and the school districts to collaborate on the identification of sites.
- Demitrio Filios suggested caution in addressing the Delicato Winery land use situation. He recommended that the winery needs to purchase it owns buffers and the City should monitor the operation for environmental issues and review the project’s Conditions of Approval to determine the winery’s requirements for its operation.
  - Jose Nuno questioned the regulation of the winery’s discharge.
  - It was noted that the winery has been present for 100 years, that the operation has right to farm, is a good neighbor, and is beneficial to the community (provides jobs and open space).
  - Ron Cheek suggested that it is unfair to expect the City to condemn surrounding properties.
- Stephen Tompkin suggested that there are already enough parks and not enough kids to justify creating more.
  - Ronald Light indicated that the General Plan informs how much parkland must be provided. This requirement can be changed.
  - Parminder Singh Sahi indicated that there is a lack of special use parks, such as those that include soccer fields.
  - Review of Land Use Designations in the area located south of Lathrop Road, west of the City/SOI boundary, east of Union Road, and north of Highway 120
    - To accommodate showing industrial uses on the Villa Ticino project site, the GPAC created a policy area for the site. This will allow jobs-generating or the original, entitled uses to be developed.
  - Review of Land Use Designations in the area located south of Lathrop Road, west of Union Road, east of Highway 99, and north of Highway 120
    - To accommodate the request made by the property owner, the site of the former KMart was changed from CMU to Commercial.
  - Review of Land Use Designations in the area extending south of 120 to the Planning Area boundary to the west and south and Airport Way to the West
    - The GPAC requested that this area be updated to reflect approved projects and school sites, correct the uses located in the vicinity of Oakwood Lake to reflect current conditions where
appropriate, change the Industrial use located along Bronzan Road to Commercial and to change the Commercial use located along Bronzan Road to LDR.
ATTACHMENT 2

SUMMARY MINUTES - GPAC MEETING #12, DECEMBER 10, 2018
Summary Minutes

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting 12 – December 10, 2018

These meeting notes provide an overview and summary of the input received during the December 10, 2018 General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meeting which focused on the selection of the GPAC’s Preferred Alternative for recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

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, Jose Nuno, Richard Paz, Parminder Singh Sahi, Jack Snyder

GPAC Member Absent: Stephen Tompkin, David Tenney

GPAC Alternates Present: David Cushman, Jason Laughlin, John Reilla

GPAC Alternates Absent: Benjamin Cantu, Marco Galeazzi

Item 4 – Public Comment

- Marian Rawlins, owner and occupant of 5880 Fig Avenue
  - Opposed to the construction of Raymus Expressway based upon traffic impacts and likely ensuing devaluation of the surrounding residential properties.
  - Requested that the City let the affected parties know about the expressway.

- Fred Urgonis, owner of property at southwestern corner of Milo Candini Drive extension and Yosemite Avenue Intersection
  - Late to the process. Requested that the parcels be re-designated from Light Industrial (LI) to Commercial (C). Ask for guidance on how to proceed.

- Steve Herum, attorney representing the Delicato Winery Conditional Use Permit Application
  - Expressed initial concern with the Preferred Alternative, but felt it was unfair to react without having the opportunity to review in greater detail. Request that the GPAC vote on the Preferred Alternative at a future meeting.

- Martin Harris, Terra Land Group
  - Indicated that the State of California requires all land uses to be protected by levies (in flood zone).
  - Expressed concern that the GPAC did not cover possible land use changes in the Planning Area’s southwestern quadrant at the December 3 meeting.
The consultant confirmed that the GPAC did review this area.

- Made the following observations about the three land use alternative maps:
  - Consider flood impacts
  - By designating land uses before deciding upon infrastructure needs, the City is putting the cart before the horse.
  - It appears that the flood protection system is shedding water towards Oakwood Shores.
- Share four alternatives for flood protection
  - Concern for sedimentation in the southwestern quadrant, especially south of Woodward

  - Raymond Quarresma, owner of dairy farm in the southern portion of the Planning Area
    - Took issue with 4-minute speaking limit
    - Expressed concerns with potential flooding issues

  - Leonard Smith, resident
    - Environmental justice not presented as a key consideration, nor discussed by the GPAC
      - The topic deserves equal representation
      - Mentioned that the Planning Commission failed to discuss the topic as part of a recent warehousing project determination
      - Air Quality and Energy implications – solar important – Germany achieves close to 100% solar energy, and does so with less available sunlight
      - Healthy Food affected by water contamination (E. coli)
      - Not enough housing – consider waiving fees, faster processing, concessions on setback, and reduced street widths
      - Mobility is an issue, especially south of Highway 120 – a car is required to purchase food – designate neighborhood commercial in this area
        - Important issues: SB 1000 requires sustainable economy and community, more imperative for future of kids and grandkids

  - Christine Mendez, resident at 1841 South McKinley Avenue, Lathrop
    - Property designated for Limited Commercial
    - Concerned by unfettered growth – flooding and air quality from traffic and new development
      - Informed that GPAC is also addressing flooding and traffic impacts through General Plan policies and the project’s environmental review requirement (EIR)

  - Lori Brocchini Makey, Brocchini Family Land Group
- Land holdings surround the Kaiser Permanente hospital campus
- Requested that properties be designated to Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) to provide greater development flexibility should Kaiser expand. This will provide space for additional medical offices, promoting better health care and employment opportunities. It could also support housing within close proximity to the hospital.

○ Ryan Snella, NAI Benchmark
  - Brocchini Family Land Group holdings by Kaiser Permanente hospital campus
    ▪ Echoed Lori Brocchini Makey’s comments
    ▪ Specified that land holdings are located to the north and east of the hospital
    ▪ Suggested that the CMU designation would accommodate high end condos and apartments
    ▪ Requested that the CMU designation be defined broadly enough to accommodate a single use. This includes abandoning the percentage requirement.
  - Northeastern corner of Main Street and Atherton Drive – developed with a gas station, so Regional Commercial (RC) is not required.

○ Bill Filios, developer
  - Submitted two land use change requests

○ Lou Tallerico, property owner
  - Suggested that real estate is the meeting of location and opportunity
  - Referred to Manteca Village map included in the meeting packet
    ▪ Not encumbered, several area farmers support the map’s vision
    ▪ Requested that the Urban Reserve Overlay from the parcels located north of the Roth Road extension. Suggested that this would help pay for the road’s extension.

○ Owner of the property located at the southeastern corner of Lathrop and Union Roads
  - Indicated that their family wants to sell the property to a developer
  - Requested that the parcel be designated General Commercial (GC)

○ Tony Nunes, property owner
  - Grandmother passed the property down to him
  - Confirmed that the property was designated to his request at the previous meeting

○ Deidre Phillips, property owner – both sides of Lovelace Road by Union Road
  - Wants the properties to be annexed into the City, but does not want them to serve as buffers to the Delicato Winery
o Yolanda Park, Program Manager, Environmental Justice Project at Catholic Charities, Diocese of Stockton
  - Agreed with Leonard Smith’s concerns about the City and the GPAC’s lack of discussion regarding environmental justice. Expressed particular concern about food deserts within the city and the impact of building/expanding freeways (if it built, drivers will come). Mentioned the importance of providing necessary tribal outreach.

o Mike Smith, resident
  - Discussed the impact of extending Roth Road to Highway 99 frontage road. This will bifurcate properties, creating changes on either side.

Item 5 – GPAC Discussion
    o Bill Barnhart confirmed to Lou Tallerico for the GPAC that the group received the map on three occasions.

    o Land Use Designations
      - GPAC confirmed that the Preferred Alternative will include a Commercial (C) and a CMU designation.
      - Bill Barnhart requested that the GPAC be able to review the land use designation definitions
        ▪ The consultant confirmed that the definitions would be included alongside the Land Use Policy Set.

    o The GPAC confirmed their desire to hold a third meeting on land use mapping.

    o Demitri Filios mentioned that flexibility as it pertains to the CMU designation is good. It will help the City meet demand and provide affordable housing.
      - Bill Barnhardt suggested that the designation’s density range is too high and recommended setting the floor lower.

    o Daryl Quarreresma reflected on the public comments pertaining to environmental justice, asking if the General Plan addresses roadway design, flooding, affordable housing, and environmental concerns.
      - J.D. Hightower indicated that the document does in the following ways:
        ▪ Safety Element – flooding
        ▪ Resource Conservation Element – renewable energy
        ▪ All elements – opportunities and constraints
        ▪ Circulation – all manners of transportation
        ▪ Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

    o Changes to the Land Use Designation of Parcels
      The GPAC direction regarding its preferred Land Use Map are reflected on the Preferred Land Use Map and include the following modifications:
      - Within the Planning Area’s northwestern quadrant:
- Intensify the large area designated for Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR);
- Relocate and expand upon the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) designation along the eastern side of Airport Way;
- Expand urbanized development, in the form of the Business Industrial Park (BIP) designation, in the area north of Roth Road and west of Union Road; and
  - Reflect current planned and developed uses in the Oakwood Landing and Hat Ranch project areas;
  - Reflect existing multifamily and mobile home park developments;
  - Designate the Austin Road Business Park Master Plan as policy area to reflect the differences between the preferred land use alternative map’s designations and the uses approved by the City for the area;
  - Expand the presence of the CMU designation along the south side of Highway 120 east around the Main Street interchange and east of the The Promenade shopping center;
  - In the northcentral portion of the Planning Area, extend the I and BIP designation, in combination with the Urban Reserve Overlay, eastward across Castle Road;
  - Revise the southernmost I parcel at the southeast quadrant of Highway 120/Austin Road from I to MDR and expand the C designation for Jacob’s Fruit Stand.
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GPAC PREFERRED LAND USE ALTERNATIVE MAP
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DRAFT LAND USE POLICY SET
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

Land Use Map

**GOAL LU-1**  
**MAINTAIN A LAND USE PLAN THAT PROVIDES A MIX AND DISTRIBUTION OF USES THAT MEET THE IDENTIFIED NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY.**

**Policies**

LU-P-1.1  
Maintain an adequate supply of land to support projected housing, employment, service, retail, educational, and institutional needs for the community.

LU-P-1.2  
Promote land use compatibility through use restrictions, development standards, environmental review, and design considerations.

LU-P-1.3  
Ensure consistency between the Land Use Plan and implementing plans, ordinances, and regulations.

LU-P-1.4  
Assign the land use designations throughout the City and to parcels within the Planning Area, as included in this element and shown in the Land Use Map (Figure 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Designations¹</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)**  
This designation provides for residences on larger lots and small, quasi-agricultural activities, including raising and boarding livestock. Clustering is encouraged to allow continuation of agricultural uses or to provide common amenities for the development. | Up to 2 dwelling units per acre |
| **Low Density Residential (LDR)**  
This designation provides for a mix of single family housing, including small lots, clustered lots, attached homes, and conventional large lot detached residences. | 2.1 to 8 dwelling units per acre |
| **Medium Density Residential (MDR)**  
This designation provides for smaller single family homes in more imaginative lotting arrangements, duplex and triplex development, smaller scale multi-family developments, including cottage homes, garden apartments, townhouses, and cluster housing, and mobile home parks. The density range will accommodate small-lot single family homes that will typically be smaller in size and more affordable to residents. | 8.1 to 15 dwelling units per acre |
| **High Density Residential (HDR)**  
This designation provides for multi-family townhome, condominium, and apartment style housing and mobile home parks. The multi-family dwelling sites are typically located with direct access to arterial streets. The sites have access to the pedestrian and bikeway network along the street corridor and are located along the conceptual route of a public transportation shuttle route. Sites should be located near a neighborhood park, a neighborhood commercial center, or jobs centers and should provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to these amenities and services. | 15.1 to 25 dwelling units per acre |
### Mixed Use Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Mixed Use (CMU)</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use Designations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-residential:</strong> Up to 1.0 FAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential:</strong> 15.1 to 25 units per acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site coverage:</strong> 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This designation provides for high density residential, employment centers, retail commercial, and professional offices. A mix of compatible uses is encouraged to provide neighborhood-serving sales, services, and activities, as well as employment opportunities, including offices.

Developments shall include community-serving amenities and connections that distinguish them from conventional multifamily, neighborhood commercial, or office development, with the intent that a recreational area and neighborhood serving uses will provide a local gathering place for recreation and socializing much as does a small town square. Amenities for a residential development shall include a work center that provides on-site facilities that encourage telecommuting and entrepreneurship.

Mixed uses may be integrated vertically or horizontally and shall be linked together through common walkways, plazas, and parking areas, as well as linkages to the adjoining bicycle and pedestrian system.

Where required, open space, detention facilities, and parks, will be designed as an amenity within the site. Public facilities, such as a post office, library, fire station, or satellite government office, shall be included where feasible.

Developments shall have a shared parking program with the objective of reducing the parking required for each individual use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown (DW)</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use Designations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-residential:</strong> Up to 1.5 FAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential:</strong> 15.1 to 25 units per acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site coverage:</strong> 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This designation provides for the mixture of retail and service commercial, office, and/or multiple-family residential uses that are intended to preserve and enhance the historic and pedestrian-scale character of the Downtown.

Preferred residential uses include condominiums and townhomes and high-quality second and third floor apartment uses. Short-term rentals are not allowed in this designation, unless developed as part of a hotel. Multi-family residential uses are required to be permanent dwellings with each unit having separate restrooms, kitchens, and thermostats. The designation also provides for public/quasi-public uses, parks and urban open spaces, and similar and compatible uses.
### Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial, Professional, and Industrial Designations</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Business Industrial Park (BIP)**                                                                                  | Non-residential: Up to 1.0 FAR  
Site coverage: 50%                                                                                       |
| This designation provides for sites for large uses in an office park environment that would include multi-tenant buildings. Business parks of this nature are well suited for research and development facilities and also provide an attractive business environment for unrelated businesses. Allowed uses include administrative, offices, research and development, light industrial, including manufacturing and assembly, and commercial storage. Warehouse, storage, and distribution that support the industrial uses shall not comprise more than 20% of a business industrial park. Service commercial and retail activities provided for the convenience of the employees shall not comprise more than 10% of a business industrial park. |  
| **Business Professional (BP)**                                                                                    | Non-residential: Up to 1.5 FAR  
Site coverage: 50%                                                                                       |
| This designation provides for professional and administrative offices, medical and dental clinics, laboratories, financial institutions, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses. The use category is specifically intended for the frontage along SR 120, and along other major roads and in the Central Business District to provide an attractive, landscaped setting for one, two, and three-story office buildings. |  
| **Commercial (C)**                                                                                                   | Central Business District Non-residential: Up to 2.0 FAR  
Other non-residential: Up to 0.6 FAR  
Site coverage: 50%                                                                                       |
| This designation provides for neighborhood, community, and regional-serving retail and service uses; offices; restaurants; service stations; highway-oriented and visitor commercial and lodging; auto-serving and heavy commercial uses; wholesale; warehousing; public and quasi-public uses; commercial recreation and public gathering facilities, such as amphitheaters or public gardens; and similar and compatible uses. Uses that are incompatible with residential uses due to noise, vibration, or other characteristics are not permitted in locations that may impact existing or future residential development. |  
| **Industrial (I)**                                                                                                | Non-residential: Up to 0.7 FAR  
Site coverage: 60%                                                                                       |
| This designation provides for manufacturing, processing, assembling, research, wholesale, and storage uses, trucking terminals, railroad and freight stations, industrial parks, warehouses, distribution centers, light manufacturing, public and quasi-public uses and similar and compatible uses. Uses that are incompatible with residential uses due to noise, vibration, or other characteristics are not permitted in locations that may impact existing or future residential development. |  
| **Agricultural Industrial (AI)**                                                                                   | Non-residential: Up to 0.4 FAR  
Site coverage: 50%                                                                                       |
| This designation provides for limited industrial uses directly related to agriculture and compatible uses. |
### Public Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Designations</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/Quasi-Public (PQP)</strong>&lt;br&gt;This designation provides for government owned facilities, public and private schools, institutions, civic uses, assembly uses, and public utilities, and quasi-public uses such as hospitals and churches. Multifamily and congregate residential housing is allowed when secondary to the primary use. This designation also allows commercial recreation uses, including public and private parks, recreation fields, lifestyle centers that include upscale specialty stores with dining and entertainment in an outdoor setting, and other community- and visitor-oriented recreation, provided that the project includes a component that provides a significant public benefit to the community.</td>
<td>Non-residential: Up to 0.5 FAR&lt;br&gt;Site coverage: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park (P)</strong>&lt;br&gt;This designation provides for neighborhood, community and regional parks, golf courses, and other outdoor recreational facilities within urban development. Specific uses include public recreation sites, including ball fields, tot lots and play apparatus, adult softball and soccer playing fields, swimming pools, community center buildings, meeting facilities, libraries, art centers, after school care facilities, art in public places, facilities for night-time recreation, trails benches, interpretive markers, picnic areas, barbecue facilities, landscaping, irrigation, city wells, trees and natural habitat areas.</td>
<td>Non-residential: Up to 0.2 FAR&lt;br&gt;Site coverage: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space (OS)</strong>&lt;br&gt;This designation provides for habitat, open space, natural areas, lands of special status species, wetlands and riparian areas. These areas are set aside as permanent open space preserves to protect environmentally sensitive areas. Development is limited to improvements, such as parking, restrooms, and walkways, etc., to provide for public access to open space and educational facilities, such as learning centers or space for hosted talks and tours of the open space.</td>
<td>Non-residential: Up to 0.05 FAR&lt;br&gt;Site coverage: 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Designations</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Agriculture (AG)** | Residential and non-residential: Up to 0.2 FAR  
Site coverage: 20% |
| **Urban Reserve Overlay** | Based on underlying land use designation |
| **Policy Area** | Based on underlying land use designation or existing entitlements |

**Agriculture (AG)**  
This designation provides for agricultural uses (such as vineyards, orchards, and row crops), single family homes directly related to the agricultural use of the property, limited industrial uses directly related to the agricultural use of the property, and similar and compatible uses.

**Urban Reserve Overlay**  
This designation is applied to select properties around the perimeter of the City, both within city limits and beyond in the Sphere of Influence, where the City intends expand its urbanized development pattern in the time horizon beyond the current General Plan. The overlay accompanies an underlying Agricultural, Very Low Density Residential, Low Density Residential, Business Industrial Park, or Industrial land use designation.

**Policy Area**  
This designation is applied to select sites with approved land use entitlements. This designation allows the area to develop under the approved land use entitlement (e.g., approved subdivision map or specific plan), while also providing flexibility for a change in the vision for the site and allowing development associated with the underlying land use designation shown on the land use map.
Implementation

LU-I-1a As part of the annual report on the implementation of the General Plan to the Planning Commission and City Council, provide an evaluation of the year’s development trends, current land supply, and the ability of infrastructure and public services to meet future needs.

LU-I-1b Regularly review and revise, as necessary, the Zoning Ordinance to accomplish the following purposes:

• Ensure consistency with the General Plan in terms of zoning districts and development standards;
• Ensure consistency with the General Plan in terms of the distribution and boundaries of zoning districts;
• Provide for a Downtown zone that permits the vibrant mixing of residential, commercial, office, business-professional, and institutional uses within the Central Business District;
• Ensure adequate buffers and transitions are required between intensive uses, such as industrial and agricultural industrial, and sensitive receptors, including residential uses and schools; and
• Provide for an Agricultural Industrial zone that accommodates the processing of crops and livestock.
• Ensure that land use requirements meet actual demand and needs over time as technology, social expectations, and business practices change.

LU-I-1d Conduct a General Plan review in conjunction with adoption of policy and regulatory documents to ensure consistency with the Land Use Map.

Growth Patterns and Capacity

GOAL LU-2 PROMOTE INFILL DEVELOPMENT AND PROVIDE FOR ORDERLY, WELL-PLANNED, AND BALANCED GROWTH THAT DOES NOT EXCEED THE CITY’S AVAILABLE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY AND RESOURCES AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN.

Note: See the Public Facilities and Services Element for goals, policies, and measures related to the management, timing, and implementation of public services (police, fire, schools) and facilities (water supply, sewer, storm drainage, solid waste, communications) to support existing and new development.

Policies

LU-P-2.1 Continue to maintain and implement the City’s Growth Management Program, as set forth in the Growth Management Element.

LU-P-2.2 Encourage growth to contribute to the city’s strong, diversified economic base and provide an appropriate balance between employment and housing opportunities for all income levels.

LU-P-2.3 To maintain balanced growth and to manage the City’s investment in infrastructure, facilities,
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

and services for growth areas, encourage infill development, redevelopment, and rehabilitation projects within the City and growth that is contiguous with existing development and/or the boundary of the City.

LU-P-2.4 Continue to encourage the use of specific and master plans, as needed, to ensure orderly, well-planned growth.

LU-P-2.5 Lands within the SOI that are not designated with the Urban Reserve Overlay are intended to serve as the Primary Urban Service Area and be planned for development during the General Plan horizon (2040). Lands within the SOI that are designated with the Urban Reserve Overlay as well as lands within the Planning Area that are outside of the SOI are anticipated to accommodate the City’s long-term growth and are intended to serve as the Secondary Urban Service Area.

LU-P-2.6 Evaluate applications for annexations based upon the following criteria:

- The annexation shall mitigate its impacts through consistency with the General Plan goals and policies and shall provide a positive benefit to Manteca.
- The annexation area is contiguous with city boundaries and provides for logical expansion and development.
- The annexation area creates clear and reasonable boundaries for the City and service providers.
- The annexation area will be adequately served by municipal services.
- The annexation, when reviewed cumulatively with other annexations, provides a long-term fiscal balance for the City and its residents.
- The annexation is consistent with State law and San Joaquin County Local Agency Formation Commission standards.
- The annexation is consistent with the General Plan.
- The annexation contributes its fair-share to applicable infrastructure and public services needs, including facilities identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, Public Facilities Implementation Plan, and Capital Improvement Program.
- The effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands and achievement of Resource Conservation and Community Design Elements goals.
- The extent to which the proposal will assist the City in achieving the adopted fair share of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment as determined by the San Joaquin Council of Governments.
- The extent to which the proposal will promote environmental justice. As used in this policy, “environmental justice” means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the location of public facilities and the provision of public services.
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• The extent in which the proposal facilitates achievement of the City’s jobs/housing balance goal of a 1:1 ratio.

LU-P-2.7 Review public and private development proposals and land use changes within the City’s Sphere of Influence (SOI) and Planning Area for consistency within the General Plan.

LU-P-2.8 Consider expanding the SOI to incorporate areas that logically should be planned and serviced by Manteca. The City shall consider the following factors when making determinations involving sphere of influence boundaries:

• Present and planned land uses in the area;
• Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area;
• Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services; and
• Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area.

LU-P-2.9 Growth areas anticipated for urbanization in the long-term are shown as Urban Reserve Overlay and are located within the SOI or Planning Area. While these areas are not currently planned for development prior to 2040, the Urban Reserve Overlay may be removed when there is a need to plan for annexation of the lands into the City.

Implementation

LU-I-2a Monitor the issuance of building permits and development entitlement in order to determine and forecast the rate of future development.

LU-I-2b Educate the community regarding the benefits of infill development.

LU-I-2c Maintain a computerized land use database system that includes current parcel-specific information regarding General Plan, Zoning, parcel size, pending and approved development, and other relevant factors.

LU-I-2d Prior to the consideration of any General Plan amendment to modify the land use allocation or expand the City’s boundaries or sphere of influence, the City shall complete or cause to be completed the following City-wide studies/plans:

a. Recreational needs assessment and consistency with the Open Space and Conservation Element and Parks and Recreation Master Plan.


c. Public Facilities and Services Capacity Study consistent with the Public Facilities and Services Element.

d. Transportation System Capacity Study, including Long Range Transit Plan consistent with the Circulation Element.

The studies shall define overall holding capacities and identify additional performance standards that will need to be met to ensure the achievement of the goals and policies of the
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General Plan.

**LU-I-2e** Continue to participate with planning efforts among local jurisdictions, such as the Valley Blueprint, to minimize the impacts of regional growth to Manteca and in the south San Joaquin County area.

**LU-I-2f** Formally request that the County provide the City with notice of development applications and related actions within and adjacent to the Planning Area and provide the City with the opportunity to comment on land use changes and development proposals under review. The City’s review of projects within the referral area shall emphasize the importance of:

- Consistency with the Land Use Map;
- The protection of agricultural lands and open space;
- The protection of biological resources, including riparian habitat and corridors;
- The protection of groundwater recharge areas and watersheds;
- Reducing sprawl; and
- Ensuring quality development that meets the City’s standards and is consistent with the City’s character and values.

**LU-I-2g** Review and comment on development proposals in adjacent communities to minimize potential environmental and economic impacts to Manteca.

**LU-I-2h** Coordinate with City of Ripon in implementing the Cities’ Memorandum of Understanding regarding future land use and public services and facilities in the area between the two cities.

**LU-I-2i** Refer all applications for development within the Stockton Metro Airport Area of Influence to the Airport Land Use Commission, and the Stockton Metro Airport.


Residential Areas

GOAL LU-3 ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS THAT MEET THE HOUSING NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND ARE SAFE AND ATTRACTIVE PLACES TO LIVE WITH CONVENIENT ACCESS TO SERVICES, RECREATION, AND EMPLOYMENT.

Policies

LU-P-3.1 Provide for the development of a variety of housing types and at a range of prices to meet the needs of all segments of the city’s population, including individuals and families who qualify for affordable housing assistance in accordance with the Housing Element.

LU-P-3.2 Require the design of new residential development to be consistent with any applicable design guidelines, to ensure harmony with Manteca’s unique character, and compatible with existing surrounding land uses.

LU-P-3.3 Encourage residential development to occur in a balanced and efficient pattern that reduces sprawl, preserves open space, and creates convenient connections to other land uses.

LU-P-3.4 Prioritize the location of higher density housing in close proximity to employment areas, services, retail, transit stops, and near community destinations with high access to transit and non-vehicle transportation modes.

LU-P-3.5 Encourage residential uses above the ground floor in mixed-use areas.

LU-P-3.6 Encourage new neighborhoods to include a mix and distribution of land uses that reduce auto trips and support walking, biking, and transit use.

LU-P-3.7 Promote the development of strategically located neighborhood serving centers that incorporate commercial, employment, cultural or entertainment uses and are within walking distance of surrounding residents.

LU-P-3.8 Where planned residential areas and existing residential neighborhoods interface with commercial, industrial, and other non-residential development, require that the development be designed to maximize the compatibility between the uses and reduce any potential negative impacts associated with aesthetics, noise, safety, odor, and lighting.

LU-P-3.9 Locate residences away from areas of excessive noise, smoke, dust, odor, and lighting, and ensure that adequate provisions, including buffers or transitional uses, are made to ensure the health and well-being of existing and future residents.

The Housing Element identifies the City’s plan for development, preservation, and maintenance of housing that is affordable at a range of income levels and provides for a variety of housing types. The Housing Element includes goals, policies, and programs that address:

- Development of affordable housing
- Infill and Downtown residential development
- A range of housing types, densities, and designs to meet existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments
- Maintenance and improvement of existing housing and neighborhoods
- Provision of adequate housing opportunities for special needs groups
- Promote equal opportunity for safe and affordable housing for everyone in the community
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LU-P-3.10 Encourage the development of additional executive housing units and neighborhoods.

LU-P-3.11 Encourage property maintenance and the revitalization of economically disadvantaged and poorly maintained neighborhoods.

LU-P-3.14 Support the development of higher density housing along major streets to provide residents with close access to the City's public transportation system.

LU-P-3.15 Encourage and support development patterns at the highest limits permitted within each General Plan land use designation consistent with the policies of all other General Plan elements.

Implementation

LU-I-3a Through the development review and permit process, screen development proposals for land use compatibility, including conformance with existing development or neighborhoods.

LU-I-3b Through the development review and permit process, ensure that residential developments meet the minimum density requirement stipulated on the Land Use Map in order to ensure that Manteca has an ample number of housing units to meet all of its housing needs.

LU-I-3c Utilize density transitions and buffers in order to protect the integrity of existing land use patterns and minimize the impacts on existing uses and residents. Development projects shall be designed to:

• Locate lower residential densities adjacent to open space, areas of agricultural use, and existing lower density residential areas;

• Locate higher residential densities in proximity to services, transit, and/or employment activity centers;

• Where new residential uses are proposed adjacent existing industrial uses, the residential development shall incorporate a buffer, such as a roadway, landscaped open space, parking area, detention basin, or similar feature, to separate the residential uses from industrial uses.

• Where new residential uses are proposed adjacent Highway 99 or Highway 120, the residential development shall incorporate a buffer, such as a roadway with landscape-separated sidewalk, landscaped open space, parking area, detention basin, or similar feature, to separate the residential uses from freeway uses.

LU-I-3d Implement the policies and actions in the Housing Element in order to enhance opportunities to provide affordable housing within the community and to accommodate a range of household types, special need populations, and income levels.

LU-I-3e Explore and encourage creative approaches to providing affordable housing, including market rate housing affordable to moderate income households, within the community. Such approaches may include public/private partnerships, land trusts, housing cooperatives, co-housing, and/or inclusionary housing.

LU-I-3f Continue to fund existing and provide assistance to additional neighborhood improvement programs designed to stabilize and enhance the quality of existing neighborhoods. Such
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

Improvements may include, but are not limited to sidewalk upgrade and repair, street tree programs, street lighting, signage, trash collectors, bus stop shelters and benches and similar improvements to the public areas.

**LU-I-3g** Facilitate and encourage the participation of neighborhood groups and associations in the planning process, and identify neighborhood priorities for future public improvements and capital projects.

**LU-I-3h** Continue the City’s Code Enforcement efforts to preserve existing neighborhoods through the elimination of blight and improvement of substandard housing.

**LU-I-3i** Upgrade and provide infrastructure in existing neighborhoods as funding is available.

**LU-I-3j** Support efforts by the League of California Cities, American Planning Association, American Public Works Association, and other mutual interest organization to establish and/or re-establish stable funding mechanisms, like property tax backed revenue sources, at the State level.

**LU-I-3k** Within new subdivisions, accessory dwelling units that are integrated into the overall primary home design shall be encouraged so long as from the street view the primary and accessory dwelling units give the exterior appearance of a single family home.

**LU-I-3l** Within new subdivisions, duplexes on corner lots shall be encouraged so long as the front doors and garages for each dwelling unit face the differing intersecting streets.

**LU-I-3m** Within new subdivisions, developers shall be encouraged to develop up to 30% of the total number of dwelling units in the subdivision as attached houses, cottage homes, garden apartments, and other types of higher density product types so long as the overall density of the called for in the respective General Plan land use designation is not exceeded; the pattern of the neighborhood is maintained; such units are distributed evenly throughout the subdivision; and, limited to no more than 6 dwelling units per lot.

**LU-I-3n** Evaluate, in cooperation with the Building Industry Association, fiscal alternatives that will encourage development at the highest levels permitted by general plan land use designations such as Public Facilities Implementation Plan fees collected at the per acre basis compared to the per dwelling unit basis.

**Commercial Uses**

**GOAL LU-4** PROVIDE FOR A BROAD RANGE OF COMMERCIAL USES THAT SERVE THE NEEDS OF MANTECA’S RESIDENTS AND THE REGION-AT-LARGE AND INCREASE MANTECA’S SALES TAX BASE.

*Note: See the Economic Development Element for additional goals, policies, and measures related to development of retail and commercial service uses."

**Policies**

**LU-P-4.1** Establish and maintain inviting and attractive neighborhood, community, and regional-serving commercial centers in prominent, easily accessible locations.
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- Neighborhood-serving centers should be centrally located within and well-integrated into the adjacent neighborhood(s).
- Community-serving centers should be located along arterial streets and similar major roadways.
- Regional-serving centers should be located in close proximity to freeway interchanges.

LU-P-4.2 Encourage retail and commercial service uses on the ground floor in mixed-use areas.

LU-P-4.3 Encourage the rehabilitation and redevelopment of existing shopping centers where a dominant retail use is still likely to be viable. At locations with with obsolete retail space and limited opportunity for future viable retail uses, encourage conversion to mixed use and other non-retail uses.

LU-P-4.4 Ensure that all commercial and other non-residential development is compatible with adjacent land uses, particularly residential uses, based upon the location and scale of buildings, lighting, and in conformance with the noise standards of the Safety Element. When development is incompatible, require commercial uses to provide adequate buffers and/or architectural features to protect residential areas, developed or undeveloped, from intrusion of nonresidential activities that may degrade the quality of life in such residential areas.

Implementation

LU-I-4a Concentrate new neighborhood-serving commercial centers within neighborhoods, community-serving commercial centers along arterial streets, and regional-serving commercial centers around freeway interchanges.

LU-I-4b As part of the City’s development review process, ensure that commercial projects are designed to minimize conflicts with residential uses. Review of commercial projects should ensure that the following design concepts are avoided in projects that abut residential areas:

- Inappropriate building scale and/or siting on the lot.
- Excessive glare or excessive impacts from light sources onto adjacent properties.
- Excessive noise generated from freight and waste management activities during night hours.
- Excessive air pollutant emissions from freight trucks and large expanses of parking lot areas.

LU-I-4c Monitor commercial development to ensure balanced residential, commercial, and industrial growth.

LU-I-4d Monitor revenues relative to new growth to ensure that projected cumulative revenue of all land uses in the City is sufficient to support public service costs. The resulting fiscal trends will be incorporated into the annual General Plan implementation report as outlined in LU-I-1a.
Employment and Revenue Generating Uses

**GOAL LU-5**  
**INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS ALL SECTORS OF THE ECONOMY TO ENHANCE MANTeca’S REPUTATION AS AN EMPLOYMENT CENTER IN SOUTHERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND TO IMPROVE UPON MANTeca’S JOBS-TO-HOUSING RATIO.**

*Note: See the Economic Development Element for goals, policies, and measures related to the employment-generating uses, including industrial, professional, and office uses.*

**POLICIES**

**LU-P-5.1** Encourage the development and intensification of employment centers, including high quality, professional office campuses, business parks, and industrial parks, along with related mixed-use development and open spaces. The centers shall be located in areas fully served by public facilities and services, located along major arterials with easy freeway access and with access from public transit, and accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians.

**LU-P-5.2** Encourage office uses above the ground floor in commercial and mixed-use areas.

**LU-P-5.3** Encourage the expansion of business professional uses around the civic center and both Doctors and Kaiser Permanente hospitals.

**LU-P-5.4** Ensure that employment-generating development is compatible with adjacent land uses, particularly residential uses, based upon the location and scale of buildings, lighting, noise, and smell. When development is incompatible, require adequate buffers and/or architectural consideration to protect residential areas, developed or undeveloped, from intrusion of nonresidential activities that may degrade the quality of life in such residential areas.

**LU-P-5.5** Maintain and implement Zoning Code provisions that accommodate and facilitate home-based and locally-owned businesses throughout the City.

**LU-P-5.6** Encourage the development of “clean” industries, such as researcher and development, technology manufacturing, green manufacturing, and similar uses, that limit environmental impacts and health risks commonly associated with industrial uses.

**LU-P-5.7** Require common amenities, detention facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities and linkages to be incorporated into the landscaping and site design.

**LU-P-5.8** In new growth areas, require that high speed fiber optic or other advanced high speed communication technologies are provided to lot and house.

**Implementation**

**LU-I-5a** Review and revise the Zoning Code as appropriate to accommodate research, technology, and similar emerging uses as permitted and to accommodate a mix of complementary uses in all zones.

**LU-I-5b** Concentrate new employment centers along the Planning Area’s western and northern boundaries. Employment centers should provide a focal point and/or theme feature and shall provide prominent entryways at entrances from the City’s major roadway system. Where
possible, the entryways shall take advantage of and incorporate existing natural resources into the entry treatment. Plans for employment centers should identify the location and treatment of the entryways, and shall consider the use of open space, signage and/or special landscaping to create a visual edge or buffer for the employment center.

**LU-I-5c** Concentrate new professional office uses around the civic center, Downtown, and near State Route 99 and State Route 120 interchanges.

**LU-I-5d** As part of the City’s development review process, continue to ensure that employment-generating projects are designed to minimize conflicts with residential uses. Review of employment-generating projects should ensure that the following design concepts are addressed in projects that abut residential areas:

- Appropriate building scale and/or siting;
- Site design and noise-attenuating features to avoid exposure to excessive noise due to long hours of operation or inappropriate location of accessory structures;
- Site and structure design to avoid excessive glare or excessive impacts from light sources onto adjacent properties; and
- Site design to avoid unnecessary loss of community and environmental resources (archaeological, historical, ecological, recreational, etc.).

**LU-I-5e** Require proposed major industrial development to provide the City with an engineering report of the anticipated potable water and wastewater demand. Additional review will be required for proposed industrial uses with a high potable water and wastewater demand.

**LU-I-5g** Ensure that applications for new development contain sufficient information for staff to analyze its contribution to the city’s jobs-to-housing ratio.

**Mixed Use Development**

**GOAL LU-6** INCREASE THE PRESENCE OF MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT TO REVITALIZE DOWNTOWN AND AGING COMMERCIAL CENTERS AND CREATE VIBRANT CENTERS IN NEW GROWTH AREAS.

**LU-P-6.1** Promote Downtown as the city’s primary civic and cultural center and a significant commercial and financial center that provides a public focal point, community, and/or theme features and architectural textures and features on a fine grain scale.

**LU-P-6.2** Encourage a vibrant mixture of office, retail, service, institutional, and residential uses in Downtown.

**LU-P-6.3** Encourage a variety of Downtown business types to provide a unique shopping experience.

**LU-P-6.4** Encourage the development of projects that include residential uses to help create an economically healthy and vibrant Downtown throughout the day and night.

**LU-P-6.5** Preserve and enhance the civic focus of Downtown by maintaining existing civic structures and uses, such as the Transit Center, and by encouraging other civic uses to locate Downtown.
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

LU-P-6.6 Encourage resident-serving land uses, such as pharmacies and small grocery stores, in Downtown.

LU-P-6.7 Encourage all mixed-use projects to, at minimum, incorporate a significant ground floor retail component and a residential component, located on upper stories and or behind the project’s commercial uses.

LU-P-6.8 Encourage the mixing of retail, service, residential, office, and institutional uses on the properties surrounding The Promenade to create a significant retail, employment, and cultural center south of Highway 120.

LU-P-6.9 Require mixed-use development to provide strong connections with the surrounding development and neighborhoods through the provision of pedestrian and bicycle facilities and, where feasible, site consolidation.

LU-P-6.10 Encourage the reuse of existing buildings within Downtown and in other developed locations designated for mixed-use development by utilizing the California Existing Building Code which provides flexibility in the retrofitting of buildings.

LU-P-6.11 Promote the revitalization of underutilized, deteriorated areas and buildings within Downtown and in other developed locations designated for mixed-use development through development incentives, public/private partnerships, and public investments.

Implementation

LU-I-6a Consider implementing incentives to support developers who construct vertical mixed-use projects and/or who build housing above non-residential ground-floor uses within Downtown.

LU-I-6b Support Downtown business and property owners by helping to develop and fund public/private partnerships, such as business improvement districts, to provide for increased maintenance, cleanliness, security, marketing, business retention and recruitment.

LU-I-6c Maintain the Zoning Ordinance to allow frequently visited, resident-serving uses by right in Downtown.

LU-I-6d Promote the intensified use and reuse of existing suites above ground floors.

Public and Quasi-Public Uses

GOAL LU-7 PROVIDE ADEQUATE LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC AND QUASI-PUBLIC USES TO SUPPORT EXISTING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT AND THE COMMUNITY’S NEEDS.

Policies

LU-P-7.1 Designate adequate land, appropriately located for City, County, and School District facilities.

LU-P-7.2 Designate adequate land, appropriately located for quasi-public uses such as hospitals, churches, private school facilities, and utility uses.

LU-P-7.3 In determining appropriate locations for public and quasi-public uses, consider, among other things, proximity to major streets, the cost to develop access to public facilities, and the safety of pedestrians and motorists.
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

LU-P-7.4 Manage development to ensure that adequate public facilities and services, as defined in the Public Services and Facilities Element, are planned for and provided.

LU-P-7.5 To the extent feasible, encourage school districts to locate school sites within easy walking distance of a large percentage of the student population and in areas where there are existing or planned safe routes to school (complete sidewalk/bike lane access from the residential neighborhoods within the enrollment boundary).

LU-P-7.6 Encourage community-oriented recreation and commercial, such as lifestyle commercial centers and/or assembly uses, on public/quasi-public lands, provided the development provides a public benefit, such as a significant community gathering area and focal point with high quality amenities and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.

Implementation
LU-I-7a Maintain a sufficient supply of land in the Public/Quasi-Public designations to meet anticipated needs.

LU-I-7b Collaborate and coordinate with the local school districts to assist in the identification of suitable future school sites, and provide assistance through land use and zoning actions to aid the school districts in the procurement and entitlement of future school sites.

LU-I-7c Update the Zoning Code to accommodate community-oriented recreation and commercial uses that provide public benefits, including high-quality amenities and multi-modal connectivity.

Environmental Justice

GOAL LU-8 CREATE AN ENVIRONMENTALLY JUST CITY WITH AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES, A SAFE AND HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING ACCESS TO HEALTHY FOODS, RECREATION AND ACTIVITY, AND PUBLIC SERVICES, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT FOR ALL COMMUNITY MEMBERS.

Refer to the Safety Element for additional goals, policies, and measures to reduce exposure to pollutants, excessive noise, and hazards, the Housing Element to encourage housing opportunities for all income levels and special needs population, the Public Facilities And Services Element regarding provision of services for existing and planned development, including opportunities for recreation and physical activity, and the Circulation Element regarding access to non-vehicle transportation and improving opportunities for active transportation modes.

Policies
LU-P-8.1 Consider the effects of planning decisions on the overall health and well-being of the community and its residents, with specific consideration provided regarding disadvantaged populations and communities.

LU-P-8.2 Consider environmental justice issues related to potential adverse health impacts associated with land use decisions, including methods to reduce exposure to hazardous materials, industrial activity, vehicle exhaust, other sources of pollution, and excessive noise on residents regardless of age, culture, gender, race, socioeconomic status, or geographic location.
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

LU-P-8.3 Consider environmental justice issues related to the equitable provision of desirable public amenities such as parks, recreational facilities, community gardens, civic facilities, and other uses that improve the quality of life.

LU-P-8.4 Promote broad and balanced participation to ensure that affected residents have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, including in decisions that affect their health and well-being such as planning, roadway, parks, infrastructure, and utility projects.

LU-P-8.5 Support existing health care services and encourage the location of new health care facilities and medical services, particularly in disadvantaged areas, areas with a high rate of special needs populations, and in underserved residential areas. Encourage new facilities to be located in areas that are readily accessible by pedestrians and bicyclists and served by transit.

LU-P-8.6 Encourage smoke free workplaces, multifamily housing, parks, and other outdoor gathering places to reduce exposure to second-hand smoke.

LU-P-8.7 Encourage convenience stores, supermarkets, liquor stores, and neighborhood markets to stock nutritional food choices, including local produce, local meats and dairy, 100% juices, and whole-grain products.

LU-P-8.8 Encourage sustainable local food systems including farmer’s markets, community gardens, edible school yards, community supported agriculture, neighborhood garden exchanges, federal food assistance programs, and healthy food retailers.

LU-P-8.9 Encourage and support the continued year-round operation of farmers’ markets and local fruit and vegetable stands.

LU-P-8.10 Support schools and other organizations’ efforts to encourage students and their families to make healthy food choices through providing fresh, nutritious lunches and providing students and their families access to fresh fruits and vegetables through “edible school yards”, holiday meal programs, and sustainable gardening programs.

Implementation

LU-I-8a Review all development proposals, planning projects, and infrastructure projects to ensure that potential adverse impacts to disadvantaged communities, such as exposure to pollutants, including toxic air contaminants, and unacceptable levels of noise and vibration are reduced to the extent feasible and that measures to improve quality of life, such as connections to bicycle and pedestrian paths, community services, schools, and recreation facilities, access to healthy foods, and improvement of air quality are included in the project. The review shall address both the construction and operation phases of the project.

LU-I-8b Review the City’s community outreach programs and public notice requirements to encourage broad-based and meaningful community participation in decisions. The review should address providing measures to promote capacity-building, encourage participation from populations that may have language, health, or other barriers that may reduce their involvement in the decision-making process, and maximize use of technology broaden opportunities for participation.

LU-I-8c Encourage and support local transit service providers to increase and expand services for
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

people who are transit-dependent, including seniors, persons with mobility disabilities, and persons without regular access to automobiles by improving connections to regional medical facilities, senior centers, and other support systems that serve residents and businesses.

LU-I-8d  Encourage community gardens near high-density housing and encourage the incorporation of community gardens into new and existing high-density housing projects.

LU-I-8e  Encourage schools that serve the City to develop school gardens and to develop protocols to facilitate the streamlined development of school gardens from year to year.

LU-I-8f  Support local government and non-profit efforts and programs aimed at teen drug, alcohol, and tobacco use prevention.

Recreation and Open Space

GOAL LU-9  MAINTAIN A HIGH QUALITY NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN AND AROUND MANTECA.

Policies

LU-P-9.1  Promote the provision of both public and private open space within Manteca to provide visual contrast with the built-environment and to increase recreational opportunities for Manteca residents. Private open space shall not be considered for public use, other than as visual open space, and shall not be constrained from other uses as identified in the General Plan, unless as provided for by agreement with the land owner.

LU-P-9.2  Protect those environmental features that make Manteca an attractive and desirable place to live, work, play, and visit.

LU-P-9.3  Protect significant open space and/or habitat areas for their ecological, educational, scenic, and recreational values.

LU-P-9.4  Require development projects to provide adequate and appropriately located land, easements, or other accommodation for recreational uses, including neighborhood parks, existing and planned trails, and connections to existing or planned trails and other recreational resources as set forth in the Resource Conservation Element, the Public Facilities and Services Element, and the Circulation Element.

LU-P-9.5  Provide new opportunities for community gathering and social interaction through park facilities, community centers, and cultural/art facilities.

LU-P-9.6  Site new park and recreation facilities where they will be accessible by the City’s pedestrian and bicycle network and in close proximity to medium and higher density residential uses, where appropriate.

LU-P-9.7  Encourage commercial recreation uses at the Family Entertainment Zone, Field of Dreams, and on other appropriately designated locations.

Implementation

LU-I-9a  Preserve, enhance, and restore selected existing natural habitat areas.
Land Use Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures

**LU-I-9b**  Create new wildlife habitat areas in appropriate locations, which serve multiple purposes.

**LU-I-9c**  Explore with the State Department of Parks and Recreation innovative ways to link visitor destinations in Manteca and Caswell State Park so that annual visitors increase to both and are aware of the amenities at both.

**LU-I-9d**  Explore with the San Joaquin County, State Department of Parks and Recreation and Army Corps of Engineers ways to create synergy between Dos Reis, Mossdale County Parks, Caswell State Park and Army Corps of Engineer McHenry Recreation Areas with Manteca serving as the initial visitor center for the regional Stanislaus River park system. Support public outreach campaigns that link the regional Stanislaus River park system as a natural stay over for visitors to Yosemite National Park.

**Agricultural Heritage**

**GOAL LU-10**  PRESERVE MANTECA’S AGRICULTURAL HERITAGE BY PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING SIGNIFICANT AREAS OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS AROUND THE CITY.

**Policies**

**LU-P-10.1**  Protect agricultural land from urban development except where the General Plan Land Use Map has designated the land for urban uses.

**LU-P-10.2**  Encourage the continuation of agricultural uses on lands within and adjacent to the SOI and Planning Area, where appropriate.

**LU-P-10.3**  Encourage the continuation of small, specialty agricultural operations, demonstration or educational agricultural operations, and agricultural tourism operations that are compatible with the Land Use Map.

**LU-P-10.4**  Encourage buffering for new urban uses along the SOI boundary adjacent to commercial agricultural uses.

**Implementation**

**LU-I-10a**  Continue to designate agricultural lands to the north, east, and south of the city limits as Agriculture on the Land Use Map.

**LU-I-10b**  Consider prioritizing use of the Agricultural Mitigation Fee to ensure long-term conservation and protection of agricultural lands to the west and south of Manteca.

**LU-I-10c**  Consider requiring buffering features between new urban uses and commercial agricultural uses, including but not limited to, landscaping, trails, gardens, solar arrays, and open spaces.

**LU-I-10d**  Encourage local wineries, Delicato, Barrel Ten, Wine Group, Gnekow, McManis, and Lucca, to locate independent tasting rooms in a centralized Manteca location convenient to local visitors.

**LU-I-10e**  Encourage and cooperate in the formation of a Stanislaus River Appellation.
ATTACHMENT 5

DRAFT GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY SET
Draft Growth Management Policy Set

GOAL GM-1 MAINTAIN APPROPRIATE GROWTH MANAGEMENT MEASURES THAT ENSURE A HIGH QUALITY OF LIFE, APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF SERVICE, AND ADDRESS ANTICIPATED DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS AND TIMING OF PUBLIC SERVICES, FACILITIES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO SERVE NEW GROWTH.

See the Public Facilities and Services Element for additional goals, policies, and implementation measures regarding the provision and timing of public facilities and services.

Policies

GM-P-1.1 Maintain a Growth Management Program that requires new development to meet and address level of service standards for water, sewer, circulation, schools, parks, public safety, and other necessary services and facilities and demonstrate consistency with the General Plan.

GM-P-1.2 Base the approval of development projects in growth areas on the Growth Management Program’s annual allotment of allocations and construction of infrastructure and facilities and availability of public services prior to the project’s construction.

GM-P-1.3 Continue to exempt infill development projects from complying with the Growth Management Program.

GM-P-1.4 Coordinate with City departments, outside agencies, and service providers to assure that any level of service standards used to measure effective services and facilities reflect current service delivery and measurement techniques.

GM-P-1.5 Periodically review and revise levels of service thresholds and any growth caps to assure that they reflect current service delivery and measurement techniques and to assure their effectiveness at achieving quality of life goals.

GM-P-1.6 Ensure that the City's building, development, and growth management regulations continue to support sustainable development.

GM-P-1.7 Limit the number of project allocations per residential project when the annual requests for growth allocations exceed the specified growth cap.

GM-P-1.8 Withhold discretionary approvals and subsequent building permits from projects demonstrated to be out of compliance with the Growth Management Program.

Implementation

GM-I-1a Update Municipal Code Chapter 18.04 (Growth Management Program) to implement the General Plan. Consider revisions to: 1) incorporate levels of service standards, where appropriate, as a tool to assess the relative impact of public facilities, services, and utilities demands created by new growth, 2) reflect current conditions as well as applicable goals and policies of this General Plan, 3) address the desired rate of development, and 4) to provide for incentives for desired types of development, including mixed use or intensified uses in the Downtown that contribute to the area's vitality, revitalization of vacant or underutilized buildings, and priority residential uses such as executive, senior, workforce, and/or special needs housing.
Draft Growth Management Policy Set

GM-I-1b Consider appointment of a Growth Management Commission, which would review growth management applications, when necessary, and provide an annual report to the City Council on the program, including levels of service and approved and forecasted development.

GM-I-1c Periodically review and revise Chapter 18.04 (Growth Management Program) to assure that:

- the program’s specified annual growth rate and points systems for assigning project allocations reflects sustainable growth within the context of the City’s infrastructure and public services capacity;
- the program reflects current service delivery and measurement techniques;
- the program is contributing to a high quality of life in the City;
- the program does not impede accommodation of the City’s fair-share of regional housing needs; and
- the program generally meets the City’s needs.

GM-I-1d Continue to actively solicit annual input from the applicable service-providing agencies and City departments in order to judge current service levels compliance, growth impacts, facility improvements, maintenance issues, and funding opportunities.

GM-I-1e Participate in regional and sub-regional planning forums that may address matters affecting the quality of life in Manteca and the region.
ATTACHMENT 6

DRAFT CIRCULATION POLICY SET
Multimodal Accessibility

**GOAL C-1**  
PROVIDE FOR A COMPLETE MULTIMODAL CIRCULATION SYSTEM DESIGNED FOR THE BALANCED MOVEMENT OF ALL USERS, INCLUDING CHILDREN, PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, AND SENIORS, GOODS, AND SERVICES TO DESTINATIONS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF MANTeca WHILE MINIMIZING PUBLIC COSTS TO BUILD AND MAINTAIN THE SYSTEM.

**Policies**

C-P-1.1  
Strive to balance levels of service (LOS) for all modes (vehicle, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian) to maintain a high level of access and mobility, while developing a safe, complete, and efficient circulation system. The impact of new development and land use proposals on LOS and accessibility for all modes should be considered in the review process.

C-P-1.2  
To the extent feasible, strive for a vehicular LOS of D or better during weekday AM and PM peak hours at all streets and intersections, except in the Downtown area and on the roadway segments listed below: Airport Way north of Daniels Road and south of Lathrop Road

- Airport Way north of Daniels Road and south of Lathrop Road
- Main Street north of Highway 120 and south of Louise Avenue
- Lathrop Road west of Highway 99 and east of Union Road
- Cottage Ave north of Yosemite Ave and south of E Louise Avenue
- Yosemite Avenue west of Highway 99 and east of Cottage Avenue

Note: This list will be finalized after the preferred land use map is selected by City Council.

C-P-1.3  
At the discretion of the City Council or Planning Commission, certain locations may be allowed to fall below the City’s LOS standard established by C-P-1.2 under the following circumstances:

a. Where constructing facilities with enough capacity to provide LOS D is found to be unreasonably expensive. This applies to facilities, for example, on which it would cost significantly more per dwelling unit equivalent (DUE) to provide LOS D than is deemed reasonable.

b. Where conditions are worse than LOS D and caused primarily by traffic from adjacent jurisdictions.

c. Where maintaining LOS D will be a disincentive to use transit and active transportation modes (i.e., walking and bicycling) or to the implementation of new transportation modes that would reduce vehicle travel. Examples include roadway or intersection widening in areas with substantial pedestrian activity or near major transit centers.

C-P-1.4  
While vehicular LOS D is not a requirement in the Downtown area due to the development pattern and limited street right-of-way, traffic studies shall: 1) disclose whether any proposed transportation or land use action will substantially increase traffic
at intersections and roadways within this area of the City and 2) identify measures to maintain high quality access and mobility in the area with a priority toward active transportation modes. New discretionary land use permit requests within the Downtown area, which generate net new PM peak-hour auto trips, shall participate in enhancing access and mobility for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes. These enhancements may include, but are not limited to:

- Enhancing sidewalks to create a high quality pedestrian environment, including wider sidewalks and improved crosswalks, landscaping, buffers between sidewalks and vehicle travel lanes, enhanced pedestrian lighting, wayfinding signage, shade trees, and canopies, increased availability of benches, provisions for café-style seating, and usage of monument elements and other public art.
- Improving bicycle facilities to include attractive and secure bicycle parking, installation of bike lockers in appropriate locations, and provision of bicycle lanes, bike paths, and wayfinding signage along appropriate roadways.
- Enhancing transit stops through high quality, well-maintained shelters, and provision of wayfinding signage and transit timetables.
- Providing off-street parking with high quality access to Downtown businesses, and which is well-maintained and provides amenities like shade streets, canopies, adequate lighting, and wayfinding signage.
- Supporting the development of a Downtown Business Improvement District or similar mechanism to help fund ongoing maintenance of the streetscape enhancements.

C-P-1.4 As new transportation technologies and mobility services, including autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles, electric bicycles and scooters, and transportation network companies (e.g., Uber and Lyft) are implemented in Manteca and used by the public, the City shall review and update its policies and plans to maximize the benefit to the public of such technologies and services without adversely affecting the City’s transportation network. Updates to the City’s policies and plans may cover topics such as electric vehicle charging stations, curb space management, changes in parking supply requirements, policies regarding electric scooter use and docking, etc.

**Implementation**

**C-I-1a** Maintain an up-to-date master list of multimodal conditions, including volume data for key intersections and roadway segments. This master list shall be updated regularly with traffic counts (for autos, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians) taken in conjunction with project traffic studies and by special counts conducted by the City as necessary and shall include periodic evaluation of the mobility and access on major streets, including access and mobility issues faced by transit riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

**C-I-1c** Develop a program to implement California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements regarding the impacts of vehicle miles traveled (i.e., SB 743) for both land development and infrastructure projects.

**C-I-1d** Develop Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines to provide guidance on identifying deficiencies and impacts on all modes of transportation caused by new development. The TIS guidelines will also provide guidance on the types of mitigation measures that would
be appropriate to mitigate project-related impacts to transportation facilities in the City. The TIS guidelines will address impact thresholds for vehicular, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The TIS guidelines should include guidance on addressing CEQA required impacts of vehicle miles traveled as developed by implementation measure C-I-1c.

C-I-1e Develop a pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvement plan for the Downtown area to facilitate implementation of level of service policy C-P-1.4. This plan will develop a list of multi-modal improvements in the Downtown area to increase the viability and encourage the use of non-auto modes.

C-I-1f Work with the San Joaquin Council of Governments to remove the downtown segment of Yosemite Avenue, as shown in Figure X (Note: roadway figure to be developed following selection of preferred alternative by the City Council) from the Regional Congestion Management Program (RCMP) roadway network. In the Downtown area the City cannot maintain the RCMP vehicular LOS D standard as discussed in policy C-P-1.2 and C-P-1.4.

C-I-1g Periodically review local adoption of new transportation technologies and develop plans based on best practices to ensure these policies benefit the public and the multimodal transportation system, including the following:

- Call for and support mobility innovation in California through the League of Cities and other national and statewide organizations.
- Advocate for new approaches to financing infrastructure projects.
- Invest in lane markings that enhance effectiveness of lane departure warning and prevention systems.
- Implement an autonomous vehicle road network along major roadways
- Introduce polices that can influence how autonomous vehicles can affect vehicle miles travelled, urban sprawl, and/or parking requirements.
- By 2029, planning documents such as the Capital Improvement Program and Short Range Transit Plan shall address the conversion the public transit vehicle fleet to fully automated.

C-I-1h Encourage open data sharing. While it is important to preserve people’s privacy, open, anonymized data can improve the City’s decision-making and help to develop more informed policies and plans. Measures may include:

- Develop an automated traffic surveillance and control system and provide to the data to enhance transparency of network prioritization for planning.
- Launch a Data as a Service program to provide real-time infrastructure data to connected vehicles.
- Collaborate with the San Joaquin Council of Governments and Caltrans to promote interoperability.

C-I-1i Review updates to transportation planning documents and any automated vehicle plans to ensure the benefits of automated mobility are equitably distributed across all segments of the community and that the negative impacts of automated mobility are not disproportionately borne on traditionally marginalized neighborhoods.

C-I-1j As part of the development of or participation in any ridesharing program, including for shared automated vehicle fleets, ensure that the program considers the safety needs of vulnerable populations and loading needs of seniors, families with children, and individuals with mobility impairments.
Major Streets Master Plan

**GOAL C-2** PROVIDE A SAFE, HIGH-QUALITY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT ADDRESSES ALL MODES OF TRAVEL AND INCLUDES ATTRACTIVE STREETSCAPES WITH LANDSCAPING, STREET TREES, PLANTED BERMS, AND LANDSCAPED MEDIANS.

**Policies**

C-P-2.1 Promote development of a future roadway system as shown in the Major Streets Master Plan, **Figure X (Note: roadway figure to be developed following selection of preferred alternative by the City Council)**, with streets designed in accordance with the City’s standard plans to provide multiple, direct, and convenient routes for all modes and to provide high-volume, multi-lane facilities with access controls, as needed, to preserve the through traffic carrying capacity of the facility.

C-P-2.2 Design roadway improvements to occur in a contiguous, orderly fashion and strive to build roadway improvements in advance of new development particularly when addressing existing deficiencies. However, major circulation improvements shall be constructed no later than when abutting lands develop or redevelop, with dedication of right-of-way and construction of improvements, or participation in construction of such improvements, required as a condition of approval.

C-P-2.3 Require new development to pay a fair share of the costs of street and other transportation improvements based on impacts to LOS and other modes in conformance with the goals and policies established in this Circulation Element and the Public Facilities Implementation Program (PFIP).

C-P-2.4 Design street improvements to provide multiple, direct, and convenient routes for all modes.

C-P-2.5 Align residential and collector street intersections with collector and arterial streets with other residential and collector streets, where feasible, to maintain a high degree of connectivity between neighborhoods, minimize circuitous travel, and to allow bicyclists and pedestrians to travel conveniently and safely from one neighborhood to another without using major streets.

C-P-2.6 Provide access for bicycles and pedestrians at the ends of cul-de-sacs, where right-of-way is available, to provide convenient access within and between neighborhoods and to encourage walking and bicycling to neighborhood destinations.

C-P-2.7 Signals, roundabouts, traffic circles and other traffic management techniques shall be applied appropriately at residential and collector street intersections with collector and arterial streets in order to allow bicyclists and pedestrians to travel conveniently and safely from one neighborhood to another.

C-P-2.8 Where traffic congestion, pedestrian travel, collision history, or other factors warrant the installation of a traffic signal, the feasibility of a roundabout shall also be evaluated on a whole life cycle cost basis. In general, a roundabout should be installed at these locations unless right of way, cost, operational concerns, design limitations, or other issues preclude the installation of a roundabout.

C-P-2.9 Development of private streets may be allowed in new residential projects that
demonstrate the ability to facilitate police patrol, emergency access, and solid waste collection as well as fund on-going maintenance.

C-P-2.10 Promote infill development that closes gaps and “squeezes” in the circulation system.

C-P-2.11 Require new development to establish joint-use driveways and/or cross access easements to provide access when feasible and/or if: 1) located on street segments identified in C-P-1.2, 2) located on streets approaching not meeting LOS D, or 3) the shared access will reduce vehicle miles travelled as determined by the City’s Community Development Department. The requirement is intended to preserve the movement function of the major thoroughfare system by requiring development of parallel roads or cross access easements to connect developments as they are permitted along major roads, providing more efficient connections to destinations, and reducing air emissions.

C-P-2.11 Require development projects to arrange streets in an interconnected block pattern, so that pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers are not forced onto arterial streets for inter- or intra-neighborhood travel. This approach will also ensure safe and efficient movement of emergency responders. The street pattern shall include:

- a fully connected network of smaller roadways that provides multiple alternative routes between each point of origin and destination.
- a maximum driving distance of 2,000 feet from any dwelling to the nearest collector streets, with no more than three turning movements at intersections required to travel from any home to a collector street.
- connections to adjacent roadways and stubbed roads, including provision of stubbed roadways where appropriate to connect to areas designated for future development, such as lands designated for commercial, mixed-use, industrial, and public/quasi-public uses. Connections shall be provided at a minimum of 600-foot intervals except where adjacent existing or planned future limited access highways, expressways, or parkways.
- an internal street network that provides a minimum internal connectivity index of 1.4 or higher. The connectivity index is calculated by dividing the total number of road segments the number of nodes. Nodes are intersections plus cul-de-sacs. Roadway segments are between intersections. Higher connectivity standards may be required by the City when appropriate.

![Figure C-2. Connectivity Index. There are six segments and four nodes in the example above yielding an overall connectivity index of 1.5.](image)

C-P-2.12 Residential subdivisions with lots fronting on an existing arterial street shall provide for
separate roadway access to the maximum extent feasible, with access to residential lots provided from residential or collector streets. For those properties that currently front arterial streets, consideration should be given to providing separate roadway access as a condition of approval for any redevelopment or subdivision of the property.

C-P-2.13 Ensure that development and infrastructure projects are designed in a way that provides pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods and areas (such as ensuring that sound walls, berms, and similar physical barriers are considered and gaps or other measures are provided to ensure connectivity).

C-P-2.14 Aggressively pursue state and federal funding to augment the PFIP and implement the City’s Circulation Element.

C-P-2.15 Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions, including Caltrans, San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOC), San Joaquin County, the City of Lathrop, and the City of Ripon to pursue funding for the following regional facilities:

- A new interchange at McKinley Avenue and SR 120;
- A new interchange at Austin Road/McKinley Avenue and SR 99;
- A new interchange on SR 99 between Lathrop Road and French Camp Road;
- An easterly extension of the SR 120 freeway towards Oakdale; and
- Regional bicycle lanes and bicycle paths.

Note: This list will be finalized after the preferred land use map is selected by City Council.

C-P-2.16 Prohibit the creation of traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian hazards and conflicts with vehicular traffic movements in new development, infill development, and redevelopment areas and pursue opportunities to improve conditions where there are existing conflicts to ensure that the pedestrian and bicycle network provides a direct and convenient route equal to or greater than vehicular routes in new development, infill, and redevelopment areas.

C-P-2.17 In the development of new projects, give special attention to maintaining/ensuring adequate corner-sight distances appropriate for the speed and type of facility, including intersections of city streets and private access drives and roadways.

C-P-2.18 Encourage the development of landscape separated sidewalks along roadways (particularly arterials and non-residential streets) when feasible to discourage pedestrian/vehicle conflicts and be consistent with complete streets concepts.

Implementation

C-I-2a Maintain the Major Street Master Plan (Figure X) showing the existing and proposed ultimate right-of-way and street width for each road segment within the City’s Sphere of Influence and Area of Interest. The Major Street Master Plan shall also indicate the necessary right-of-way to be acquired or dedicated and the expected method of financing roadway improvements (i.e., City-funded or property owner/developer-funded). The Major Street Master Plan shall be regularly updated.

C-I-2b When planning roadway facilities, incorporate the concept of complete streets. Complete streets include design elements for all modes that use streets, including autos, transit,
pedestrians, and bicycles. Complete streets shall be developed in a context-sensitive manner. For example, it may be more appropriate to provide a Class I bike path, as opposed to bike lanes along a major arterial. Pedestrian districts like Downtown Manteca or areas near school entrances should have an enhanced streetscape (e.g., narrower travel lanes, landscape buffers with street trees, etc.) to better accommodate and encourage pedestrian travel.

C-I-2c Review and update the City’s standard plans to ensure that the plans reflect the City’s goals and policies for the circulation system, including cross-sections that provide for landscape-separated sidewalks along arterials and non-residential streets, best practices for traffic safety, and accommodate all users.

C-I-2d Require new development to participate in the implementation of transportation improvements identified in the Major Street Master Plan. Participation could include the construction of roadways, improvements to roadways, payment into the PFIP program, payment into other fee programs, or fair-share payments. In general, the infrastructure needs and methods of participation will be determined through an environmental impact report or transportation impact analysis.

C-I-2e Work with SJCOG inclusion of projects in the City’s Circulation Element and Major Street Master Plan into long range planning documents, including the SJCOG Regional Transportation Plan and the San Joaquin County Congestion Management Program.

C-I-2f Ensure that bicycle and pedestrian access is provided through walls and berms to minimize travel distances and increase the viability walking and bicycling.

C-I-2g To support the City’s goals of minimizing maintenance costs and encouraging active transportation, any new or substantially modified roadway shall be as narrow as feasible while being consistent with LOS standards, goods movement policies, and safety best practices. In general, this implementation measure can be achieved by constructing narrower traffic lanes, although wider lanes may be necessary on certain truck routes.

C-I-2h Regularly update the PFIP program to ensure that the fees are consistent with construction costs and the project list reflects changes in the transportation system that may occur as land use development projects progress and more details about specific transportation needs and design are known.

C-I-2i Pursue funding to improve and address areas of traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian hazards and conflicts with vehicular traffic movements.

C-I-2j Identify and remove, as feasible, obstacles limiting corner-sight distances at existing street corners.

C-I-2k Maintain a program of identification and surveillance of high vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian collision locations, with emphasis on early detection and correction of conditions that could potentially violate user expectations.

C-I-2l Require all new signs, roadway striping, and traffic signals to be consistent with the latest edition of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

C-I-2m Through the development review process, require joint use access, cross access easements, and access prohibitions wherever traffic patterns and physical features make it possible and ensure that proposed street networks maximize access and connectivity.
Parking

GOAL C-3 ESTABLISH REASONABLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS (MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM RATES FOR USES) THAT LIMIT PARKING ENCROACHMENT WHILE MINIMIZING THE AMOUNT OF LAND CONSUMED BY PARKING LOTS.

Policies

C-P-3.1 Future growth in traffic volumes may necessitate removal of on-street parking spaces to provide additional traffic lanes.

C-P-3.2 Require new development to provide an appropriate number of off-street parking spaces to accommodate the typical parking demands of the type of development on the site. The City may dictate both minimum and maximum amounts of parking to ensure that adequate parking is available for typical activities associated with a use as well as for special events, where anticipated and appropriate, and to ensure that parking standards encourage alternatives to single occupant vehicles.

C-P-3.3 Encourage shared parking to reduce overall land consumed by parking areas.

C-P-3.4 Develop a coordinated approach to address parking supply and demand in the Downtown area, including location of parking facilities within easy walking distance of Downtown businesses.

C-P-3.5 Allow for changes to the parking requirements under certain circumstances. In such cases, the City may require provision of off-site parking, participation in a parking district, payment of an in-lieu fee to cover the costs of land acquisition and construction of parking spaces, or similar measure to ensure that projects adequately address parking demand.

Implementation

C-I-3a Review and revise, as necessary, off-street parking standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Such revision shall be based on parking best practices, multimodal transportation needs, infill considerations, construction and maintenance costs, the requirements of the Housing Element to achieve specified residential density levels, and an assessment of the adequacy of the City’s current standards.

C-I-3b Work with local merchants to improve on-street and off-street parking conditions.

C-I-3c Require a shared parking analysis for all proposed mixed-use developments and new projects in the Downtown area to ensure that an appropriate supply of parking is provided.

C-I-3d To maintain adequate parking supply for businesses, the City may restrict parking on public streets through permit programs, time limits, or parking meters, where appropriate. Parking meter, on-street parking time limits, and off-street lot rates should be periodically evaluated to ensure an appropriate level of vehicle turnover and available spaces to reduce unnecessary travel caused by vehicles hunting for vacant spaces.

C-I-3e If roadway widening requires the removal of on-street parking, a parking supply study should be conducted to determine if the loss of on-street parking spaces would create a parking shortage. If so, the parking supply study should address the feasibility of replacing the lost parking spaces and methods to reduce parking demand, such as transit improvements and/or transportation demand management measures.
Develop standards for the maximum number of parking spaces that will be allowed for any particular use to encourage walking, bicycling, ridesharing, transit use, shared parking, and to facilitate the transition to autonomous vehicle parking demand.

Bikeway and Pedestrian Systems

**GOAL C-4** PROVIDE A SAFE, SECURE, COMFORTABLE, AND CONVENIENT PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE SYSTEM THAT CONNECTS RIDERS OF ALL AGES AND ABILITIES TO SCHOOLS, RETAIL, EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, PUBLIC FACILITIES, AND PARKS.

*Policies*

**C-P-4.1** Improve safety conditions, efficiency, and comfort for bicyclists and pedestrians by providing shade trees and controlling traffic speeds by implementing narrow lanes or other traffic calming measures in accordance with the City Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program on appropriate streets, in particular residential and downtown areas.

**C-P-4.2** Provide a sidewalk and bicycle route system that serves all pedestrian and bicycle users and meets the latest guidelines related to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

**C-P-4.3** Through regular updates to the City's Bicycle Master Plan and/or development of an Active Transportation Plan, establish a safe and convenient network of identified bicycle and pedestrian routes connecting residential areas with schools, recreation, shopping, and employment areas within the city. The City shall also strive to develop connections with existing and planned regional routes shown in the San Joaquin County Bicycle Master Plan.

**C-P-4.4** Provide bicycle parking facilities at commercial, business/professional and light industrial uses in accordance with Part 11 of the California Building Standards Code.

**C-P-4.5** Expand the existing network of off-street bicycle facilities as shown in the City’s Bicycle Master Plan to accommodate cyclists who prefer to travel on dedicated trails. Further, the City shall strive to develop: 1) a “city-loop” Class I bike path for use by both bicyclists and pedestrians that links Austin Road, Atherton Drive, Airport Way, and a route along or near Lathrop Road to the Tidewater bike path and its existing and planned extensions, and 2) an off-street bicycle trail extension between the Tidewater Bike Trail near the intersection of Moffat Boulevard and Industrial Park Drive to the proposed regional route between Manteca and Ripon.

**C-P-4.6** Provide on-street Class II bike lanes, Class IV protected bike lanes, or off-street Class I bike paths along major collector and arterial streets whenever feasible.

**C-P-4.7** Facilitate bicycle travel through residential streets through signage necessary to communicate the presence of Class III bicycle lanes on residential streets that have sufficiently low volumes as to not require bike lanes or have narrower street cross sections that assist in calming traffic.

**C-P-4.8** Provide sidewalks and/or walkways connecting to the residential neighborhoods, primary public destinations, major public parking areas, transit stops, and intersections with the bikeway system.

**C-P-4.9** Provide sidewalks along both sides of all new streets in the City.
**Implementation**

C-I-4a  Develop an Active Transportation Plan to include all areas envisioned for development by this General Plan and to address pedestrian and bicycle facilities needed to provide a complete circulation system that adequately meets the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists. The Plan will establish future bicycle routes and provide standards for bicycle facilities, including bicycle paths and bicycle lanes. The Plan will identify existing deficiencies and establish standards for future pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian pathways. The Plan will incorporate the Bicycle Master Plan.

C-I-4b  The Utilize the standards set forth in the latest editions of the California MUTCD and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Green Book for improvement and re-striping of appropriate major collector and arterial streets to accommodate Class II bike lanes or Class IV protected bikeways in both directions, where sufficient roadway width is available. This may include narrowing of travel lanes.

C-I-4c  Increase bicycle safety by:

- Providing bicycle paths and lanes that promote bicycle travel.
- Sweeping, repairing, and maintaining vegetation along bicycle lanes and paths on a continuing, regular basis.
- Ensuring that bikeways are delineated and signed in accordance with the latest editions of the California MUTCD and AASHTO standards and lighting is provided, where feasible.
- Ensuring that all new and improved streets have bicycle-safe drainage grates and are eliminate uneven pavement, gravel, encroaching vegetation, and other conditions that may impede user expectations and convenience.

C-I-4d  Add bicycle facilities whenever possible in conjunction with road rehabilitation, reconstruction, or re-striping projects.

C-I-4e  Update the City’s standard plans to accommodate pedestrian and bicyclists, including landscape-separated sidewalks where appropriate and to include bike lanes on collector and arterial streets, as defined by the Bicycle Master Plan or Active Transportation Plan.

C-I-4f  Encourage and facilitate resident and visitor use of the bike trail system by preparing a map of the pedestrian and bike paths and implementing wayfinding signage.

C-I-4g  Update the standard plans to specify a set of roadways with narrower lanes (less than 12 feet) and pedestrian bulb-outs to calm traffic and increase pedestrian and bicycle comfort. These narrow lane standards shall be applied to appropriate streets (e.g., they shall not be applied to outside lanes on major truck routes).

C-I-4h  Develop an ADA Transition Plan. This plan shall identify deficiencies related to ADA access and identify an implementation strategy to bring the deficient facilities up to the applicable standards.

C-I-4k  Provide for pedestrian access in the Downtown area, along Yosemite Avenue, Main Street, and in other high-use areas by:

- Constructing wide sidewalks where feasible to accommodate increased pedestrian use.
• Providing improved crosswalks, landscaping, buffers between sidewalks and vehicle travel lanes, enhanced pedestrian lighting.

• Improving the walking environment by providing benches, allowing for café seating, and constructing monument elements and other public art.

• Providing improvements that enhance pedestrian safety and convenience, such as bulb-outs extending into intersections and at crosswalks to reduce walking distances and provide a safe peninsula for pedestrians.

• Providing bulb-outs at intersections (to be identified by the City) to reduce crossing distances and calm traffic.

• Providing marked (and signalized, if appropriate) mid-block crossings near schools, parks, or other neighborhood attractions. A landscaped median refuge island, raised/textured sidewalk, or other design features may also be provided.

• Providing landscape buffer separated sidewalks.

C-I-4k By 2021, consider adoption of a Vision Zero Action Plan (or strategy) that prioritizes systems-based approach to preventing traffic fatalities, focusing on the built environment, systems, and policies that influence behavior as well as messaging that emphasizes that these traffic losses are preventable.

Public Transit

GOAL C-5 MAINTAIN A COORDINATED, EFFICIENT BUS SERVICE THAT PROVIDES AN EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVE TO AUTOMOBILE USE, SERVES MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY THAT CANNOT DRIVE, AND INCLUDES REGIONAL TRANSIT CONNECTIONS THAT LINK MANTeca TO OTHER DESTINATIONS

Policies

C-P-5.1 Encourage and plan for the expansion of regional bus service in the Manteca area.

C-P-5.2 Promote increased commuter and regional passenger rail service that will benefit the businesses and residents of Manteca. Examples include Amtrak, the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), and high-speed rail.

C-P-5.3 Identify and implement means of enhancing the opportunities for residents to commute from residential neighborhoods to the ACE station or other transit facilities that may develop in the City.

C-P-5.4 Include primary locations where the transit systems will connect to the major bikeways and pedestrian ways and primary public parking areas in the Active Transportation Plan (see C-I-4a).

C-P-5.5 Encourage programs that provide ridesharing and vanpool opportunities and other alternative modes of transportation for Manteca residents.

C-P-5.6 Promote the development of park-and-ride facilities near I-5, SR 120, SR 99, and transit stations.

C-P-5.7 Maintain a working relationship between the City administration and the local
management of the Union Pacific Railroad regarding expansion of freight and passenger rail service and economic development of the region.

C-P-5.8 Design future roadways to accommodate transit facilities, as appropriate. These design elements should include installation of transit stops adjacent to intersections and provision of bus turnouts and sheltered stops, where feasible.

C-P-5.9 Encourage land uses and site developments that promote public transit along fixed route public transportation corridors, with priority given to those projects that will bring the greatest increase in transit ridership.

Implementation

C-I-5a Periodically review transit needs in the city and adjust bus routes to accommodate changing land use and transit demand patterns. The City shall also periodically coordinate with the San Joaquin Regional Transit District to assess the demand for regional transit services.

C-I-5b Explore a transit connections study that would identify improvements to connections and access to the existing ACE station, the Manteca Transit Center, and future planned transit stations.

C-I-5c Update the City’s standard plans to include the option for bus turnouts at intersections of major streets.

C-I-5d Review and consider alternatives to conventional bus systems, such as smaller shuttle buses (i.e., micro-transit), on-demand transit services, or transportation networking company services that connect neighborhood centers to local activity centers with greater cost efficiency.

C-I-5e Work with the school districts to identify and implement opportunities for joint-use public transit that would provide both student transportation and local transit service.

C-I-5f Through the development review process, ensure that projects provide increased land use densities and mixed uses, consistent with the Land Use Element to enhance the feasibility of transit and promote alternative transportation modes.

C-I-5g Along fixed route corridors, require that new development to be compatible with and further the achievement of the Circulation Element. Requirements for compatibility may include but are not limited to:

- Orienting pedestrian access to transit centers and existing and planned transit routes.

- Orienting buildings, walkways, and other features to provide pedestrian access from the street and locating parking to the side or behind the development, rather than separating the development from the street and pedestrian with parking.

- Providing clearly delineated routes through parking lots to safely accommodate pedestrian and bicycle circulation.
Goods Movement

GOAL C-6  ACCOMMODATE TRUCK AND FREIGHT MOVEMENTS BY DEVELOPING CITY-WIDE TRUCK ROUTES AND ENCOURAGING THE DEVELOPMENT OF FREIGHT AND WAREHOUSING CENTERS NEAR EXISTING RAIL LINES AND SPURS.

Policies

C-P-6.1 Require new industrial development to pay a fair share toward improvements required to accommodate heavy vehicles, including increased pavement wear.

C-P-6.2 Develop and maintain a truck network to connect Surface Transportation Accountability Act (STAA) trucks to industrial areas.

C-P-6.3 Encourage the provision of freight rail service into industrial developments through the use and development of rail spurs.

C-P-6.4 Consider implementing vehicle weight limit restrictions on roadways near sensitive uses like schools and residential neighborhoods to discourage cut-through truck traffic.

Implementation

C-I-6a Maintain an up-to-date truck route map that identifies key goods movement corridors in Manteca and ensures goods movement needs are adequately served.

C-I-6b Prominently sign all truck routes in accordance with the California MUTCD.

C-I-6c Develop an enforcement program through the Police Department to enforce compliance with truck routes.

Transportation Demand Management

GOAL C-7  REDUCE VEHICLE TRAVEL ASSOCIATED WITH EMPLOYEE TRIPS AND GOODS MOVEMENT

Policies

C-P-7.1 Encourage employers to provide alternative mode subsidies, bicycle facilities, alternative work schedules, ridesharing, telecommuting, and work-at-home programs employee education and preferential parking for carpools/vanpools.

C-P-7.2 Require development projects that employ 50 or more full-time equivalent employees to establish a transportation demand management (TDM) programs.

C-P-7.3 Partner with SJCOG on the Dibs program, which is the regional smart travel program, including rideshare, transit, walking, and biking, operated by SJCOG.

Implementation

C-I-7a Provide information about transit services, ridesharing, van-pools, and other transportation alternatives to single occupant vehicles at City Hall, the library, and on the City website.

C-I-7b Develop TDM program requirements with consideration of addressing CEQA vehicle miles traveled impact analysis requirements (i.e., SB 743) in accordance with implementation measure C-I-1c. TDM programs shall include measures to reduce total vehicle miles
travelled and peak hour vehicle trips. A simplified version of the Air District’s Rule 9410 could be used to implement this measure.

C-I-7c Coordinate with the San Joaquin Council of Governments on a Congestion/Mobility Management Program to identify TDM strategies to mitigate peak-hour congestion impacts, focusing on the roadway segments identified in C-P-1.3. Strategies may include: growth management and activity center strategies, telecommuting, transit information systems, alternative work hours, carpooling, vanpooling, guaranteed ride home program, parking management, addition of general purpose lanes, channelization, computerized signal systems, intersection or midblock widenings and Intelligent Transportation System.
ATTACHMENT 7

EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT, CHAPTER 6: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
6.0. **Environmental Justice**

This section addresses, provides an overview of existing environmental conditions for disadvantaged communities in Manteca and describes components of the built environment that may impact human health disproportionately. Environmental justice is related to a number of environmental categories and topics. Therefore, this section of the Manteca General Plan Existing Conditions Report contains numerous references to other sections in this report. For example, conditions regarding transit options, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities are addressed in greater detail in Section 2.0 (Circulation). Parks and recreational facilities are discussed in Section 3.0 (Utilities and Community Services). Hazards and hazardous materials and applicable regulations are addressed in Section 4.0 (Hazards, Safety, and Noise). Air quality and air quality regulations as well as water quality and water quality regulations, are addressed in Section 5.0 (Conservation).

### 6.1 Environmental Justice- Background and Overview

#### Background

The negative effects of environmental degradation and pollution are well-documented and include severe impacts to human health and longevity, depending on the level of exposure. Within the United States, certain communities have historically been disproportionately disadvantaged by environmental threats and the negative health impacts of environmental degradation. These disproportionately disadvantaged communities include, but are not limited to: communities of color, low-income communities, members of tribal nations, and immigrant communities. Increased exposure to environmental pollutants, unsafe drinking water, and contaminated facilities/structures have contributed to poorer health outcomes for these communities. Local and regional policies, intersectional structural inequalities, land-use planning, enforcement deficiencies, and lack of community engagement and advocacy are all critical facets of the disproportionate layout of negative environmental externalities. The field of environmental justice is focused on addressing these disproportionate impacts and improving the wellness of all communities by bolstering community planning efforts and promoting the fair treatment of all people regardless of their race, ethnicity, national origin, or income.

Environmental justice practices across the United States have worked to improve the status of disadvantaged communities, through effective planning and policy decisions. Effective planning and policy decisions at the federal, state, and local levels can help ensure that equal protection from environmental hazards is prioritized for all people.

#### Defining Disadvantaged Communities

The term ‘Disadvantaged Community’ is a broad designation that may include any community that lacks appropriate resources, or is confronted with any exceptional economic, health, or environmental burden. In relation to environmental justice, disadvantaged communities are typically those communities that disproportionately face the burdens of environmental hazards. The Planning for Healthy Communities Act of 2016 (Senate Bill 1000), establishes a set criterion for identifying a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). The definition of a DAC for the purposes of the bill is as follows:

> “An area identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) pursuant to Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code or an area that is a low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.”
6.0 Environmental Justice

California cities that are updating two or more elements of their General Plans concurrently must include environmental justice if one or more DAC is identified within their Planning Area. Using the CalEPA definition of a DAC, Senate Bill 1000 provides stakeholders with the CalEnviroScreen (CES) 3.0 map to identify communities that are disproportionately disadvantaged by environmental hazards. The CES 3.0 map is a science-based tool developed by the Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment on behalf of CalEPA that uses existing environmental, health, and socioeconomic data to rank all census tracts in California with a CES score designating DACs as the highest 25% scoring census tracts. CES scores for the Manteca Planning Area are shown on Figure 6.1-1. As shown on this figure, the majority of lands surrounding the central portions of Manteca are designated DACs.

Regulatory Setting

Senate Bill 1000

Senate Bill 1000 (SB 1000), also known as The Planning for Healthy Communities Act, is a comprehensive state legislation that requires California cities to include an Environmental Justice element or a set of environmental justice policies into their General Plans when updating two or more elements concurrently on or after January 1, 2018.

The Bill was established as a state regulation on September 24, 2016, with the goal of improving the health of California cities and addressing pertinent issues of environmental justice related to community wellness. SB 1000 outlines strategies to promote the protection of sensitive land uses within the state, and simultaneously mandates that cities address the needs of disadvantaged communities. Through this bill, environmental justice is a mandated consideration in all city’s local land-use planning. SB 1000 was authored by Senator Connie Leyva, and co-sponsored by the California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA), and the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCAEJ).

To aid city governments in meeting the requirements of SB 1000, the California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) has created a strategic toolkit. The SB 1000 Implementation Toolkit serves as a guide for key stakeholders by clarifying legislation requirements and providing tools, best practices, and resources to support these stakeholders as they begin to incorporate the law into local practice. To effectively meet the mandates of the bill, cities must formally identify DACs and work to reduce health risks specific to these communities by outlining methods and programs within their plan that address the needs of DACs. Each General Plan must address the following topics in order to meet the requirements of SB 1000:

- Pollution Exposure and Air Quality
- Public Facilities
- Food Access
- Safe and Sanitary Homes
- Physical Activity
- “Civil” or Community Engagement
- Improvements and Programs (that address the needs of DACs)

Senate Bill 535

In 2012, the Legislature passed SB 535, directing that 25 percent of the proceeds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), established by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 AB 52’s cap and trade program, go to projects that provide a benefit to DACs.
Assembly Bill 1550
In 2016, the Legislature passed AB 1550, which amended SB 535 to require all GGRF investments that benefit DACs to also be located within those communities. The law also requires that an additional 10% of the fund be dedicated to low-income households and communities, of which 5% is reserved for low-income households and communities living within a half-mile of a designated DAC.

Senate Bill 673
In 2015, the Legislature passed SB 673 directing the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to include criteria such as cumulative impact and neighborhood vulnerability when issuing or renewing facility permits. The law provides the DTSC with an opportunity to use tools such as CES when making decisions on hazardous waste permitting.

Assembly Bill 523
Approved in 2017, AB 523, allocates at least 25% of the Electric Program Investment Charge (EPIC) funds administered by the California Energy Commission (CEC) to support technology demonstration and deployment projects located in and benefiting “disadvantaged communities,” and dedicates at least 10% of the fund to activities located in and benefiting “low-income” communities as defined by AB 1550.

Senate Bill 43
Approved in 2013, SB 43, establishes the Green Tariff Shared Renewables program, administered by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), which enables utility customers to meet their energy generation needs through offsite generation of renewable energy projects. The program requires 100 MW of renewable energy projects to be sited in the top 20% of CES scores based on each investor-owned utility (IOU) service territory.

Assembly Bill 693
Approved in 2015, AB 693 allocates $100 million per year for 10 years to fund solar installations on multifamily affordable housing. To qualify, a multifamily affordable housing property must be: (1) located in a DAC as defined by SB 535 using the most recent version of CES; or (2) have at least 80% of tenants with incomes at or below 60% of area median income (AMI).

Assembly Bill 2722
Approved in 2016, AB 2722 requires the California Strategic Growth Council to award competitive grants to specified eligible entities for the development and implementation of neighborhood-level transformative climate community plans that include greenhouse gas emissions reduction projects that provide local economic, environmental, and health benefits to DACs, as defined. AB 2722 created the Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) program administered through the California Strategic Growth Council (SGC). The TCC is a GGRF-funded program that supports innovative, comprehensive, and community-led plans that reduce pollution and achieve multiple co-benefits at the neighborhood level.

Senate Bill 244
Approved in 2011, SB 244 requires cities and counties to address the infrastructure needs of unincorporated DACs in city and county general plans and LAFCo Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) and annexation decisions. SB 244 defines an unincorporated DAC as a place that: contains 10 or more dwelling units in close proximity to one another; is either within a city SOI, is an island within a city boundary, or is geographically isolated and has existed for more than 50 years; and has a median household income that is 80 percent or less than the statewide median household income. For cities and counties, SB 244 requires...
that before the due date for adoption of the next housing element after January 1, 2012, the general plan land use element must be updated to: identify unincorporated DACs; analyze for each identified community the water, wastewater, stormwater drainage, and structural fire protection needs; and identify financial funding alternatives for the extension of services to identified communities. For LAFCos, SB 244 generally prohibits approval of city annexations greater than 10 acres that are contiguous to a disadvantaged unincorporated community unless the city applies to annex the DAC as well.

**California Department of Transportation’s Active Transportation Program (ATP)**

California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) the Active Transportation Program (ATP) aims to enhance public health and advance California's climate goals by increasing safety and mobility for non-motorized active transportation such as biking and walking. Twenty-five percent of program funds are set aside for ATP projects in “disadvantaged communities” (defined as census tracts within the top 25% of CES scores along with several other options), while an additional 2% is set aside to fund active transportation planning in DACs.

**City of Manteca**

A variety of goals and policies contained in the existing Manteca General Plan support disadvantaged communities and environmental justice issues through city-wide improvements that provide equitable access to facilities and services, transportation network improvements, parks and recreation opportunities, and promoting air and water quality throughout the Planning Area.

Specifically, the Circulation Element addresses bikeway and pedestrian systems and public transit opportunities, the Economic Development Element addresses quality of life infrastructure goals, the Public Facilities and Services Element addresses the provision of public services and issues related to recreation and parks that are provided by the City, the Safety Element addresses hazardous materials and pollution exposure, the Resource Conservation Element includes the topics of air and water quality, and open space, the Housing Element addresses housing conditions and needs, and the Air Quality Element addresses the primary air quality concerns in the region including: ozone precursors from internal combustion engines (smog), dust and other man-made airborne particles, objectionable odors and hazardous or toxic fumes.
The percentile represents an area's relative score, with 0% being best and 100% being worst. The score is based on:

1) an area's pollution burden (the average of exposure to air pollution, drinking water pollution, certain pesticide use, toxic releases, and traffic density factors and exposure to environmental effects caused by pollutants)

2) the average of sensitive populations, in terms of health status and age, and socioeconomic factors related to a heightened vulnerability to environmental effects.
6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DETERMINANTS IN MANTeca

The CES 3.0 tool is the standard metric for determining the location and presence of designated DACs within an area. As shown on Figure 6.1-1, based on a screening of existing census tracts within the Manteca, many census tracts are considered CES-designated DACs. As described previously, there are seven primary environmental justice focus areas defined within The Planning for Healthy Communities Act that must be used in addressing the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities (Pollution Exposure and Air Quality, Public Facilities, Food Access, Safe and Sanitary Homes, Physical Activity, Community Engagement, and Improvements and Programs). The existing conditions for these focus areas within the Manteca are assessed below.

Pollution Exposure and Air Quality

Air quality and pollution exposure is an aspect of environmental quality that may disproportionately impact DACs. This is often due to the existence and maintenance of pollution-emitting sources within close proximity to DACs. If disadvantaged communities have unequal or excessive exposure to sources of pollution including; air pollution, water contamination, and hazardous waste exposure, this exposure must be addressed using appropriate planning measures. Disproportionate exposure to pollutants is linked to negative health impacts including asthma, cardiovascular illness, and other fatal conditions.

Air quality is a mandated environmental justice focus area under SB 1000. This section serves to assess pollution exposure and air quality in Manteca as a response to the presence of DACs. A detailed assessment of relevant existing air quality and air quality regulations as well as water quality and water quality regulations, are addressed in Section 5.0 (Conservation) and Section 3.0 (Utilities and Community Services).

Air Quality

As described in Section 5.0 of this document, pollution potential in the San Joaquin County area is relatively high due to the combination of air pollutant emissions sources, transport of pollutants into the area and meteorological conditions that are conducive to high levels of air pollution. Elevated levels of particulate matter (primarily very small particulates or PM$_{10}$) and ground-level ozone are of most concern to regional air quality officials.

Table 6.2-1 depicts the State and national attainment status for San Joaquin County. As evident in the table, San Joaquin County has a State designation of Nonattainment for O$_3$, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ and is either Unclassified or Attainment for all other criteria pollutants. In accordance with the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), areas of the state are designated as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified with respect to applicable standards dependent upon the status of pollutant concentrations. “Attainment” refers to instances where pollutant concentrations did not violate the applicable standard in that area. A “nonattainment” designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the applicable standard at least once, excluding those occasions when a violation was caused by an exceptional event, as defined in the criteria. A detailed analysis of criteria pollutants within San Joaquin County is available in Section 5.0 (Conservation).
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**Table 6.2-1: State and National Attainment Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutants</th>
<th>State Designations</th>
<th>National Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Air Resources Board (Area Designations Maps / State and National), 2017B.

**Asthma Rates**

Table 6.2-2 includes data from California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) administered by the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research for asthma rates, symptoms and hospitalizations for San Joaquin County, and the State.

**Table 6.2-2: Asthma Rates and Hospitalizations (2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ever Diagnosed with Asthma</th>
<th>Emergency or Urgent Care in Past 12 Months for Asthma (Current Asthmatics)</th>
<th>Had Asthma Episode / Attack in Past 12 Months (Current Asthmatics)</th>
<th>Had Asthma Symptoms within Past 12 Months (Current Asthmatics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>9.1%*</td>
<td>36.8%*</td>
<td>99.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As shown in Table 6.2-2 above, 20.3 percent of San Joaquin County residents have been diagnosed with asthma at some point in their lives, and of those who have been diagnosed, nearly all have had asthma symptoms in the past 12 months (from the time the CHIS survey was conducted), however County Hospitalizations due to asthma are slightly lower than statewide averages at 9.1 percent and 13.1 percent respectively. The percentage of people diagnosed with asthma in San Joaquin County is roughly equal the statewide average.

**Water Quality**

According to the California Water Quality Control Monitoring Council, there are areas designated as Section 303(d) impaired waterbodies within San Joaquin County and the Planning Area. Areas in the city and in the regional vicinity of the Planning Area that are impaired are referred as Delta Waterways (Southern Portion) by the Water Quality Control Monitoring Council. This includes 3,125 acres listed as early as 1996 for Chlorpyrifos (Agriculture, Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers), DDT (Agriculture), Diazinon (Agriculture, Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers), Electrical Conductivity (Agriculture), Group A Pesticides (Agriculture), Invasive Species (Source Unknown), Mercury (Resource Extraction), and Unknown Toxicity.

1 Possible statistically unstable values due to sample size.
To maintain water quality, the City of Manteca provides a system of storm drains, detention basins, and pumping facilities and provides monitoring for this storm drain system. The City enforces all storm drain regulations established by the US EPA and the State of California. To further address storm water quality - the City of Manteca, in collaboration with the rest of San Joaquin County, prepared a Multi-Agency Post-construction Stormwater Standards Manual to provide consistent guidance for municipal workers, developers and builders in implementing the requirements under the Statewide Small MS4 NPDES permit (2013-0001-DWQ). In regard to water treatment and wastewater; the City of Manteca maintains a variety of Master Plan documents that guide the design, development, and maintenance of the utilities within the city limits. Section 5.0, (Conservation), and Section 3.0 (Utilities and Community Services) includes additional information related to water quality, and water quality facilities.

**Drinking Water Quality Reporting**

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 20 requires all public water systems to prepare a Consumer Confidence Report for distribution to its customers and to the Department of Health Services. The Consumer Confidence Report provides information regarding the quality of potable water provided by the water system. It includes information on the sources of the water, any detected contaminants in the water, the maximum contaminant levels set by regulation, violations and actions taken to correct them, and opportunities for public participation in decisions that may affect the quality of the water provided.

The City routinely monitor for the presence of drinking water contaminants and provides an annual report to consumers. In 2018 the City’s water quality failed a State drinking water standard. On July 18, 2017, the State adopted a MCL for 1,2,3-TCP. The City tested the water supply for this newly adopted MCL and to date we have two wells with average concentrations over the MCL. The City is focusing water production from sources that meet all drinking water standards. However, there are times of high water demand, like summer, when wells with a detection of 1,2,3-TCP will be used. The City has completed a feasibility study of TCP treatment alternatives and is working on adding treatment systems to the wells with detections to reduce the levels of 1,2,3-TCP. The City has also initiated legal action against the parties responsible for the TCP contamination in order to minimize the cost impacts of treatment on the City’s water customers, and anticipates resolving the problem within approximately 3 years.

**Water Supply**

Within the San Joaquin River Hydrological Region, the Planning Area is located in the Lower Lone Tree Creek, Middle Lone Tree Creek, Oakwood Lake-San Joaquin River, Town of French Camp-San Joaquin River, Walker Slough-French Camp Slough, and Walthall Slough-San Joaquin River watersheds.

In regard to groundwater, Manteca is located in the Eastern San Joaquin River Groundwater Basin. The Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan (ESJGB-GMP) (NSJCGB, 2004) was prepared in September 2004 “to review, enhance, assess, and coordinate existing groundwater management policies and programs...and to develop new policies and programs to ensure the long-term sustainability of groundwater resources in Eastern San Joaquin County.” A detailed discussion of the Eastern San Joaquin River Groundwater Basin is available in Section 5.0 (Conservation).

The City’s two primary supply sources are surface water, purchased from the SSSJID’s SCWSP, and local groundwater. The City also uses recycled water for irrigation, and dust control. On an annual basis, the City’s goal is to provide 53 percent of the City potable water supply from surface water and 47 percent from groundwater.
The City has an adopted Urban Water Management Plan to ensure water supply capacity and infrastructure is adequate for existing and projected needs. Considering existing water supply sources, all planned system improvements, planned construction, future unaccounted-for conservation measures, and other projected availability considerations, the City is expected to have adequate supplies through 2040 (2015 Urban Water Management Plan). For detailed information on the City’s surface water supply, groundwater supply, and distribution system please see Section 5.0 (Conservation) and Section 3.0 (Utilities and Community Services).

**Public Facilities**

Access and availability of public facilities is an aspect of the built-environment that may disproportionately limit the opportunities of DACs. If disadvantaged communities have unequal access to public facilities, or if a City does not provide adequate facilities for public use, DACs may be limited in their ability to access necessary key resources. Adequate planning of parks, and transportation infrastructure can ensure that all communities within a City have equal access to resources. Limited access to resources as a result of inadequate public facilities can lead to reduced lifespan, poorer health outcomes, and diminished mental well-being.

Public Facilities is a mandated environmental justice focus area under SB 1000. This section serves to assess the adequacy of public facilities in the City given the presence of DACs throughout the Planning Area.

**Parks and Cultural Centers**

Equitable access to public parks, schools and cultural centers within a community is critical to the promotion of public health and well-being. Lack of recreational and open spaces is a significant driver of poor physical and mental health. Parks and public facilities provide opportunities for exercise, recreation, and community engagement that is necessary to bolster resident health. Parkland within the city is detailed and displayed in Section 3.0 Utilities and Community Services (Table 3.3-1 and Figure 3.3-1).

Because the majority of the City surrounding the city center is designated as a Disadvantaged Community under the SB 1000 guidelines, park acreage per 1,000 residents for the entire City is an appropriate indicator of adequate park space, while access would be further identified through park distances from population areas within the city which is related to the current distribution of parks and park access. The California Statewide Park Program (Public Resources Code §5642) defines underserved communities as having a ratio of less than three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. This measure identifies areas where surrounding population density may overwhelm limited park space. The city through General Plan Policy PF-P-49 requires city park acquisition and development efforts to be based on a goal of 5 acres of developed neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents within the city limits. Additionally, Policy PF-P-50 requires that Neighborhood parks conform to the following general guidelines (specific details and standards ARE determined within the Parks and Recreation Master Plan):

- The typical minimum size shall be set to support active and passive recreation activities.
- The typical service area for a neighborhood park is approximately ¼ mile walking distance.
- Neighborhood parks shall include a turf area above the basin flood line of sufficient area to be used for playgrounds, sports, picnic areas, and other recreational facilities.

---


---
As described in Section 3.0 (Utilities and Community Services) The City currently manages more than 483 acres of parks, facilities, trails and recreation lands, including 382 acres of community, neighborhood, and special use parks and the 101-acre Manteca Park Golf Course. The location of parks within the City is shown in Section 3.0 on Figure 3.3-1 and park acres and details are summarized in Table 3.3-1. When the acreage is broken down into functional categories, the City currently has 212.73 acres of Neighborhood Park land. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan identified a small current deficit of 5.67 acres in the Neighborhood Parks category. This is approximately the equivalent of one Neighborhood Park. In the category of Community Park acreage, the current quantity of 78.46 acres exceeds the city’s goal of one acre per 1,000 population. In the category of Special Use Facility/Parks, the City’s 90.94 acres of park lands for special uses exceeds the City’s goal of one acre per 1,000 population.

An additional factor that determines the equitability and accessibility of parks and public facilities within an area is the distance between these public facilities and the home. If this distance to public facilities is perceived as “walkable”, residents may be more likely and willing to walk to those amenities. A distance of 1/4 mile is a commonly cited threshold for how far most people are willing to walk for neighborhood services. Conversely, a national survey of bicyclist and pedestrian attitudes and behavior, by the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, surveyed almost 10,000 people over the age of 16 and found that only 5 percent of walking trips were for getting to work. Of the other trips, 38 percent were for personal errands, 28 percent were for exercise, and 21 percent were for recreation or leisure and the average trip length was 1.3 miles. The validity of both the quarter-mile, and or longer distances, may be dependent on perceptions of the built environment, safety, and time constraints, distance, as well as connectivity. As shown of Figure 6.2-1, the majority of developed residential areas fall within the half-mile radius, and most are also within a quarter-mile of public parks.

Public Transit
Public transit within a city increases accessibility to resources for disadvantaged communities and ensures that those without automobile access or without the ability to operate an automobile can maintain mobility. In this way, public transit provides a way of promoting equity within the built-environment.

Within the City, the San Joaquin Regional Transit District is the primary provider of bus transit. The San Joaquin Regional Transit District provides connections from Manteca to Stockton, Tracy, and Livermore. Manteca Transit provides regularly-scheduled fixed-route service to major activity centers and transit hubs within the City limits. Three routes provide hourly service weekdays from 6 AM to 7 PM. An exhibit showing bus routes is provided in Section 2.0 (Circulation) Figure 2.0-3.

The San Joaquin Regional Transit provides paratransit, also known as dial-a-ride or door-to-door service, for people who are unable to independently use the transit system due to a physical or mental disability. Individuals must be registered and certified as ADA eligible before using the service. Paratransit operators are required by the ADA to service areas within three-quarters of a mile of their respective, public fixed-route service. Service hours are Monday through Friday from 6 AM to 7 PM and Saturday from 9 AM to 4 PM. Ride reservations can be scheduled daily.

Discounted bus fare for the San Joaquin Regional Transit District are available for Manteca residents including: seniors (age 65 & over), Medicare card holders, Veterans, and Discount Fare Card holders and students. Standard priced bus fare within the City of Manteca is shown in Table 6.2-3 below.

---
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### Table 6.2-3: San Joaquin Regional Transit District Bus Fare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare</th>
<th>Full Cost</th>
<th>Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ride Cash at Farebox</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ride Pass</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Day Pass</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Day Pass</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source San Joaquin Regional Transit District (2019)*

Additionally, the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) rail service connects Manteca to San Jose and the Bay Area and also connects Stockton to Manteca. During weekdays, four westbound trains serve Manteca between 4:39 AM and 7:24 AM and four eastbound trains serve Manteca between 5:23 PM and 8:26 PM. The Lathrop/Manteca station is located just off Yosemite Avenue, west of the city limit. ACE trains allow bicycles on designated passenger train cars.

The affordability and competency of the public transit network within a city is critical for ensuring equitable resource access. Expanding the network of bus routes and maintaining discounted fare rates for disadvantaged communities will promote equitable mobility within the City of Manteca. Additional information on public transportation and circulation within the City of Manteca is available in Section 2.0 (Circulation).

### Bike Lanes

Bike access is a facet of transportation that offers a mobility option for those residents who do not have access to a car and/or those who prefer active transportation. Increased accessibility of bike lanes may help reduce congestion, contribute to community physical health, and improve air quality. Communities that do not have available bike lanes may be disadvantaged by limited resource access and diminished opportunity for physical exercise. Maintaining facilities that allow for bicycle mobility is important for community vitality. This is especially true in disadvantaged communities where transportation via car may be less accessible.

Bicycle circulation in Manteca is supported by an existing network of multi-use off-street (Class I) paths, on-street (Class II) bike lanes, and bicycle routes (Class III). The most notable City bicycle facility is the Tidewater Bike Path, which serves as the backbone of Manteca’s bicycle network. The Tidewater Bike Path (Class I) begins north of Lathrop Road and continues south to the Union Pacific Railroad corridor, where it turns southeast and continues to Spreckels Avenue where it meets the Spreckels Bike Path (Class I). The Spreckels Bike Path connects from Yosemite Avenue south to Atherton Drive where it ends at the Atherton Bike Path. Additional multi-use paths, bike lanes, and bike routes connect to destinations around the City.

The City’s Bicycle Master Plan, shown in in Section 2.0 (Circulation) Figure 2.0-4, expands upon the existing bicycle network to create a robust bicycle circulation system. The Plan includes important bicycle facility improvements such as extension of the Atherton Bike Path from the west city limit to the east city limit, connections across SR 99 and SR 120, and Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes on other major connector roads in the City.

In general, most Manteca schools, parks, and public buildings are equipped with bike racks for shortterm bicycle parking. Section 17.15.110 of the Manteca Municipal Code specifies bicycle parking requirements, including number of spaces and locations.
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Food Access
Ensuring adequate food access is challenging in many communities in California. Some communities within California cities have limited access to adequate and/or healthy food. Often, low-income areas may lack healthy food options or adequate supermarkets. An inability to access nutritious foods can lead to poor health outcomes in disadvantaged communities. Food-insecurity, or the uncertainty of having adequate food, is especially harmful for children and pregnant women who are most in need of nutrient-rich foods. Communities that are most often impacted by food insecurity include low income communities and communities of color.4

Food Access is a mandated environmental justice focus area under SB 1000. This section serves to assess the existing conditions of food accessibility given the presence of DACs across the City.

Food Insecurity
Food insecurity is the uncertainty about the availability or adequacy of nutritional and safe foods. Based on the USDA available food security data and data from the 2016 American Community Survey, Feeding America estimates the number of food insecure people within a given county. These estimates are located in the Feed America Map the Meal Gap Report. Feeding America estimated that the number of food insecure individuals in San Joaquin County was 95,290, with a food insecurity rate of 13.3% for the year 2016. The state estimate for these same measures was 11.7%. Therefore, the rate of food insecurity within San Joaquin County is higher than the rate of food insecurity within California as a whole.

Of the food insecure population within San Joaquin County, 91% were from households which were below the Federal poverty threshold used for nutrition assistance programs and are therefore eligible for food assistance from the federal government.5 These residents who qualify for federal nutrition assistance programs can utilize assistance at any store that accepts WIC and SNAP purchases.

Food Access
The Healthy Food Financing Initiative (HFFI) Working Group considers a food desert as a low-income census tract where a substantial number or share of residents has low access to a supermarket or large grocery store. Additionally, the USDA developed a Food Access Research Atlas that identifies “Food deserts” in the United States at the census tract level. The 2008 U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Bill defined a food desert as an “area in the United States with limited access to affordable and nutritious food, particularly such an area composed of predominantly lower income neighborhoods and communities.”

The California Department of Public Health Nutrition Network GIS Map Viewer, and the USDA Food Access Research Atlas both indicate that no portions of Planning Area are delineated as Food Deserts. However areas just north of the planning area in the city of Stockton, unincorporated portions of the county, as well as in the neighboring City of Lathrop (within U.S. Census Tract 38.03) do include delineated food deserts.

In addition to the proximity of grocery and food sources within an area, the types of food sources available are important for determining adequacy of food access. The USDA Food Research Atlas data shows that

---


there were approximately 158 grocery stores in San Joaquin County, and approximately 529 of these stores were SNAP authorized. In addition, the same data set shows that the County had approximately 442 fast food restaurants as of.\(^6\)

**Safe and Sanitary Homes**

The condition of the housing stock in a disadvantaged community may have negative impacts on the well-being of community residents. These health impacts stem from issues such as poor indoor air quality, toxic building materials, exposure to climate variation such as excess heat or cold, improper ventilation, and structural insecurity. Unsafe housing conditions can be a result of the age of the dwelling structure, which increases the likelihood of incorporation of dangerous materials like lead and asbestos, that have significant negative health impacts.\(^7\) Disadvantaged communities often have a larger amount of older units within their housing stock and therefore, residents of these communities are more likely to be exposed to the harmful health impacts that are associated with older housing. Other factors that can contribute to unsafe housing conditions include; improper regulation and overcrowding. Ensuring the safety and sanitation of housing stock within a community ensures that there are proper living conditions for all residents, including DACs.

Safe and Sanitary Homes is a mandated environmental justice focus area under SB 1000. This section serves to assess the existing conditions of home safety and home sanitation in Manteca given the presence of DACs across the City.

**Age of Housing Stock and Housing Conditions**

Generally the age of a housing unit can be a primary factor in the building conditions of the dwelling unit, therefore the age of a community’s housing stock is a good indicator of the condition of the housing stock. Figure 1.1-4. Located in Section 1.0 (Land Use and Socioeconomics) shows Development Trends by year built based on County Assessor data. As shown in the figure, residential development constructed before 1940 until 1959 is generally located near Downtown Manteca. Scattered rural residences constructed in the same time period are also located in the periphery of the City. From 1960 to 1999, residential development was generally constructed south of Lathrop Road, west of Austin Road, north of SR 120, and east of Airport Way. Residential construction south of SR 120 and north of Lathrop Road generally occurred between 2000 to 2016.

According to the CDC, a substantial amount of existing United States housing regulation and bans related to the use of toxic materials were developed in the 1970s; including regulations on the use of lead paint and asbestos.\(^8\) Additionally, older housing units may be more likely to have structural and material damage. Data from the 2017 ACS data indicates that 62 percent of units within the City of Manteca have been built in 1980 or later.\(^\text{Error! Bookmark not defined.}\) as described in the City’s Housing Element, the median year built for all housing units in Manteca as of 2013 was 1987, compared to 1981 for San Joaquin County and 1974 for California. Nearly 31 percent of Manteca’s housing stock was fifteen or less years old in 2013. Another 33.6 percent of the housing stock was between 15 and 35 years old. These statistics reflect the tremendous growth in the area during the 1980s and 1990s and the growth that continues today. Because over 44 percent of the housing units in Manteca were 25 years old or less in 2013 (compared to 35 percent in the county and 23 percent in the State), Manteca’s housing stock should still be in relatively good condition compared to communities with larger shares of older homes. Since 2010, there has been

\(^6\) https://www.ers.usda.gov/data

\(^7\) SB 1000 Toolkit

\(^8\) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Environmental Health, 2018. Retrieved from: https://www.cdc.gov/ncceh
a net increase of about 2,402 housing units in Manteca, almost all of which should still be in sound condition.

**Overcrowding**

U.S. Census Bureau standards define a housing unit as overcrowded when the total number of occupants is greater than one person per room, excluding kitchens and bathrooms. A typical home might have a total of five rooms (three bedrooms, living room, and dining room). If more than five people were living in the home, it would be considered overcrowded. There is some debate about whether units with larger households where seven people might occupy a home with six rooms should really be considered overcrowded. Nonetheless, units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded, and should be recognized as a significant housing problem. Table 6.2-4 below depicts overcrowding data for Manteca.

**Table 6.2-4: Overcrowding by Tenure for Total Occupied Housing Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Per Room</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 or less</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>13,275</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 to 1.00</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>3,681</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>7,636</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 to 1.50</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 to 2.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13,041</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9,285</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>22,326</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** City of Manteca Housing Element 2015-2023

As shown in Table 6.2-4, in 2013, 93.7 percent of Manteca’s housing units had 1.0 or fewer persons per room, meaning 6.3 percent would be considered overcrowded. Of all units in Manteca, 4.8 percent had between 1.01 and 1.50 persons per room; 1.3 percent had between 1.51 and 2.0 persons per room; and 0.3 percent had more than 2.0 persons per room. These statistics show that overcrowding was less of a problem in 2013 in Manteca than in San Joaquin County where 7.3 percent of all households had more than 1.0 persons per room, and in California where 8.2 percent of households were considered overcrowded. Overcrowding is typically more of a problem in rental units than owner-occupied units. When broken out by tenure, 76.0 percent of the overcrowded households in Manteca were renter households.

**Policies**

The existing City of Manteca’s Housing Element was adopted in 2016 and contains policies that are focused on supporting the efforts of the San Joaquin Housing Authority in its administration of Section 8/Housing Choice vouchers, public housing, and farmworker housing. The Housing Element also includes policies to promote the construction of housing that is affordable to all income levels and policies to promote equal opportunity to secure safe, sanitary, and affordable housing for everyone in the community.

**Physical Activity**

Residents of Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) are often more likely to have negative health outcomes. Increased physical activity levels are associated with a decreased risk for numerous health conditions and chronic illnesses. The built environment in DACs can often be limited by land use planning and lack of
investment, leaving less opportunities for formal and informal physical activity. Increasing the opportunity for physical activity within a community can work to positively impact the health of DACs.

Physical activity a mandated environmental justice focus area under SB 1000. This section serves to assess the existing conditions related to physical activity given the presence of DACs across the City.

**Physical Fitness and Health Demographics**

Lack of physical activity is a major risk factor for many diseases and causes of death, including heart disease, obesity, mental-health conditions, diabetes, stroke, and Alzheimer’s. The San Joaquin County 2016 Community Health Needs Assessment includes data regarding health measures for children and adults in San Joaquin County. As shown in Table 6.2-5 below, for almost all listed indicators (Diabetes prevalence, poor mental health, self-reported health quality, and obesity rates), the County of San Joaquin had higher percentages of residents with physical activity-related health problems than those same measures for the State of California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes Prevalence (Age-adjusted)⁹</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Heart Disease Prevalence¹⁰</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Mental Health¹¹</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Self-Reported Poor or Fair Health (Age-adjusted)¹²</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Obesity Prevalence (BMI &gt; 30)¹³</td>
<td>29.10%</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Obesity Prevalence (Grades 5, 7, 9) (BMI&gt;30)¹⁴</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOURCE: ADAPTED FROM THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY 2016 COMMUNITY HEALTH NEEDS ASSESSMENT*¹⁵

In addition, the California Health Interview Survey includes data regarding activity levels for children and teens in San Joaquin County. As shown in Table 6.2-6 below, approximately 44 percent of San Joaquin County children ages 5-11 identified being physically active every day of the week for at least one hour, which is roughly 18 percentage points higher than the Statewide average for children. However, 12 percent of children in the County reported zero days per week of more than one hour of physical activity, compared to a Statewide average of 6.2 percent.

This data also indicates that exercise and activity levels may decrease from childhood ages to teen ages. 27.2 percent of teens in the county reported being active for at least one hour, seven days a week, compared to 44 percent of children, however it should be noted that these values may be statistically unstable due to limited sample size in several topic areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS PER WEEK</th>
<th>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CHILDREN (5-11)</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA CHILDREN (5-11)</th>
<th>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY TEENS</th>
<th>CALIFORNIA TEENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.0%*</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.2%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2012.
¹⁰ California Health Interview Survey, 2011-12
¹³ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2012.
6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MANTECA UNIFIED DISTRICT % WITHIN HEALTHY FITNESS ZONE HFZ</th>
<th>STATEWIDE % WITHIN HEALTHY FITNESS ZONE HFZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr. 5</td>
<td>Gr. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.6%*</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0%*</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8%*</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.6%*</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* INDICATES POSSIBLE STATISTICALLY UNSTABLE VALUES DUE TO SAMPLE SIZE. -- = NONE REPORTING.

PHYSICAL FITNESS TESTING

Another indicator of physical activity and fitness for children and teens is the California Department of Education’s Physical Fitness Testing (PFT) Program, which is administered by local school districts to all fifth, seventh, and ninth graders annually. The test assesses six major fitness areas, including aerobic capacity (cardiovascular endurance), body composition (percentage of body fat), abdominal strength and endurance, trunk strength and flexibility, upper body strength and endurance, and overall flexibility. The PFT Program provides a statewide snapshot of physical fitness. However, its data is collected at the local school district level by people who may not be health professionals, and tests for each of the fitness areas are difficult to administer consistently. Consequently, its results are prone to some margin of error over time and from place to place. California Physical Fitness Test PFT Results for the Manteca Unified District, and statewide results for the 2017-18 academic year are shown in Table 6.2-7.

### Table 6.2-7: Student Physical Fitness Testing (PFT) Results (2017-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL AREAS</th>
<th>MANTECA UNIFIED DISTRICT % WITHIN HEALTHY FITNESS ZONE HFZ</th>
<th>STATEWIDE % WITHIN HEALTHY FITNESS ZONE HFZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr. 5</td>
<td>Gr. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Capacity</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Composition</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal Strength</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Extension</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Body Strength</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6.2-7 above, the PFT results for 5th 7th and 9th graders in the Manteca Unified District, District between 2017-18 show that generally local children surpass the statewide averages in all testing areas with the exception of Aerobic Capacity and Body Composition.

Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signal infrastructure, curb ramps, and streetscape amenities. Most developed arterial streets in Manteca provide sidewalk coverage, accessible curb ramps, and marked crosswalks.

Sidewalks and a variety of pedestrian amenities are provided throughout the downtown including accessible pedestrian ramps, decorative paving and crosswalk treatments, curb extensions, benches, and

---

street trees. Sidewalks are also provided in most of Manteca’s single-family residential neighborhoods, in multi-family residential developments, and in commercial developments.

While the pedestrian network is generally well developed in Manteca, there are some locations where gaps in the sidewalk network can be found. In general, facilities along developing arterials vary depending on the level of development along the street. In some locations where adjacent parcels have not been developed, the street is not fully built-out and hence sidewalks have not been constructed.

Active Transportation Use
Active transportation is any form of transportation that is non-motorized. The use of active transportation during a daily commute increases physical activity levels. Increased physical activity has positive health benefits; including mortality risk reduction, disease prevention, cardiorespiratory fitness, and metabolic health. As Disadvantaged communities often have disproportionately poorer health outcomes, increasing opportunities for active transportation within a City can improve the overall health outcomes of DACs.

As described in Section 2.0 (Circulation) Table 2.0-1, the majority of workers living in Manteca, 78.5 percent, drove to work alone, whereas alternative modes of transportation accounted for approximately 18 percent of commute trips, with 13.2 percent of workers in carpools, 1.8 percent using public transit systems, 1.5 percent of commuters walking to work, 0.3 percent bicycling to work, and 3.5 percent of workers working at home.

Civic and Community Engagement
An important aspect of planning for environmental justice is the development of effective policies and programs that enable all residents to participate in local decision making. Disadvantaged communities can often be excluded from decision-making when officials and policies do not focus on involving these communities in a strategic manner. SB 1000 emphasizes that community engagement must be promoted in a local jurisdiction through the development of objectives and policies that seek to involve members of DACs specifically. By involving and engaging DACs in decision-making processes, policy-makers can effectively meet the needs of these community members. Disadvantaged communities often have culturally-specific needs that must be made a priority within local policy to ensure community success. These needs are often distinct from those of the general population. The US EPA Environmental Justice Policy requires the “…meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” The establishment of appropriate opportunities for those who are low-income, minorities, and linguistically isolated to engage in local decision making will help ensure that environmental justice issues are identified and resolved. In addition, community programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities are critical to ensuring environmental justice is achieved for these communities within a city.

Promoting civic engagement and programs for DACs is a mandated environmental justice focus area under SB 1000. This section serves to assess the levels of civic engagement and existing community programs in the City given the presence of DACs across the City.

Levels of Civic Engagement
At the local level, there were 344,891 total registered voters in San Joaquin County 15 days before the general election in October of 2018; 39,099 of these registered voters were from the City of Manteca.17

At the same time there were approximately 59,381 people of voting age (over the age of 18) living within the City of Manteca according to U.S Census estimates. This indicates that for one measure of voter participation, the participation rate for residents of voting age within the City was about 65%. It should be noted that not all residents of voting age are eligible to vote in the state of California.

**Improvements and Programs**

**DAC Programs**

A critical aspect of planning to achieve environmental justice is prioritizing projects and policies that directly benefit disadvantaged communities. As stated previously, in Manteca, many areas within the General Plan Planning Area are designated as DACs, however, it is often the case that individual disadvantaged communities are not considered in regard to public investment decisions and new public programs. When disadvantaged communities are overlooked for public programs and investments, the specific needs of these communities are not met and the conditions in which they live often worsen. To promote environmentally just planning, cities should incorporate programs and policies that are specific to the needs of DACs.

As describe previously, the Manteca General Plan includes a variety of goals and policies to support disadvantaged communities and environmental justice issues through policies aimed at improving the transportation network to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, supplying the city residents with high quality parks, recreation opportunities, community services and facilities, improving housing conditions and affordability, and promoting air and water quality throughout the planning area.

To promote housing maintenance and affordability for low income residents, The City established the GAP Loan Program Down payment Assistance Program that provides deferred downpayment assistance loans to low income, first time homebuyers, looking to purchase homes in the City. Additionally, San Joaquin County offers similar loan and housing cost assistance programs for low income residents.

Furthermore, the City of Manteca’s 2015 Housing Element includes housing policies that are focused on supporting the efforts of the San Joaquin Housing Authority in its administration of Section 8/Housing Choice vouchers, public housing, and farmworker housing. The housing element also includes policies to promote the construction of housing that is affordable to all income levels and policies to ensure healthy and safe housing.

The Manteca Transit Short Range Transit Plan (2014) includes a Transit Needs Index, which identifies and provides a general idea of the geographic distribution of Manteca residents who are more likely to depend on public transit for basic mobility, and the identification of transit-disadvantaged groups throughout the community. The Plan includes the Evaluation of System Performance, Community Outreach, and Service Recommendations. As described in the Plan, the central and eastern portions of the city reflect the greatest need for public transit and are identified as having particularly high percentages of transit-disadvantaged residents. It should be noted that some census block groups with higher percentages of transportation-dependent populations are lightly populated and thus programs such as Dial-A-Ride may better serve these areas when compared to transit service extensions and new routes.

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan identifies areas that are not served by a park facility and includes policies and actions to encourage outreach and participation for underserved populations in planning efforts, provision of parks facilities for underserved areas, and increased connectivity to parks, natural

---

18 U.S. Census Bureau: [https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/mantecacitycalifornia](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/mantecacitycalifornia)
open space, schools, neighborhoods, and commercial areas to increase access to community facilities, including parks, and to ensure opportunities for recreation and physical activity.
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Figure 6.2-1. Park Buffer Zones
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