



**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT
TO ADOPT AN INITIAL STUDY/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

TO: Responsible and Interested Parties

From: City of Manteca
Community Development Department
Planning Division
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337

The City of Manteca (City) (as lead agency) has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act Section 21000 *et seq.* and the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15070 through 15075. The Initial Study/Negative Declaration (ND-09-02) are being circulated for public review and comment for a review period of 20 days starting April 20, 2009.

Project Title: UPJ 08-04 SSJID Communications and Cellular Tower

Project Applicant: South San Joaquin Irrigation District/Metro PCS

Project Description: The project proposes the construction of a 135' lattice communications tower and corresponding equipment area. The equipment area is proposed to be 35' x 79' and located approximately 100' north of Lathrop Road. The enclosure will include ground mounted support equipment, back up generators, and the tower. The enclosure will be protected by a 6' wrought iron fence. The tower will have communications equipment for the South San Joaquin County Irrigation District and City of Manteca. Additionally, a cellular provider will co locate on the tower.

Project Location: 703 W. Lathrop Road, Manteca CA 95336 (APN) 197-020-45

Comment Period:

The comment period for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration begins April 20, 2009 and closes May 11th, 2009. Please submit comments by 5:00 p.m. on May 11th, 2009 to Lantz Rey, Associate Planner, at the address below or by email to lrey@ci.manteca.ca.us

Public Hearing Date: May 26th, 2009

Document Availability: Copies of the Initial Study/Negative Declaration are available for review at the following location:

City of Manteca
Community Development Department
Planning Division
1001 West Center Street
Manteca, CA 95337
(209) 239-8427

Attachments: Negative Declaration
Initial Study (CEQA §15073(c))

Notice of Intent Distribution List
(per CEQA §15072)

- Army Corps of Engineers (1325 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2922)
- Union Pacific Railroad Co. (Wayne K. Horiuchi, 915 L Street, Suite 1180, Sacramento, CA 95814)
- Caltrans District 10 (Environmental Branch, 1976 E. Charter Way, Stockton, CA 95201)
- Comcast Cable (3443 Deer Park Dr., Stockton, CA 95219)
- San Joaquin County Local Agency Formation Commission, LAFCO (1860 E. Hazelton Avenue, Stockton, CA 95205)
- SSJID (Sam Bologna, 11011 E Hwy 120, Manteca, CA 95336)
- S.J. Council of Governments, ALUC, Attn: Laura Brunn (555 E. Weber Street, Stockton, CA 95202)
- S. J. County Multi Species Habitat Conservation (Steve Mayo, 555 E. Weber Street, Stockton, CA 95202)
- Manteca Unified School District (Sandy Dwyer, 2901 E. Louise, Lathrop, CA 95330)
- Ripon Unified School District (Louise Nan, Ed. D., Superintendent, 304 N. Acacia Ave., Ripon, CA 95366)
- Lathrop-Manteca Fire District (Fire Chief, 800 East J Street, Lathrop, CA 95336)
- Pacific Gas & Electric (Land Department, 4040 West Lane, Stockton, CA 95204)
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (1990 E. Gettysburg Ave., Fresno, CA 93726-0244)
- San Joaquin County, Community Development Department (1810 E. Hazelton Avenue, Stockton CA 95205)
- San Joaquin County Environmental Health (600 E. Main Street, Stockton CA 95202-3029)
- San Joaquin County, Public Works Department (P.O. Box 1810, Stockton CA 95201)
- San Joaquin Delta College, Office of the President (5151 Pacific Avenue, Stockton CA 95207)
- State Water Resources Control Board, Division-Water Quality (P.O. Box 1977, Sacramento, CA 95812-1977)
- California Department of Conservation (801 K Street, MS 13-71, Sacramento, CA 95814)
- SoCal Drinking Water Field Ops (31 E Channel Street, Rm 270, Stockton CA 95202)
- Oakwood Lake Water District, Douglas E. Coty, General Counsel, c/o Bold, Polisner, Maddow, Nelson & Judson (5000 Ygnacio Valley Road, Walnut Creek, CA 94596-3840)
- Verizon (Attn: Erica Lucas, 430 W. Center Street, Manteca, CA 95336)

(Include 3 copies of Negative Declaration, 1 copy of initial study, 1 copy NOA, and self-addressed envelope:)

- San Joaquin County Clerk (6 South El Dorado St., 2nd Floor, Stockton CA 95202)

(Include at least one of the following:)

- Legal Advertisement: Manteca Bulletin.
- Posted at Project Site and Community Development Department Bulletin Board.
- Owners and occupants of property contiguous to the project.

(Projects of Statewide Significance, CEQA §15206:)

- City of Lathrop (Community Development Department, 390 Towne Centre Dr., Lathrop, CA 95330)
- City of Ripon (Community Development Department, 259 Wilma Ave., Ripon, CA 95366)
- S.J. Council of Governments, Transportation Planning (Dana Cowell, Deputy Director, 555 E. Weber Street, Stockton, CA 95202)
- 15 Copies – State Clearing House, Office of Planning & Research (P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044)



City of Manteca

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: UPJ 08-04 SSJID Communications and Cellular Tower

CASE NO.: ND-09-02

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposes the construction of a 135' lattice communications tower and corresponding equipment area. The equipment area is proposed to be 35' x 79' and located approximately 100' north of Lathrop Road. The enclosure will include ground mounted support equipment, back up generators, and the tower. The enclosure will be protected by a 6' wrought iron fence. The tower will have communications equipment for the South San Joaquin County Irrigation District and City of Manteca. Additionally, a cellular provider will co locate on the tower.

LOCATION: 703 W. Lathrop Road, Manteca CA 95336 (APN) 197-020-45

APPLICANT: South San Joaquin Irrigation District/Metro PCS

ADOPTED:

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


April 20, 2009


 Date


 Lantz Rey




SSJID CELL TOWER VICINITY MAP

 NORTH

 PARCEL NO. 19702046

 City Limit

 Parcels

PROJECT AREA



SSJID CELL TOWER VICINITY MAP

4/14/09

CITY OF MANTECA
 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
 1001 W. CENTER STREET
 MANTECA, CA 95337

Data on this map is intended for general use and informational purposes only. The City of Manteca does not warrant the accuracy, quality or completeness of data or suitability for any particular purpose. Information on this map is not intended to replace engineering, survey or other primary research methods.



WILLIAMS 4/14/09
 Proj:\Planning\common\GIS\Work\gmap\MK_1072046\MK.D



ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY
(Completed by Community Development Staff)

A. BACKGROUND:

1. Project Proponent: South San Joaquin Irrigation District/Metro PCS, Attn: Karen Lienert
2. Proponent Phone Number: 916-834-0834
3. Proponent Address: 785 Orchard Dr. #200, Folsom CA 95630
4. Property Owner: Woodbridge Center East + Union Ranch Partners- Attn: Albert Boyce
5. Owner Phone Number: 209-823-3121
6. Owner Address: 120 Manteca Avenue, Manteca CA 95336
7. Project Title: SSJID/Metro PCS Cell Tower
8. Project Location: 703 W. Lathrop Road, Manteca CA 95336
9. Questionnaire Submittal Date: April 7th, 2009
10. Assessor Parcel No's: 197-020-45
11. Staff Contact Person: Lantz Rey, Associate Planner
12. Staff Contact Phone Number: 209-825-2348
13. General Plan Designation: PQP, Public Quasi Public
14. Zoning Designation: PQP, Public Quasi Public

B. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: (Describe the whole action involved, including project characteristics and features, and later phases and any secondary, support, off-site features necessary for its implementation. Describe the physical characteristics and other features of the project and the project site.)

The project (UPJ 08-04) proposes the construction of a 135' lattice communications tower and corresponding equipment area. The equipment area is proposed to be 35' x 79' and located approximately 100' north of Lathrop Road. The enclosure will include ground mounted support equipment, back up generators, and the tower. The enclosure will be protected by a 6' wrought iron fence. The tower will have communications equipment for the South San Joaquin County Irrigation District and City of Manteca. Additionally, a cellular provider will co locate on the tower.

C. PROJECT SETTING: (Describe surrounding land uses and the project's setting.)

The property is approximately 700' long and 50' wide along Lathrop Road. The property is flat, vacant and covered in dry weeds. No trees are present on the site. To the west is a parking lot belonging to the neighboring church. To the north is an almond orchard. To the east is a stand of trees that surrounds a drainage basin. To the south is Lathrop Road.

D. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES APPROVAL: (List public agencies whose approval is required, eq., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement, etc.)

No other agencies are involved in the approval process. The site plan was forwarded for comment and condition to the City's Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and Police Departments, and to the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) and Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) land department.

E. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: (The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utility/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

F. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Planner, Document Preparer (Signature)

Date

Lantz Rey, Associate Planner
Printed Name

209-825-2348
Phone Number

G. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS: (Describe mitigation measures and explain how they reduce the identified impact to a less than significant level and/or cross-reference an earlier analysis. Any potentially significant impact identified in the Initial Environmental Study and for which mitigation is not incorporated will necessitate the preparation of an EIR.)

1. Aesthetics. *Would the project:*

- a. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*
- b. *Substantially damage a scenic resource, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*
- c. *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*
- d. *Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				X
b.			X	
c.			X	
d.			X	

a) No scenic vistas occur in the area of the project site. There would be no impact

b-c) There is a grove of trees located directly east of this project site. The construction of the tower would not necessitate the removal of any of these trees or block the view of these trees from the public right-of-way. Placing a cellular tower at this location would degrade the overall visual character of the site and its surroundings, however there is an existing cellular tower less than 1300 feet to the west. Additionally, there are large power lines that run along Lathrop Road which extend into the skyline. The addition of this tower will be less than significant when considered with the surrounding environment.

d). The proposed project will not create a significant new source of nighttime lighting or daytime glare. The tower will have the common red warning lights that identify the tower's presence to passing aircraft. This impact is considered less than significant.

2. Agriculture Resources. *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:*

- a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*
- b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*
- c. *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				X
b.				X
c.				X

a-c) The project is located on a strip that is 50' wide and approx 700' long; the size and shape of the property give the property no agricultural value. Additionally, the property is planned to develop into the future Tidewater bike path extension. The environmental impact for this extension was addressed in the Union Ranch Specific Plan (URSP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which is hereby incorporated by reference. There would be no impact.

3. Air Quality. *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:*

Potentially Less Than Less Than No

	Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Significant Impact	Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

a-c) The project would result in some construction emissions which would be described as “short term” or temporary in duration. Construction activity would temporarily generate emissions of ROG, Nox, and PM10 from site grading, trenching and motor vehicle exhaust associated with construction equipment, employee commute trips, and material transport and other construction operations. However, the project’s size does not meet the threshold for San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). These minor impacts would only be present for the construction of the tower (approximately 3 weeks), therefore the impact is considered to be less than significant.

d) Sensitive receptors include land uses such as schools, day care centers, medical facilities, recreational facilities, and others that could contain young children, elderly persons, or people with existing respiratory health problems. The proposed project does not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, other than the temporary disturbance during construction of the cellular tower which shall comply with the standards and rules established by SJVAPCD.

e) The proposed project may cause temporary odors from diesel exhaust. However, these odors would cease after construction is completed. Operation of the proposed project will include back up generators powered by gasoline or hydrogen fuel cells as required by State Law. The back up generators will only run during prolonged power outages, and periodically each month for testing. In addition to the limited use, the generators will be located approx 170’ from the nearest structure. This is considered a less-than significant impact

4. Biological Resources. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X

f. Conflict with the provision of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

		X	
--	--	---	--

a-b, d-e) The project area is located within the area covered by the San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP). This plan, of which the City is a party to, was developed to minimize and mitigate impacts to plant and wildlife habitat resulting from the conversion of open space to non-open space. Pursuant to the Final EIR/EIS for the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), dated November 15, 2000, and certified by the San Joaquin Council of Governments on December 7, 2000, implementation of the SJMSCP is expected to reduce impacts to biological resources resulting from the proposed project to a level of less-than-significant.

c) The project site is not located near a federally protected wetland. A small drainage basin is on the neighboring property to the east. The impact of this project is less-than-significant.

f) The project does not conflict with City policy regarding habitat conservation, further the project is required to comply with the the SJMSCP, making the impact less than significant.

5. Cultural Resources. *Would the project:*

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				X
b.			X	
c.				X
d.			X	

- a. The Manteca General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report does not identify any historic or prehistoric archeological resources within the project area or vicinity.
- b. No known archeological resources are identified; this may be the result of the absence of any inventory data for the area. It is possible that archaeological resources are present within the project area. Project activities including grading and excavation could affect such resources, however, standard conditions of approval require the applicant to stop work if any archeological resources are identified during project construction. Due to the small size of the project and the low probability that archaeological resources are present, this impact is less-than-significant.
- c. There are no unique paleontological resources or unique geological features present at the site. There is no impact.
- d. No known human remains are present within the area. It is possible this may be the result of the absence of any inventory data for the area. It is possible that human remains resources are present within the project area. Project activities including grading and excavation could affect such resources, however, standard conditions of approval require the applicant to stop work if any human remains are identified during project construction. Due to the small size of the project and the low probability that human remains are present, this impact is less-than-significant.

6. Geology and Soils. *Would the project:*

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - 2. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - 4. Landslides?
- b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 1.				X
a. 2.			X	
a. 3.			X	
a. 4.				X
b.				X

- c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

			X
			X
			X
		X	

a-1) The project is not located within an identified Earthquake Fault Zone as identified by the State of California (Alquist-Priolo Act). Therefore, the risks associated with fault ruptures are considered to be very low and the impacts associated with fault rupture is determined to be less-than-significant. No mitigation is required. a-2) It is likely that during the lifespan of the proposed project the site will experience strong seismic ground shaking from earthquakes located to the west of the site. The main concern of ground shaking is the corresponding structural damage and the related hazards to life and safety. All of the proposed housing/structures and improvements will be designed to meet relevant requirements of the current California Building Code (CBC). Compliance with the CBC does not eliminate the risks associated with ground shaking, however, it would reduce the risks to a level of less-than-significant. No mitigation is required. a-3) The site could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking as a result of earthquakes on active faults located west of the site. The project site is not located in an area known for expansive soil (Manteca 2023). Therefore the impacts related to liquefaction are considered to be less than significant; no mitigation is required. a-4) Topography at and surrounding the project site is very gentle, and the existing risk of landslide at the site is considered minimal. No mitigation is required

b) The project will not cause a significant loss of top soil or create a significant amount of water runoff causing soil erosion. There is no impact.

c) The Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Manteca General Plan did not identify this area as an area subject to lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. There is no evidence that this has changed, therefore, there is no impact.

d) The Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Manteca General Plan did not identify this area as an area subject expansive soil. There is no evidence that this has changed, and therefore there is no impact.

e) The project does not include the use of a septic system. There is no impact.

f) Compliance with standard conditions of approval requires the developer to stop work if paleontological resources are identified during the construction process. In conjunction with the small size of the project and low probability of discovering paleontological resources at this site, the impact is less-than-significant.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				X
b.				X
c.				X
d.				X
e.			X	

hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*
- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*
- h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

			X
			X
			X

a-d) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials ties, is not know to emit, produce or handle any hazardous materials. There is no impact.

e) The project is located in the land use plan area of the Stockton Municipal Airport. Preliminary TOWAIR reports submitted to City of Manteca indicate the size and location of the proposed study does not require any further study from the FAA. Therefore, the project is not expected to create a safety hazard for people in the project area and therefore is considered less-than-significant.

f-h) The project is not located near a private airstrip and does not impair the implementation or physically interfere with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. Further, the project does not include housing or other significant structures which could cause death or injury in the event of a wild land fire. There is no impact.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*
- b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*
- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site?*
- d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?*
- e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*
- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*
- g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*
- h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*
- i. Expose people or structures to a significance risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			X
			X
			X
			X
			X
			X
			X
			X
			X

a-i) No significant impacts to hydrology or water quality have been identified from this project. (Manteca General Plan 2023, Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 10, Public Facilities and Services and Chapter 14, Public Facilities and Services)

9. Land Use and Planning. *Would the project:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Physically divide an established community?</i>				X
b. <i>Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i>				X
c. <i>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</i>			X	

a) The proposed project will not physically divide an established community because the project location is not adjacent to an established community, there would be no impact.

b) The project does not conflict with a general plan, specific plan or zoning ordinance policy that was designed to mitigate an environmental effect. There is no impact.

c) The project is required to comply with the applicable habitat conservation plan, therefore, the impact is less-than-significant.

10. Mineral Resources. *Would the project:*

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

a-b) The project site is not located in an area of known mineral resources, nor are any expected to be encountered during project development (Manteca General Plan 2023, Final Environmental Impact Report, Chapter 8, Resource Conservation).

11. Noise. *Would the project result in:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</i>			X	
b. <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</i>			X	
c. <i>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>				X
d. <i>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i>				X
e. <i>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i>				X
f. <i>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i>				X

a) Temporary noise and ground borne vibration impacts could occur during the construction of the project. A project of this size does not require extensive construction activities on site for an extended period of time. Further, the nearest residence is approx 175' to the south and separated by an existing masonry wall making the possibility of this impact less than significant. No mitigation is required.

12. Population and Housing. *Would the project:*

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

a-c) The project will not induce population growth or displace any existing housing. Further, the project will not displace any persons and will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. There is no impact.

13. Public Services. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

1. *Fire protection?*
2. *Police protection?*
3. *Schools?*
4. *Parks?*
5. *Other public facilities?*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. <i>Fire protection?</i>				X
2. <i>Police protection?</i>				X
3. <i>Schools?</i>				X
4. <i>Parks?</i>			X	
5. <i>Other public facilities?</i>				X

a1-a3) The tower will not require additional service beyond the service typically provided by the Manteca Fire and Police Departments. The tower will have no impacts on schools. There will be no impact

a4). The City's Parks and Recreation Department operates and maintains 275 acres of neighborhood and community parks, along with the Tidewater Bike Way, skate park, and senior center. It also oversees the operations of the 18-hole municipal golf course and library services for the City. The project would be located in the area designated for the Tidewater bike expansion. However, the area is relatively small and provides access for the bike path. As a result, these impacts are considered to be less-than-significant.

a5) The project will provide communication facilities for South San Joaquin Irrigation District and the City of Manteca water delivery system. This will improve the efficiency of the existing program. Therefore, there is no negative impact.

14. Recreation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. <i>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or</i>				X

be accelerated?

			X

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

a) The project is a cellular tower that would not increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. There is no impact.

b) The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. There is no impact.

15. Transportation/Traffic. *Would the project:*

- a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g. Conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		X	
			X
		X	
			X
			X
			X
			X

a) The cellular tower project will generate no traffic, other than the short term traffic increase associated with construction of the tower. This impact is less than significant.

b, d-g) The project is a cellular tower that will not increase traffic hazards, result in inadequate parking or conflict with the adopted bicycle master plan. There will be no impact.

c) The tower is 135' tall and located in the land use plan area of the Stockton Municipal Airport. However, the tower is not located in the identified safety zones as identified on the San Joaquin County District Viewer.

16. Utilities and Service Systems. *Would the project:*

- a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			X
			X
			X
			X
			X

adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?

			X
			X

a-e) The project is a cellular tower that will include communications equipment that will allow the existing water delivery system to function appropriately. There is no impact.

f-g) The project will not produce solid waste. There is no impact.

17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.				X
b.			X	
c.				X

a) The proposed project has a low potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b) The proposed project will not have potentially significant impacts in these areas that cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level through mitigation measures identified in this document. Cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

c) As described throughout the preceding checklist sections, the proposed project would not result in any environmental impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects to human beings, either directly or indirectly

H. INCORPORATIONS BY REFERENCE

All mitigation of potential impacts identified within the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Manteca General Plan 2023 and applicable to the subject project, is hereby incorporated by reference and becomes part of this environmental document.

In accord with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines (Section 21083.3 of the Public Resources Code), the previously certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH #2002042088), and findings and mitigations contained therein, prepared for the Manteca General Plan 2023 have been incorporated into this Initial Study. The Final EIR for the Manteca General Plan 2023 was certified by the City Council on October 6, 2003.

The aforementioned environmental documents are available for review at: City of Manteca, Community Development Department, 1001 W. Center Street, Manteca, California.

I. REFERENCES

1. City of Manteca General Plan 2023 Final EIR and Policy Document adopted October 6, 2003.
2. City of Manteca Zoning Ordinance Title 17 adopted April 20, 1992, as amended.
3. Manteca Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP) adopted December 1993.

4. 2004 San Joaquin County Important Farmland Map.
5. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (2002).
6. San Joaquin Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP).

J. INITIAL STUDY PREPARATION

Lantz Rey, Associate Planner