

CHAPTER 2

SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Trimark Communities, the applicant, has submitted applications to San Joaquin County for the construction of a new community in the western portion of the County along the Alameda-San Joaquin County line and north of Interstate 205 (I-205).

In February 1993, the Board of Supervisors approved a General Plan Amendment to the County's General Plan 2010 and associated land use map, providing for urban land uses on the project site. Prior to approving the General Plan Amendment, the Board considered the environmental impacts of the Amendment contained in a Final Supplemental EIR (Final SEIR); an EIR had been previously prepared for a General Plan Amendment to the County's General Plan 1995; that Amendment was denied, and when an Amendment to the General Plan 2010 was submitted by the applicant, the Supplemental EIR was prepared. Part of the requirements for new communities in the General Plan 2010 include that a master plan, specific plan, and a public financing plan be developed and approved prior to development of tentative maps and project construction.

Master Plan	
Total acreage	4,784 acres
Residential	16,105 units (2,524 acres)
Commercial	275 acres
Industrial	441 acres
Open space	759.5 acres
Schools	285 acres
Public facilities	499.5 acres
Jobs	21,925
Specific Plan I	
Total acreage	1,345
Residential	4,140 units (611.5 acres)
Commercial	94.5 acres
Industrial	211 acres
Open space	84.5 acres
Schools	94.5 acres
Public facilities	243 acres
Jobs	9,696

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) evaluates the environmental impacts associated with the applications submitted to the County by the applicant. The applications for review consist of:

- Draft Master Plan for the 4,784-acre project site.
- Draft Specific Plan I for development of three subareas on the site, totalling 1,345 acres. The three subareas include Central Mountain House (primarily residential); Mountain House Business Park in the southeastern portion of the site (primarily business park offices and

freeway commercial); and Old River Industrial Park in the eastern portion of the site, north of Byron Road (primarily industrial and public land uses).

- Amendment to the General Plan 2010 land use map; significant changes include the elimination of a previously approved 500-foot open space buffer zone along the western site boundary and the inclusion of Grant Line Village into the project site.
- Reclassification of the project site from AG-40 to AU-20, and specific zoning for the Specific Plan I subareas.
- Various General Plan 2010 text amendments.
- **Draft Development Agreement (limited to consistency with other plans).**

IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

All impacts and mitigation measures for this project are summarized in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, Summary Table/ Mitigation Monitoring Program. The impacts and mitigation measures are separated for the Draft Master Plan and Draft Specific Plan I. All impacts would be reduced to a level of insignificance by the suggested mitigation measures unless the impact is identified as unavoidable. Unavoidable adverse impacts have been identified in the following areas: transportation, biological resources, land use, and air quality.

ALTERNATIVES

This DEIR discusses six alternatives. Five of these alternatives were discussed in detail in previous EIRs for the project site and are summarized in this DEIR; one additional alternative has been developed for this DEIR, the Mitigated Alternative. The Mitigated Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

~~A Draft Mitigation Monitoring Program for this project is included in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. The program identifies required monitoring activities, the responsible agency, and the timing or frequency of monitoring for the Master Plan and Specific Plan I.~~

TABLE 2.1

SUMMARY TABLE OF MASTER PLAN IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation*
<p>• LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL ISSUES</p> <p>M4.1-1 Development of the proposed project would result in the loss of approximately 3,600 acres of Prime Farmland.</p>	<p>M4.1-1 The following should be added as an Implementation in Chapter Three of the Draft Master Plan: "If a Countywide agricultural mitigation fee were established, an agricultural mitigation fee, based on each acre converted to an urban use, shall be paid by the developer to the County at the time of the approval of each subdivision map or other discretionary permit, if a Countywide agricultural mitigation fee has been established by the County." "Any off-site mitigation resulting in the set-aside of lands by the applicant shall be considered when assessing the fee. Further, consideration shall be made for dual use of mitigation lands, as appropriate. For example, land set aside for Swainson's Hawk mitigation that is also prime agricultural land could be credited as mitigating both impacts."</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>M4.1-2 Conflicts between urban/rural land uses would occur, particularly where existing agricultural operations abut planned residential development.</p>	<p>M4.1-2 (a) The following Objective, with corresponding Policies and Implementations, should be inserted as Objective 11- under West Edge Treatment in Development and Design (Appendix C) in place of existing Policies a) and b): "Objective 11: "The project site shall be developed to minimize land use conflicts between planned urban uses and existing agricultural operations to the west." "Policy: "a) A buffer area, minimum 500 feet wide, shall be provided along the western site boundary. This minimum 500-foot buffer requirement applies to all portions of the western project boundary except in the south, where planned housing abuts the Delta Mendota Canal. "b) A combination of hard and soft treatments may be applied in the 500-foot buffer area that is required along the western boundary to mitigate potential agricultural impacts, such as aerial spraying, trespass, and vandalism. The 500-foot buffer can be located entirely on the project site (in San Joaquin County) or can be located entirely or partially west of the project boundary (in Alameda County). If existing agricultural lands west of the project are used to satisfy the buffer requirement, conservation easements must be placed on the lands and dedicated to the Alameda County Open Space Land Trust. The conservation easement shall stipulate that development rights are permanently restricted and shall be limited to those crops that do not require aerial spraying (e.g., oats, wheat, beans, pasture).</p>	<p>I</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Use and Agricultural Issues

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation:
<p>M4.1-3 The construction of wastewater storage ponds on Fabian Tract may be inconsistent with the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Protection Act.</p>	<p>(c) A combination of windrow tree plantings of a mature height at least 6 feet, berms, fences, four-lane roadways, adjacent multi-use pathways, local streets, and utility easements should be included in any portion of the 500-foot buffer that is on the project site. To the greatest extent possible, the buffer area within the project site should be owned and maintained by a public or quasi-public agency. The inclusion of private residential backyards and private commercial facilities such as parking lots and loading zones shall be limited to a maximum of 50 feet of the total required buffer (e.g., the private back yards of homes along Marina Boulevard shall be no more than 50 feet deep). The buffer area shall ensure that along the continuous length of the western boundary of the project, all privately owned, urban uses such as residential back yards or commercial loading areas would be located a minimum of 500 feet from agricultural operations requiring aerial spraying. The design of any buffer area located in Alameda County shall be reviewed and endorsed by a qualified neutral party with specific expertise in urban/agricultural interface. Any off-site mitigation resulting in conservation easements shall be considered when assessing any per-acre agricultural mitigation fee or any wildlife mitigation.</p> <p>(b) The following Policy and Implementation should be inserted under Objective 3, in Community Monitoring Programs in Jobs/Housing & Affordable Housing (Appendix C) in place of Policy a) and b):</p> <p>"On-site residents shall be notified of the County's Right-to-Farm ordinance and that they are purchasing land in an agricultural area. The disclosure shall cite specific examples of potential nuisances (e.g., noise, dust, odor, vectors, spraying) associated with ongoing and future agricultural activity.</p> <p>"Implementation: "Notification shall be recorded by separate instrument or on the face of the deed for each newly created parcel."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>GENERAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT TITLE CONSISTENCY</p>		
<p>M4.2-1 Policies in the Draft Master Plan conflict with some of the policies of the County's General Plan 2010.</p>	<p>M4.2-1</p> <p>(a) A new policy should be added to the County General Plan 2010, Volume II, General Plan Policies specific to the Mountain House New Community (page XII-41) allowing the combination of the R/L and R/M General Plan land use designations. Alternatively, the Draft Master Plan land use map should be revised to designate separate Low Density and Medium Density Residential areas within each neighborhood.</p> <p>(b) A General Plan Text Amendment should be adopted that would allow new communities, or projects that have an adopted Master and Specific Plan, to deviate as specified in the Plan from land use definitions and Development Title permitted uses. Alternatively, Table 3.5 of the Draft Master Plan should be amended to delete "Automotive Sales" as a permitted use in the C-FS and I-P zoning districts, and to delete "Retail Sales and Services, Intermediate and General" as permitted uses in the C-1.5 zone.</p> <p>(c) The density for the Residential-Medium Density land use in Table 3.1 of the Draft Master Plan should be changed to 6.0-10.0 dwelling units per gross acre. Alternatively, a General Plan Text Amendment should be adopted to allow new communities with adopted Master Plans to deviate from the General Plan land use densities.</p>	<p>I</p>

<p>M4.2-2 Some of the Draft Master Plan design and land use standards conflict with standards in the County Development Title.</p>	<p>(d) The County General Plan Table VII-2 (Implementing Zones for General Plan Land Use Designations) should be amended to add the A-U zone for Mixed Use designations.</p> <p>(e) A General Plan Text Amendment should be adopted that would amend Table IV-8 or allow new communities, or projects that have an adopted Master and Specific plan, to deviate as specified in the Plan from the General Plan roadway classifications and right-of-way standards (see Mitigation Measure M4.12-5(h) in the Transportation section). Alternatively, standards for roadway classifications and roadway right-of-way widths in Table 9.6 of the Draft Master Plan should be amended to conform with classification, right-of-way, and capacity requirements in the General Plan (Table IV-8 in Volume I).</p> <p>(f) A General Plan Text Amendment should be submitted that will allow new communities, or projects that have an adopted Master and/or Specific plan, to deviate as specified in the Plan from the General Plan LOS standards (see Mitigation Measure M4.12-5(f) in the Transportation section). Alternatively, Draft Master Plan policies and text referring to County roadway LOS standards should be changed to conform with LOS requirements in the General Plan. In Chapter Nine of the Draft Master Plan, assumptions 9.3 a) and b) and Policies a) and b) under Objective 3 (Appendix C) should be revised to delete the exception to LOS C for "Mountain House gateway road segments."</p> <p>(g) Draft Master Plan policies and performance standards for regional park standards and for wildlife mitigation should be changed to conform with Mitigation Measures in sections 4.3.1 and 4.1.1.</p> <p>M4.2-2 For each inconsistency between the Master Plan and the County Development Title that allows more lenient standards in the Master Plan, either the Master Plan standard must be changed or the Development Title must be amended to permit the difference. If any regulations in the Development Title are changed to reconcile inconsistencies, the proposed Development Title Amendment should be phrased to apply only to the project, only to new communities, or only to projects that have an adopted Master and Specific Plan.</p>
<p>■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Parks and Recreation</p> <p>M4.3.1-1 Regional park facilities proposed for the new community would not be adequate to serve residents of the project or to meet County General Plan standards. Parks may not be available to the first residents who occupy the project site.</p>	<p>4.3.1-1</p> <p>(a) The Land Use Map, Policies, and/or Implementations under Recreation and Open Space (Appendix C) should be revised in accordance with one of the following alternative mitigation measures:</p> <p>(1) The Land Use Map for the project should be changed to include an additional 365 acres of on-site regional park land to be developed on an incremental basis as the site develops, or</p> <p>(2) The on-site golf courses should be dedicated to the County for public use and maintenance. The Land Use Map also should be changed to provide for 34 acres of regional park in addition to the 70-acre Old River regional park; the regional park facilities and golf courses should be developed incrementally as the site develops, or</p> <p>(3) 365 acres (or less if golf course(s) were donated to the County) of off-site regional park land in the Tracy or Delta Planning Area along a waterway shall be acquired and developed incrementally on a specific plan-by-specific plan basis as approved by the San Joaquin County Department of Parks and Recreation. If more than one park site were acquired there must be one site of 100 acres minimum in size. The Park land could be developed as part off-site mitigation for wildlife habitat and/or wastewater reclamation areas only if the development priority were recreational use, or</p> <p>(4) If an in-lieu fee program were adopted on a Countywide basis by the County, in-lieu fees shall be contributed to the County to allow the County to expand regional park facilities. An in-lieu fee could be imposed on the project at any time during project site development. This requirement shall be codified in the Development Agreement to apply to all phases of the project, or</p> <p>(5) The County Park and Recreation Department should enter into discussions with the East Bay Regional Park District regarding a reciprocity agreement regarding use of District facilities by county residents and residents within District boundaries using County facilities.</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Public Services

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
	<p>(b) The Draft Master Plan should be amended to ensure neighborhood and regional park availability for the first site residents; the Phasing and Costs section should be amended to read:</p> <p>"Regional parks shall preferably be implemented incrementally on a specific plan-by-specific plan basis; by completion of the first specific plan (which would result in about 25 percent project buildout), 25 percent of the proposed 70-acre regional Old River park shall be developed.</p> <p>"Alternatively, the park can be developed in two stages, with the first stage being during construction of the first specific plan."</p>	
<p>■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Schools</p> <p>M4.3.2-1 The proposed twelve elementary/middle schools may be insufficient to accommodate the community's students.</p>	<p>M4.3.2-1 The Draft Master Plan should include a revised and an additional Implementation under Objective 1 in Education (Appendix C), and Master Plan Table 17-2, as follows:</p> <p>"f) Funding sources for school facilities, including temporary facilities at existing off-site locations shall be identified in the public financing plan.</p> <p>"g) The second and each subsequent specific plan shall contain an evaluation of the student generation rates in previous specific plan(s) to assess the appropriateness of the assumed student generation rates for medium, medium high, and high density residential development. If the rates were higher than assumed, additional schools may be necessary in subsequent specific plan areas; if the rates were lower, fewer students may be attending each school; the number of schools shall not change. The land use plan containing twelve K-8 and two high schools shall not be changed to reduce the number of schools without a Master Plan revision and concurrence from the school district."</p>	I
<p>M4.3.2-2 Several proposed schools are located in proximity to high voltage transmission lines, natural gas lines, and/or a household disposal area. The presence of these utilities may present health risks to students.</p>	<p>M4.3.2-2 The underground pipelines should be moved and the household disposal area hazards remediated prior to construction. Alternatively, the Land Use Map for the project should be revised/refined to ensure that the elementary school in Neighborhood I is not near underground fuel lines and the high school in Neighborhood D should be located to ensure that it is not underlain by underground pipelines or an inactive household disposal area.</p>	I
<p>M4.3.2-3 The school sites may not conform to all siting criteria for schools in accordance with California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 5, Educational Code, Public Resources Code, California Department of Education guidelines, and San Joaquin County General Plan 2010.</p>	<p>M4.3.2-3</p> <p>(a) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.3.2-2 regarding school locations near a household disposal site and fuel pipelines.</p> <p>(b) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.10-1 regarding investigations for the presence of hazardous materials in the subsurface.</p> <p>(c) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.11-1 regarding development in areas of special natural resource areas.</p> <p>(d) Site-specific soil investigations should be conducted prior to construction to determine the liquefaction potential of the soils in Neighborhoods I, J, and K. All construction should be performed in accordance with the recommendations of the licensed professional preparing the report.</p>	I

	<p>(e) The potential extent of the landfill should be identified and remediation implemented in accordance with local and State regulatory oversight. Alternatively, the Land Use Map of the Master Plan should be revised to ensure that the high school in Neighborhood D is not underlain by the solid waste landfill site.</p>	
<p>■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Fire Protection</p>		
<p>M4.3.3-1</p> <p>The proposed project would temporarily increase the demand for local fire protection service until on-site services were provided.</p>	<p>M4.3.3-1</p> <p>The following Implementations are recommended for addition to Objective 1 in Fire Protection and Emergency Response (Appendix C):</p> <p>"i) The on-site fire station shall include an ambulance if the Fire Services were responsible for emergency medical service transport.</p> <p>"j) Fire service and protection standards during construction and occupation of the project, including the addition of staff and equipment to existing off-site facilities and the construction, staffing, and outfitting of on-site facilities, shall be included in the Fire Protection Plan. The standards shall be submitted to the County and local fire protection service agency for review and approval prior to approval of the first Development Permit."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Police Protection</p>		
<p>M4.3.4-1</p> <p>The proposed project would temporarily increase the demand for police services from the County Sheriff's Department.</p>	<p>M4.3.4-1</p> <p>The Master Plan should include Implementations under Objective 1 in Police Protection (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"e) A proposal for institutional and funding arrangements for providing police services shall be submitted at the time of formation of the Community Services District, as well as phasing of on-site police services, if required.</p> <p>"f) Deputy officers shall be added to the Sheriff's Department when the first residences in the first Specific Plan area are constructed. Sworn officers shall be provided at a ratio of 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents within the community."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.3.4-2</p> <p>The number of marine patrols on Old River would be insufficient at project buildout to provide effective law enforcement along Old River and in the Delta within the project vicinity.</p>	<p>M4.3.4-2</p> <p>The Master Plan should include additional Implementations under Objective 1 in Police Protection (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"g) The Fire Protection Plan shall include provisions to patrol the Mountain House marina and the immediate vicinity of the marina.</p> <p>"h) Fees, based on the number of berths, shall be assessed to help offset costs for providing marine patrol services by both San Joaquin and Contra Costa counties. If the counties cease patrol services in the future, the fees shall be used to contract for patrol services; and/or provide with the provisions of the plan to be completed by the Delta Protection Commission for coordinated marine patrols in the Delta.</p> <p>"i) Specific plan(s) for the areas along Old River must incorporate crime prevention policies, such as providing security fencing, good lighting, visible berth numbers, and locked gates at berths, for the marina and related facilities along Old River."</p>	<p>I</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Public Services

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Solid and Hazardous Waste</p> <p>M4.3.5-1 Solid waste projected for project buildout could be 63,532 tons per year without implementing a recycling program. At buildout, the project could generate 524 tons of household hazardous waste. Solid and hazardous waste generated by the project would contribute to the reduction in local and regional landfill capacities.</p>	<p>M4.3.5-1 The following Implementations are recommended for addition to the Draft Master Plan under Objective 1 in Waste Management:</p> <p>"i) The size of land(s) to be allocated for the on-site transfer station, recycling, and composting center(s) shall be determined on the basis of the actual waste generation rates and projected recycling rates to meet State-mandated reductions in solid waste disposal. Alternative sites for on-site waste management shall be identified in each specific plan.</p> <p>"j) Areas for recycling containers or adequate provisions to ensure on-site recycling opportunities at proposed commercial facilities and large apartment complexes shall be incorporated into Tentative Maps.</p> <p>"k) Recyclable construction waste, such as wood and metal, shall be separated and arrangement shall be made with the County, or on-site recycling services, for collection. Recycling of construction wastes shall be made part of the construction specifications for contractors."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Libraries</p> <p>No impacts identified.</p>		
<p>■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Water Supply</p> <p>M4.4.1-1 Inadequate raw water storage facilities may result in interruption of water service, especially if restrictions on water diversion were imposed by State or Federal agencies.</p>	<p>M4.4.1-1 (a) A new Implementation should be added under Objective 1 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"b) Specific Plan II and each subsequent specific plan shall reevaluate the adequacy of the confirmed water supply for the remainder of the project in light of any potential or adopted restrictions on water diversion by BBID or DWR. The specific plans shall not be approved unless it can be demonstrated that the confirmed water supply is sufficient to serve the project through buildout. If potential or proposed restrictions on diversion would cause the confirmed water supply to be insufficient to serve the project as proposed in the Draft Master Plan, then the specific plans shall identify additional water conservation/reuse measures to be incorporated into the project to ensure that the demand would not exceed the confirmed supply."</p> <p>(b) A new Policy should be added under Objective 8 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"b) Adequate raw water storage will be provided to ensure a continued supply to the project in case of restriction to water diversion and emergencies that would prevent diversion."</p>	<p>I</p>

<p>M4.4.1-2 Changing part of BBID's service area from agricultural water use to municipal/industrial water use would create institutional issues requiring resolution. Indirectly, impacts to agricultural operations could include disruption of irrigation water supply and agricultural drainage service.</p>	<p>(c) A new Implementation should be added under Objective 8 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C), as follows: "c) Assumptions and calculations for determining adequate raw water storage volume, and plans for providing the storage shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to the submittal of the first Development Permit."</p>	
<p>M4.4.1-2 Changing part of BBID's service area from agricultural water use to municipal/industrial water use would create institutional issues requiring resolution. Indirectly, impacts to agricultural operations could include disruption of irrigation water supply and agricultural drainage service.</p>	<p>M4.4.1-2 (a) The second paragraph of Implementation a) under Objective 1 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution should be revised as follows: "Prior to the submission of a Development Permit including land that may require use of water associated with its riparian water rights, an agreement between BBID and the CSD shall be executed, or the Development Permit shall demonstrate that an existing agreement is still in force. This agreement shall indicate that the parties have agreed to the terms under which BBID will wheel riparian water through their pumping and conveyance facilities to the Mountain House community as provided for in the BBID Water Services Agreement." (b) Policy a) under Objectives 4 and 5 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows: "a) Continued irrigation water and drainage service shall be provided to the land within the BBID service area located east of the project site and Patterson Pass Road throughout project buildout." (c) Implementation Measure a) under Objectives 4 and 5 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows: "a) The appropriate specific plans shall identify how water and drainage services to the land east of the project and Patterson Pass Road within the BBID service area would be affected. They shall identify the infrastructure needed to maintain these services and when construction of these facilities would need to be completed (schedule may be expressed in terms of when certain parcels are developed)." (d) Implementation Measure b) under Objectives 4 and 5 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows: "b) To ensure an uninterrupted source of irrigation water to undeveloped land, Development Permits, as applicable, shall include a detailed assessment of how irrigation water and drainage services to land within the project site that has not been or is not immediately planned for development would be affected. The assessment shall include consideration of interruption of irrigation patterns, temporary interruptions in service due to installation of underground utilities, and access to farm fields by workers, equipment and trucks. A plan for constructing/modifying facilities to maintain irrigation water and drainage services and a schedule for constructing these facilities shall be included."</p>	
<p>M4.4.1-3 The projected available supply of water to the project site from BBID (9,413 acre-feet per year) and from riparian water rights (possibly 2,600 acre-feet per year) is less than the project demand (12,874 acre-feet per year based on County Standards) and could result in an inadequate water supply for the project.</p>	<p>M4.4.1-3 (a) Implementation b) under Objective 2 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be replaced with the following: "b) Specific plans subsequent to Specific Plan 1 shall include a comparison of the actual water demand for the project with that calculated in the Draft Master Plan (assuming a 14 percent savings) to assess the effectiveness and adequacy of the water conservation measures. If the water savings specified in the Draft Master Plan were not achieved for a previous specific plan, the next specific plan shall specify additional actions that would be implemented to achieve the water conservation projections contained in the Draft Master Plan. Actions could include public information campaign, additional water conservation fixtures to be included in subsequent development, mandatory water rationing and on-site reclamation. Approval of the specific plan(s) shall be contingent on the adequacy of the proposed actions to increase water conservation effectiveness, if appropriate."</p>	

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Public Utilities

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>M4.4.1-4 Drinking water may not be available to the project if the water treatment plant were not permitted and constructed prior to occupancy within the project.</p>	<p>(b) A new Potability should be added under Objective 1 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C), as follows: "b) Riparian water rights associated with land between Byron Road and Old River shall be reserved for project use. Until the parcels with riparian water rights are developed, the water diverted under riparian rights must be reserved for agricultural irrigation."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.4.1-5 Water treatment sludge disposal could adversely impact local water quality or unnecessarily occupy scarce landfill space.</p>	<p>M4.4.1-4 Implementation a) under Objective 7 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution should be revised as follows: "a) Review Process. A Development Permit shall be required for the water treatment plant and shall be approved prior to the approval of the first tentative map. The Development Permit shall provide a schedule for ensuring that the water treatment plant is fully operational prior to approval of the first final subdivision map, in accordance with the requirements of applicable state agencies."</p> <p>M4.4.1-5 (a) Policy a) under Objective 10 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows: "a) Water treatment plant sludge shall be disposed of through industrial reuse, land spreading, and/or dedicated land disposal inside and in the vicinity of the Mountain House community to the maximum extent feasible in accordance with applicable regulations. Landfill disposal of sludge would be chosen only if the other alternatives were determined to be infeasible." (b) The following new Policies should be added under Objective 10 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C): "c) Industrial reuse of water treatment sludge shall be practiced to the maximum extent possible. The Community Service District shall consider other disposal options only if industrial reuse were infeasible." "d) Adequate sludge treatment and drying facilities shall be provided at the plant through project build out." (c) Implementation Measure a) under Objective 10 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be revised as follows: "a) Sludge Disposal Program. The initial Development Permit for the water treatment plant shall specify the water treatment sludge reuse/disposal method(s) that will be used throughout the development of Specific Plan I. Approval of subsequent specific plans shall be contingent on the identification of means of water treatment sludge reuse/application/disposal consistent with applicable local, state, and federal policies and regulations, and which minimizes landfill disposal. If landfill disposal were proposed, an agreement or "will serve" letter with a landfill that would accept the sludge for at least the next five years shall be provided with the initial Development Permit for the water treatment plant or subsequent specific plan. If land spreading or dedicated land disposal were proposed, then guarantees of adequate acres for sludge disposal for at least the next five years must be provided. Provisions for sludge disposal shall be updated annually so that there are always firm provisions for disposal for at least five years into the future."</p>	<p>I</p>

<p>M4.4.1-6 An uncontrolled release of hazardous materials associated with water treatment practices could potentially occur and impact water resources and public health.</p>	<p>(d) A new Implementation Measure should be added under Objective 10 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C), as follows: "e) A detailed assessment of water sludge treatment and drying needs shall be provided in the Development Permit for the water treatment plant. The assessment shall provide the supporting calculations for determining sludge production rates, estimates on percent moisture content in raw sludge and dried sludge, application rates and design parameters for sludge drying beds, projected surface area requirements for the drying bed, and land required for sludge disposal (if appropriate)."</p>	
<p>M4.4.1-6 An uncontrolled release of hazardous materials associated with water treatment practices could potentially occur and impact water resources and public health.</p>	<p>M4.4.1-6 (a) Objective 5 in Waste Management (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows: "To insure the safe handling and to minimize the use of chemicals and other hazardous materials at the water and wastewater treatment plants." (b) The following new Implementation should be added under Objectives 1 through 5 in Waste Management (Appendix C), as follows: "i) Chemical Selection and Facilities. Prior to design of the plants, chemicals associated with water and wastewater treatment operations shall be carefully selected to minimize the hazard. Chemical handling and storage facilities shall be designed to minimize and effectively mitigate the potential for accidental releases, including such features as secondary containment, alarms, remote sensing instruments, and other safety features."</p>	I
<p>M4.4.1-7 Water treatment plant capacity may be insufficient to meet project demand if any unit process in the plant were under-designed, or if plant expansion did not keep pace with project growth.</p>	<p>M4.4.1-7 The following new Implementation should be added under Objective 8 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C): "d) Calculations, including assumptions and process loading parameters, to support the determination of the amount of land necessary for raw water storage, different water treatment processes, treated water storage, sludge disposal, and support facilities shall be included in the Development Permit application for the water treatment plant."</p>	I
<p>■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Wastewater</p>		
<p>M4.4.2-1 Inadequately treated reclaimed wastewater could impact local surface and groundwaters and public health. Insufficient reclamation sites could result in illegal and inappropriate discharge of treated wastewater.</p>	<p>M4.4.2-1 (a) Objective 1 in Wastewater Treatment Plant (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows: "To ensure that wastewater treatment processes be selected, designed, constructed, and operated to provide adequate treatment capacity and water quality for the method(s) of disposal throughout project buildout." (b) Policy a) under Objectives 1 and 2 in Wastewater Treatment Plant should be revised, as follows: "a) Initial treatment processes shall be selected to meet effluent quality required for restricted use reclamation such as irrigation of agricultural lands." (c) Two new policies should be added under Objectives 1 and 2 in Wastewater Treatment Plant (Appendix C), as follows: "c) Additional wastewater treatment processes shall be provided if unrestricted use reclamation, including irrigation on-site, industrial/commercial reuse, or surface water discharge were implemented." "d) Expansion of the wastewater treatment plant shall be constructed and completed before the existing capacity has been exceeded."</p>	I

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>(d) Implementation b) under Objectives 1 and 2 in Wastewater Treatment Plant should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"b) Ultimate Treatment. The facultative lagoons shall be replaced by activated sludge treatment, or other similarly effective process(es), to provide secondary treatment after Specific Plan I buildout is complete. Additional treatment processes shall be added to produce the required effluent quality necessary for disposal options other than restricted use reclamation, if implemented."</p> <p>(e) Implementation c) under Objectives 1 and 2 in Wastewater Treatment Plant should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"c) Level of Treatment. Initially, all process designs shall be sufficient to treat effluent for surface irrigation of crops and/or landscape irrigation with limited public access. Processes shall be upgraded or replaced to produce higher quality effluent suitable for other disposal methods; such other disposal methods may include irrigation with potential human contact, if on-site reclamation and discharge to Old River were implemented."</p> <p>(f) Implementation f) under Objectives 1 and 2 in Wastewater Treatment Plant (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"f) Development Permit. A Development Permit shall be required for the wastewater treatment plant and shall be approved prior to the approval of the first tentative map. The permit application shall include a schedule for design, construction, and permitting for the plant to ensure that the wastewater treatment and reclamation facilities would be operational prior to the approval of the first final subdivision map. A separate Development Permit shall be required for each change in disposal method or area, or with each specific plan after Specific Plan I, whichever is sooner. Each Development Permit for the wastewater treatment plant shall describe the mechanism by which the construction of additional facilities for incremental expansion in treatment capacity shall be completed before the existing capacity is exceeded."</p> <p>(g) The following new Implementation should be added under Objectives 1 and 2 in Wastewater Treatment Plant (Appendix C):</p> <p>"g) Specific plans subsequent to Specific Plan I shall include a comparison of the actual wastewater generation rates for the project with that calculated in the Draft Master Plan. If wastewater flow rates were higher than those predicted in the Draft Master Plan assuming implementation of water conservation measures, then the next specific plan shall specify actions that would be implemented in the next specific plan to reduce the wastewater generation rates. Approval of the specific plan(s) shall be contingent on the adequacy of the proposed actions to reduce wastewater generation rates to those calculated in the Draft Master Plan, if appropriate."</p> <p>(h) Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"All wastewater from the project shall be reclaimed to the maximum extent possible by assuring that the best beneficial use of the wastewater is implemented throughout the life of the project."</p> <p>(i) Policy c) under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"c) Water reclamation facilities shall be designed and operated to minimize physical adverse effects on crop production, public health, groundwater, or surface waterways from agricultural irrigation with reclaimed water. Physical adverse impacts include salt and trace metal buildup in soil that prevents the growth of crops, or impacts to surrounding surface waterways due to discharge from agricultural drainage systems underlying the reclamation site."</p>	

(j) Implementation a) under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C) should be replaced with the following:

"a) A Reclamation Plan shall be approved by the County prior to the submittal of the Development Permit for the wastewater treatment plant. The Reclamation Plan shall include an engineering report and a schedule for ensuring that the design, construction, and permitting of the reclamation facilities would be completed prior to the approval of the first Tentative Map. The Reclamation Plan shall be updated and approved prior to the approval of specific plans subsequent to Specific Plan I."

(k) Implementation b) under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:

"b) Specific Plan Requirement. With the exception of Specific Plan I, no specific plan shall be approved unless guarantee has been provided to the County that sufficient land to meet the required storage and disposal acreage is under the control of the plan applicant or the community, and the consent of all agencies which have the legal responsibility to approve and/or issue permits has been obtained. Alternatively, if sufficient off-site land cannot be secured, then on-site reclamation shall be practiced to the maximum extent possible. Other disposal options, including discharge to Old River and piping the effluent to non-contiguous lands for irrigation, shall be considered, if necessary. If future specific plans propose an interim or permanent wastewater reclamation at a site other than the sites identified in the Master Plan, all the policies in the proposed Master Plan and all the adopted mitigation measures, shall be applicable to the proposed alternative reclamation site(s). Any alternative wastewater reclamation site shall also be subject to the permitting requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Department of Health Services. Prior to the approval of any specific plan utilizing an alternative wastewater reclamation site not specifically identified in the Master Plan/Specific Plan I EIR, site-specific environmental review shall be performed (including but not limited with respect to human contact, biological impact, crop types, etc.) and additional mitigation measures will be adopted to mitigate any site-specific environmental impacts not previously addressed."

(l) Implementation b) under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C) should be replaced, as follows:

"b) Monitoring. A detailed Salt and Trace Metal Management Plan shall be submitted as part of the reclamation plan to ensure that irrigation with reclaimed water is a viable long-term disposal option and to ensure minimization of salts and trace metals that are discharged to surface waters via the agricultural drains."

(m) The following new Implementation Measures should be added under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C), as follows:

"j) The location and design specifications for the wastewater storage ponds shall be provided in the Reclamation Plan. The location of agricultural drains within a one-half mile radius of the storage ponds and the sources and characteristics of soil that would be used to construct the ponds shall be identified. The design specifications shall address levee and pond bottom permeability, levee stability, and flood protection.

"k) An estimate shall be made of the wastewater volume that may seep from the ponds, and an assessment of potential flow paths from pond seepage shall be determined for the interim and potential permanent reclamation sites. The result of the assessment shall be submitted to the CVRWQCB for determination of whether agricultural drain discharge from land irrigated with reclaimed water would be regulated as a point-source discharge under the NPDES program. The determination by the CVRWQCB shall be provided in the reclamation plan. If it appears likely that the CVRWQCB would regulate the agricultural drain discharge, then assurance that the discharge would be allowed must be documented prior to approval of the reclamation plan."

(n) A new Policy should be added to Objective 3 in Wastewater Reuse Program as follows:

"f) The project shall be constructed such that on-site wastewater reclamation could be practiced to the maximum extent possible upon the completion of an advanced wastewater treatment plant with minimal retrofitting of developed areas."

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>M4.4.2-2 Illegal discharge of waste and wastewater to the intake channel of the Delta-Mendota Canal via agricultural drains may occur if the drains were not abandoned upon development.</p>	<p>(o) A new Implementation should be added to Objective 3 in Wastewater Reuse Program.</p> <p>"g) <u>On-Site Reclamation.</u> A reclaimed water distribution system shall be installed throughout the project upon initial development. The system shall provide for transmission of treated wastewater from the treatment plant to all public landscaped areas, parks, industrial and commercial areas, and other areas where reclaimed water could reasonably be used in the future. Major reclaimed water pipelines shall be sized to serve "downstream" areas upon development."</p> <p>(p) A new Implementation should be added under Objective 3 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution, as follows.</p> <p>"d) <u>On-Site Reclamation.</u> Upon operation of the advanced wastewater treatment plant to produce reclaimed water suitable for human contact on-site reclamation with reclaimed water shall be used to replace potable water to the maximum extent possible. The Community Services District, and/or other public municipal agencies, shall use reclaimed water for irrigation of public areas and operations (e.g., equipment/vehicle/bus washing). The Community Services District shall ensure that industrial and commercial operations that use water for washing or processing be required to use reclaimed water to the maximum extent possible."</p> <p>M4.4.2-2</p> <p>(a) A new Policy should be added to Objectives 4 and 5 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"Obscure agricultural irrigation and drainage facilities shall be removed or properly abandoned upon development of an area."</p> <p>(b) Implementation c) under Objectives 4 and 5 in Potable Water Supply and Distribution (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"c) Farm Drainage Requirements. All Development Permit submittals shall include a report on the impact on existing farm drainage facilities. The report shall include a map of all existing farm drains that flow through the area covered by the permit or map, an assessment of the impact on the drainage system, and a determination of the planned disposition of the system. The potential for drains to act as conduits for waste or wastewater to be discharged to nearby surface waterways shall be eliminated. Drains are to be identified on the maps as to type, location, and function. Portions of a system that would be abandoned shall be removed unless they could be incorporated into the storm drainage system."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.4.2-3 An inadequate wastewater sludge treatment and disposal system could adversely impact water resources and public health. Scarce municipal landfill space may be occupied by sludge if alternative disposal/reuse options were not aggressively pursued.</p>	<p>M4.4.2-3</p> <p>(a) The following Policies should be added under Objective 1 in Sludge Disposal (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"b) Beneficial reuse of sewage sludge shall be implemented to the maximum extent possible to minimize sludge disposal at a landfill or at a dedicated site.</p> <p>"c) Sludge quality from the project shall not limit sludge reuse options. This shall be accomplished via effective pre-treatment, public education, recycling programs, and additional treatment, if necessary."</p>	<p>I</p>

	<p>(b) Implementation b) under Objective 1 in Sludge Disposal (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"b) Interim Disposal. If the sludge meets acceptance criteria of a specific landfill, the sludge shall be initially disposed of at an appropriately permitted landfill. Sludge shall meet nonhazardous classification and shall be dried to a minimum of 50 percent solids prior to disposal at a landfill. The duration of landfill disposal shall not exceed two years from the startup of the activated sludge treatment process, unless the sludge disposal program described in Implementation e) concludes that landfill disposal of wastewater sludge is the only viable option."</p> <p>(c) Implementation e) under Objective 1 in Sludge Disposal (Appendix C) should be revised, as follows:</p> <p>"e) Initial Wastewater Sludge Disposal Plan. Within one year after the startup of the permanent secondary treatment process, the Community Service District shall submit an Initial Wastewater Sludge Disposal Plan to the County and other appropriate agencies for review and approval. The Plan shall document the sludge characterization findings, a detailed impact/benefit analysis of sludge disposal options, and a proposed sludge disposal method for the duration of the current specific plan."</p> <p>(d) The following new Implementations should be added under Objective 1 in Sludge Disposal (Appendix C), as follows:</p> <p>"f) Sludge disposal options shall be evaluated as early as possible, not later than one year after the startup of the permanent secondary treatment process, to allow for early identification of disposal options. Evaluation shall include sludge characterization, survey of potential sites where sludge may be used as a soil amendment, and assessment of viability of the compost market."</p> <p>"g) In all specific plans where wastewater treatment sludge requires disposal, the specific plans shall identify the proposed method(s) of sludge disposal for the duration of the plans. The CSD may subsequently adopt other sludge disposal options provided the new method(s) will achieve an equivalent or higher degree of environmental and public health protection, as determined by the County, and meets all applicable regulatory requirements. The County shall be notified of the proposed change in disposal method at least six months prior to implementation of the new disposal method."</p> <p>"h) If landfill disposal of the wastewater sludge were proposed, an agreement or "will serve" letter with a landfill that would accept the sludge for at least the next five years shall be provided with the initial Wastewater Sludge Disposal Plan or subsequent specific plan. If land spreading or dedicated land disposal were proposed, then guarantees of adequate acres for sludge disposal for at least the next five years must be provided. Provisions for sludge disposal shall be updated annually so that there are always firm provisions for disposal for at least five years into the future."</p>	<p>M4.4.2-4 An uncontrolled release of hazardous materials could occur during wastewater treatment operations and could impact water resources and public health.</p>	<p>M4.4.2-4 Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.4.1-6.</p>	<p>M4.4.2-5 Failure of the levees around wastewater treatment and storage ponds could cause flooding in the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>M4.4.2-5 (a) A new Policy should be added under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reuse Program (Appendix C), as follows: "d) The wastewater treatment and storage pond levees shall be capable of withstanding a maximum credible earthquake; ponds located within the 100-year floodplain shall prevent inundation due to levee failure along Old River or other nearby waterways, be capable of withstanding the effects of flooding, and shall not impair the structural integrity of existing flood control levees."</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Public Utilities

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
	<p>new Implementations should be added under Objective 1 in Wastewater Reclamation as follows:</p> <p>"j) The detailed design of the wastewater treatment and storage pond levees shall be included in the Reclamation Plan and initial Development Permit for the Wastewater Treatment Plant, and in all subsequent reclamation plans where additional ponds are proposed. The pond levees within the 100-year flood plain shall meet, as a minimum, the requirements of Section 65.10 Mapping of Areas Protected By Levee Systems, 44 CFR Ch. 1 and the design standards specified herein.</p> <p>"k) The wastewater treatment and storage ponds located within the 100-year floodplain shall be set back from existing flood control levees to not interfere with inspection, maintenance, or repair of the flood control levees, if applicable.</p> <p>"l) The wastewater treatment and storage pond levees shall be set back an appropriate distance from existing flood control levees to ensure that there will be no loss of integrity of the flood control levees."</p>	I
PUBLIC UTILITIES/Storm Drainage		
<p>M4.4.3-1 The accumulation of floating debris and petroleum residual in detention ponds could create a nuisance condition (e.g., odors, mosquito infestation, and excessive algae growth) and cause adverse aesthetic effects.</p>	<p>M4.4.3-1 The following mitigation measure should be included as an Implementation under Objective 3 in Primary Storm Drain Collection System (Appendix C):</p> <p>"e) Any proposed plans for construction or grading which include a detention basin shall include a proposed schedule and description of necessary routine maintenance activities for such detention basin(s) (including access roads). The maintenance plans may be in the form of a general operations and maintenance manual or may be specific to the detention basin(s) for which construction/grading plans are being submitted."</p>	I
PUBLIC UTILITIES/Gas and Electricity		
<p>M4.4.4-1 The Draft Master Plan does not provide specifications for moving existing utilities and establishing easements.</p>	<p>M4.4.4-1 The following Implementations should be included under Objective 1 in Electricity (Appendix C):</p> <p>"e) A formal application shall be submitted to PG&E to relocate the Weber-Herdlyn 60-kV electrical transmission line or provide an adequate open space corridor or other appropriate land use approved by PG&E for the easement prior to submittal of the first Development Permit north of Byron Road.</p> <p>"f) A detailed proposal to relocate the eight-inch natural gas pipeline located north of Byron Road shall be included in the draft specific plan(s) for that area. A preliminary response from PG&E regarding the proposed relocation shall be secured and documented in the applicable final specific plan(s).</p> <p>"g) An open space corridor or appropriate land use approved by PG&E shall be provided for the Rio Oso-Tesla transmission line easements. PG&E's approval shall be secured prior to the first Development Permit in the applicable specific plans.</p> <p>"h) Construction plans shall be submitted to PG&E and other easement owners for review prior to construction in applicable specific plan areas. In particular, the construction plans should identify proposed land uses in utility easements, and procedures for movement of heavy machinery over pipelines installed in non-roadway areas which may not be designed to withstand forces exerted by heavy loads."</p>	I

<p>M4.4.4-2</p> <p>The project would have a significant energy demand and would contribute to the depletion of non-renewable resources and the demand for environmentally-detrimental renewable resources such as hydroelectric power.</p>	<p>The Master Plan should include Policies under Objective 1 in Electricity (Appendix C) to read as follows:</p> <p>"i) Land uses shall be compatible with overhead transmission line corridors, existing or proposed.</p> <p>"j) Specific plans that propose residential or school development adjacent to an overhead transmission line shall summarize and provide an evaluation of the latest information regarding EMF exposure and incorporate additional measures to mitigate those effects, if appropriate."</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>M4.4.4-2</p> <p>The following Implementations should be added under Architectural Guidelines in the Design Manual (Appendix 4-A of the Draft Master Plan):</p> <p>"π Residential street layouts that include building and roof orientations that optimize the ability of residences to use solar energy to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>(b) The following Implementation should be added under Landscape Concepts and Policies, General Issues, in the Design Manual (Appendix 4-A of the Draft Master Plan):</p> <p>"m) Street trees shall not be located in areas that would prevent residents' ability to use solar energy, unless they are deciduous trees that will not impact solar access during winter months."</p> <p>(c) The Design Manual for the Master Plan should be amended to include a section on energy efficiency that would provide guidelines for energy efficient designs for residential and non-residential development within the entire community.</p> <p>The guidelines for buildings should meet or exceed the most recent standards established by the California Energy Commission and promote passive solar design. The guidelines for the community should incorporate PG&E's recommendations, encourage efficient street design, and transportation alternatives to reduce automobile use.</p> <p>(d) A new Implementation should be added under Commercial Objective 2 (Appendix C):</p> <p>"c) The neighborhood commercial areas shall be sited so that as many homes as possible are located within one-quarter mile walk of the closest neighborhood or community shopping area."</p>	<p>M4.4.4-2</p> <p>(a) The following Implementations should be added under Architectural Guidelines in the Design Manual (Appendix 4-A of the Draft Master Plan):</p> <p>"π Residential street layouts that include building and roof orientations that optimize the ability of residences to use solar energy to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>(b) The following Implementation should be added under Landscape Concepts and Policies, General Issues, in the Design Manual (Appendix 4-A of the Draft Master Plan):</p> <p>"m) Street trees shall not be located in areas that would prevent residents' ability to use solar energy, unless they are deciduous trees that will not impact solar access during winter months."</p> <p>(c) The Design Manual for the Master Plan should be amended to include a section on energy efficiency that would provide guidelines for energy efficient designs for residential and non-residential development within the entire community.</p> <p>The guidelines for buildings should meet or exceed the most recent standards established by the California Energy Commission and promote passive solar design. The guidelines for the community should incorporate PG&E's recommendations, encourage efficient street design, and transportation alternatives to reduce automobile use.</p> <p>(d) A new Implementation should be added under Commercial Objective 2 (Appendix C):</p> <p>"c) The neighborhood commercial areas shall be sited so that as many homes as possible are located within one-quarter mile walk of the closest neighborhood or community shopping area."</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Telephone</p>		
<p>None identified</p>		
<p>■ CULTURAL RESOURCES</p>		
<p>M4.5-1</p> <p>Development of the project could result in the disturbance of currently unknown subsurface prehistoric cultural deposits or artifacts related to the prehistoric setting or historic archaeological deposits or features dating from the establishment of Euro-American settlement in San Joaquin County.</p>	<p>M4.5-1</p> <p>The following measures should replace Implementations a) and b) under Objective 8 in Development Standards (Appendix C).</p> <p>a) When specific land use and development plans are formulated as part of a specific plan, additional archaeological surveys shall be conducted in areas of development that have not been subjected to intensive archaeological reconnaissance. This shall include areas outside the specific plan area that are proposed for interim or permanent wastewater treatment or reuse.</p> <p>b) Because of the possibility that a buried site, Ca-SJo-136, may be located in the vicinity of Mountain House Creek, construction activity in the Mountain House Creek area near that site shall be monitored by an archaeologist.</p> <p>c) Because of the potential historic significance of Ca-SJo-229H, the site of the village of Wicklund, and because of the potential for buried features or artifact deposits in that area, an archaeologist shall monitor any construction work.</p>	<p>1</p>

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>d) If, during the course of construction, subsurface historic archaeological features were identified on sites Ca-SJo-230H and Ca-SJo-231H or anywhere within the project site, excavation shall cease and an archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate these materials.</p> <p>e) If, during the course of any construction activity, buried prehistoric cultural resources were found, excavation shall cease and an archaeologist shall be contacted immediately to evaluate these resources. Such evaluation may entail archaeological test excavation and/or mitigative data recovery.</p> <p>f) A demolition permit, to be approved by the Planning Division of the Community Development Department, shall be required prior to destruction of any building in excess of 50 years of age.</p>	
<p>M4.5-2 Development of the proposed project could disturb previously unknown human prehistoric burial sites.</p>	<p>M4.5-2 The following should be added as an Implementation in Development Standards (Appendix C):</p> <p>g) The County Coroner, the Native American Heritage Commission, and an archaeologist shall be informed and consulted if a human prehistoric burial site were discovered during site construction. An agreement shall be formulated between the Native American representative, the archaeologist, San Joaquin County, and the developer with regard to the proper treatment and disposition of human remains and associated artifacts in individual specific plans. Such treatment and disposition may require archaeological excavation and reburial.</p>	I
<p>M4.5-3 The proposed project could destroy structures over 50 years of age which may have significant historical value.</p>	<p>M4.5-3 The following Implementation should be added under Development Standards (Appendix C):</p> <p>h) Each specific plan shall contain a determination by a qualified architectural historian as to whether any of the structures that are more than 50 years old would be affected by specific plan implementation. If specific plan implementation were determined to affect the structures, recommendations by the qualified professional shall be implemented; such mitigation measures could consist of avoidance of impacts by incorporating the structure into planned developments, detailed architectural documentation and history, or removal of a structure to another location. Each specific plan shall map the location of all structures 50 years of older that have been determined by a historian to be of historic significance, except for Specific Plan I.</p>	I
<p>■ GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY</p>		
<p>M4.6-1 Strong ground shaking during an earthquake could cause structural damage to improvements and injuries to residents of the proposed project.</p>	<p>M4.6-1 The preparation and distribution of a Community Earthquake Preparedness Plan, proposed in the Draft Master Plan, would reduce this impact. This remains an unavoidable adverse impact. Implementation a) under Objective 5 of Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C) should be amended to ensure that the Plan be prepared prior to the start of the first Development Permit. No further mitigation is possible.</p>	SU

■ HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

M4.7-1

Increased sedimentation within Old River would be caused by runoff from Mountain House Creek and operation of the proposed marina.

M4.7-1

The Draft Master Plan should include the following Objective, Policy, and Implementations under Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) as mitigation measures for reduction of sedimentation impacts related to construction and operation of the proposed marina:

Objective:

To ensure that the design and operation of private recreation areas do not adversely affect water resources.

Policy:

The marina on Old River shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to minimize the accumulation of sediment within the marina and the Old River Channel.

Implementation:

a) A dredging plan shall be developed at the specific plan stage for the Marina portion of Neighborhood K along Old River for removal of accumulated sediment from the Old River channel in the area of the proposed marina outlet. This plan shall comply with the requirements of dredging permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and shall have provisions for controlling turbidity during dredging.

b) Prior to obtaining a dredging permit, a disposal area for the dredged sediments shall be established by the applicant and approved by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The disposal area shall be identified in the recommended dredging plan. The characteristics and design of the dredge disposal area shall minimize the potential discharge of sediments to surface water and potential discharge of contaminants to the surface water or groundwater. A sampling plan to evaluate the potential levels of contaminants within the sediments shall be incorporated in the recommended dredging plan. The collected samples shall, as a minimum, be analyzed for trace metals, salts, pesticides, and herbicides.

M4.7-2

Inadequate water circulation would potentially create water quality problems within the proposed on-site marina.

M4.7-2

The following Objective, Policy, and Implementations are recommended for inclusion under Parks and Recreation (Appendix C):

Objective:

"To minimize the potential for water quality degradation at the marina on Old River.

Policy:

"The marina shall be designed and operated to minimize the potential for water quality degradation associated with inadequate water circulation or waste discharge at the marina.

Implementation:

"a) The design of the marina shall include, if necessary, a forced circulation system capable of reducing the residence time of water in the marina to less than five days. The marina design and operation plan shall be presented at the specific plan stage for Neighborhood K, which includes the marina.

"b) Convenient and adequate waste disposal facilities for human waste, bilge water, engine fuels and lubricants, and garbage shall be incorporated in the marina design and operation plan."

M4.7-3

Water quality in Old River could be impacted by increased turbidity caused during construction of the proposed marina.

M4.7-3

The following Implementation should be included under the Objective and Policy proposed by Mitigation Measure M4.7-2:

"c) Construction of the marina shall be staged to delay breach of the Old River levee until construction of the marina basin is completed and stabilized. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for marina construction shall specifically require construction techniques to minimize erosion and sediment transport during and after breaching of the levee."

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Hydrology and Water Quality

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>M4.7-4 Shallow groundwater at the project site could present adverse conditions for construction of foundations and detention/retention basins. Ultimate development of the project site could cause a rise in shallow groundwater levels as a result of removal of subsurface drains.</p>	<p>M4.7-4 The following Implementation is recommended for inclusion under Objective 3 in Primary Storm Drain Collection System (Appendix C): "e) Preliminary Soils Report. The soils report required for each subdivision shall identify the seasonal high groundwater level at the site of any detention/retention basins proposed as part of the stormwater management system. The report shall provide recommendations for appropriate design elevations for the detention/retention basins that would avoid saturation or partial filling of the groundwater. The report shall specifically address the potential for increased groundwater levels caused by removal or disruption of existing subsurface drains. The report will provide recommendations for subsurface drains for all newly constructed structures or facilities. These recommendations all include provisions for routing and disposal of drain discharges that will not result in adverse flooding or saturation hazards within other areas of the project site."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.7-5 Increased boating within Old River and the South Delta waterways, expected as the result of the operation of the proposed marina, would contribute to the erosion of levees by waves generated as boat wakes. Erosion could result in adverse sedimentation within the waterways and levee instability.</p>	<p>M4.7-5 The following Implementations should be added to the Draft Master Plan under Objective 1 in Flood Protection (Appendix C): "g) The design of the levee improvements shall consider and mitigate the potential causes of erosion, including boat wakes. Possible design components for the prevention of erosion could include rock revetment structures, such as riprap. The erosion controls shall, to the extent possible, be designed to provide protection of existing riparian vegetation. Specific design components for erosion abatement shall be required as a condition of levee design approval. "h) Boat speed limits to reduce the generation of potentially damaging boat wakes shall be established and enforced by the San Joaquin County Sheriff's Department, Boating Safety Division, in conjunction with other Delta area law enforcement agencies."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.7-6 The sediment load transported by Mountain House Creek could be deposited within the project site, potentially interfering with flood control and the enhanced habitat function of the Mountain House Creek corridor.</p>	<p>M4.7-6 The following Implementation should be added to the Draft Master Plan under Objective 2 in Mountain House Creek Improvements (Appendix C): "A sedimentation basin or other effective sediment control structure shall be designed and constructed near the point where Mountain House Creek crosses the western project boundary. The basin shall be designed to effectively remove sediment from the creek flows entering the project site. The basin maintenance shall be the responsibility of the CSD. The basin design and maintenance program shall minimize the potential for wetland development in the basin which could hinder the function or maintenance of the structure."</p>	<p>I</p>

■ VISUAL QUALITY

M4.8-1

The proposed project would significantly alter the existing rural visual quality of the site as seen from local roads, regional freeways, and proposed public pathways.

M4.8-1

(a) The following two policies should be added under Landscape Concept and Policies in Development and Design (Appendix C):

"Landscaping plans that include fencing, trails, bikeways, and a conceptual plant and tree palette for both existing and proposed roadways, of color classification and above, and other edge treatments shall be included in each adopted specific plan, if not already set forth in the Design Manual.

"The landscaping plans included in each specific plan shall be used as criteria by the proposed Community Review Board to review the design and landscaping plans of all major projects within the community prior to construction."

(b) The Specific Plan and Special Purpose Plan for Mountain House Business Park should include a comprehensive sign program for the Freeway Service Commercial district which would limit pole signs identifying the Freeway Service area to no more than two locations; height and size restrictions shall be imposed where feasible to lessen the visual impact. The height limits of the one or two pole signs shall not exceed the heights specified in the Development Title for C-FS areas

(c) The following Policy should be added under Old River Regional Park (Objective 6) in Recreation and Open Space (Appendix C):

"j) Additional trees shall be provided along Old River where necessary to screen the project from boaters, while still affording views of the water for people using the regional park. Along Old River, the landscaped area shall be planted with species of trees and shrubs compatible with existing riparian vegetation. Species shall also be chosen to provide effective screening so that the public using the levees for walking or bicycling would have a limited view of development on site. Provisions to accomplish this shall be included in the Park and Open Space Plan."

(d) The Draft Mountain House Design Review Manual should be amended to define the Community Review Board and describe its typical duties. The Community Review Board could include some members of the larger Community Services District Board of Directors augmented with one or more design professionals. The main purpose of the Review Board would be to review Development Permits of other development applications for their consistency with established design standards in the Draft Master or specific plans. The Community Review Board would also be advisory to the CSD Board and the County on design issues that are not directly regulated by master or specific plan policies or implementations (such as the choice for public art in common spaces, minor design details of playgrounds or community parks, and choosing an appropriate gateway monument along the I-205 frontage).

M4.8-2

Views from public roads toward Mt. Diablo and the Mt. Diablo foothills to the west of the site would be screened by new buildings.

M4.8-2

The following Policy and Implementation should be added under Landscape Concept and Policies in Development and Design (Appendix C):

"Policy: View corridors towards the foothills and Mt. Diablo shall be protected and enhanced to the greatest extent possible, without compromising the ability of windrows planted along the western boundary to mitigate wind, dust, and aerial spraying.

"Implementation:

"a) Critical view corridors shall be identified in the Parks and Open Space Plan.

"b) East-west roadways and pedestrian corridors throughout the project site shall be landscaped with trees to frame views to the west and, whenever feasible, the trees shall be planted at least 40 feet apart to allow open views.

"c) Periodic breaks in the continuous landscaping plans for north-south arterials and other roadways shall be identified to maximize views toward Mount Diablo and the foothills.

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Visual Quality

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>M4.8-3 Industrial and high density residential buildings along major view corridors or open space corridors could affect views or create a strong visual contrast to the open space and generate long shadows.</p>	<p>M4.8-3 Table 4.1 should be amended to note that any High Density Residential area west of the open space corridor along Mountain House Creek must be set back from the lot line adjacent to the creek by at least 50 feet, as already required by a policy in the Draft Master Plan.</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.8-4 Project development could result in the removal of mature trees currently visible from public roads; the trees frame views along the public roads.</p>	<p>M4.8-4 Policy a) under Tree Mapping and Conservation Policy (Objective 6) in Recreation and Open Space (Appendix C) should be revised as follows: "a) Existing healthy mature trees, particularly those along Patterson Pass and Grant Line roads, shall be preserved and incorporated to the greatest extent practical into the landscape design of the community. Land uses adjacent to the existing mature trees should be compatible with the preservation program for mature trees."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.8-5 The project could generate light and glare that would be visible from major roads, residences within the project, and residences outside the project.</p>	<p>M4.8-5 Include the following Policy h) and Implementation c) under Lighting (Objective 4) in Development and Design (Appendix C) and make appropriate revisions in the Lighting section of the Design Manual (Appendix 4-A of the Draft Master Plan): "Policy: "b) Lighting throughout the project shall be designed to minimize glare and impacts to adjacent land uses, especially residences." "Implementation: "c) Special Purpose Plans and building plans for significant commercial and industrial structures shall include specific designs to ensure light and glare from the project would be minimized, especially between commercial/industrial and residential uses. Mechanisms such as screening of parking areas with evergreen trees, setbacks from residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial areas, and a design review process to review development plans shall be included in the Design Manual. The design review process shall include review of lighting proposals and architectural materials for all proposed projects. The proposed Community Review Board, a Design Review Committee, consisting of both architects and landscape architects, shall oversee the design review process."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.8-6 The planned relocation of the 60-kV Weber-Herdlyn power line could create additional visual impacts if it is reconstructed aboveground elsewhere on the project site.</p>	<p>M4.8-6 A new Policy should be added under Electric and Magnetic Fields in Public Health and Safety (Appendix C) as follows: "The 60-kV Weber-Herdlyn power line shall be relocated to an alignment that parallels the Moccoco SP rail line. The proposed relocation shall be shown in the first residential Specific Plan that is prepared for lands north of Byron Road."</p>	<p>I</p>

POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT

M4.9-1

The proposed project may not attain an adequate balance between jobs and housing, especially during the initial phases of the project.

M4.9-1

- (a) To more realistically plan for a range of absorption rates, a "Low Growth" absorption schedule, as well as a "High Growth" schedule should be included in the Master Plan. The Jobs/Housing Program policies and Tables 3.7 and 3.8 should be revised to indicate the number of jobs that would need to be created on-site to reach the "minimum" jobs/housing ratio goals for each increment of housing development, under both "High Growth" and "Low Growth" absorption schedules. This additional information will assist County staff in evaluating the project's performance in meeting jobs/housing goals during the annual monitoring process.
- (b) Implementations d) and e) under Objective 1. Jobs/Housing Program in Land Use (Appendix C) should be revised as follows:
 - "d) Jobs/Housing Reviews. The Jobs/Housing Program shall be monitored by the Review Authority as described in the monitoring and enforcement section below. In addition, the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors shall hold a Public Hearing to review the progress of the Jobs/Housing Program at the following specified times:
 - Prior to the approval of any Specific Plan, excluding the first Specific Plan or Specific Plan Amendment.
 - Every three years after construction begins, but no sooner than after 2,000 residential units have been completed, provided a Jobs/Housing Review has not already been conducted in the previous calendar year; or
 - At any other times determined appropriate by the Board of Supervisors (e.g., scheduling a Jobs/Housing Review by the Board to evaluate the circumstances for nonachievement of jobs/housing ratios.
 - "To determine whether the Community is meeting its jobs/housing goals, the following will be tracked:
 - Best Case Ratios: The jobs/housing ratio is estimated to improve over time from 0.79 by the end of the first seven years of Specific Plan I under the "High Growth" schedule to 0.99 at project buildout. These "Best Case" jobs/housing ratios are presented in Table 3.7: Analysis of Jobs/Housing Balance Over Time;
 - Minimum Ratios: The Minimum Ratio averages only 4 percent less than the Best Case Ratio; over time, the Minimum Ratio approaches the Best Case Ratio. Minimum Ratios for years or residential units not shown shall be interpolated. The Minimum Ratios are presented in Table 3.8: Analysis of Various Jobs/Housing Scenarios Over Time; and
 - Minimum Job Densities: Commercial and industrial land uses designated for each neighborhood should generally conform with the average densities shown in Table 3.1: Land Use Program."
 - "e) Enforcement. The San Joaquin County Community Development Director shall prepare a written report and findings and determine through the annual monitoring of the Jobs/Housing Program that the minimum jobs/housing ratios and minimum job densities (per Table 3.1 of the Master Plan) have been achieved. Annual monitoring shall include an inventory of built and occupied residential units, and gross commercial/industrial square footage built and occupied, broken down by land use category, with estimated number of employees for each land use category. In the event that the minimum jobs/housing ratios and minimum job densities (per Table 3.1 of the Master Plan) have not been achieved, the Board of Supervisors shall decide whether to schedule public hearings before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to evaluate the circumstances for nonachievement, and to develop an appropriate course of action. The County Planning Commission shall make recommendations to the Board regarding the issue. Both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors shall consider the following issues:

NA

Table 2.1, continued

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Population, Housing, and Employment

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent efforts in the job creation program; • Commitments for future jobs; • The financial effects that discontinued or interrupted residential development will have on Community Services District operations, and public financing districts in the community; • The effects of including construction jobs in the calculation of the jobs/housing ratio; • The types of the jobs created to date (e.g., the wage scale or salary level of the jobs, and what portion are full-time or part-time positions) and how many of the new jobs are in "basic" industries (non-local); • The relationship of the job creation rate in the project with local, State, and national economic or market trends and financing availability; • Efforts that have been made by the County to facilitate and encourage job development; and • Actual job densities (jobs per acre or square foot) that have been achieved for commercial and industrial uses, compared to the average job densities specified in Table 3.1. <p>"Following consideration of all public testimony, written materials and recommendations of County staff and the Planning Commission, the Board shall decide on a course of action to address the jobs/housing issue. Although the Board may take whatever action it deems appropriate to further jobs/housing goals, the Board shall focus on taking one or more of the following actions:</p> <p>"(1) Find that no action is necessary and direct County staff to continue processing applications for the construction of additional residential units in the project as before; or</p> <p>"(2) Direct County staff to continue processing applications for the construction of additional residential units in the project according to revised jobs/housing targets that will ensure that jobs/housing ratio goals will be substantially met in the future; and/or</p> <p>"(3) Recommend that certain actions be taken by the Master Developer and/or other developers within the project to increase job creation; and/or</p> <p>"(4) Approve future Specific Plans only if it can be demonstrated that the community will reach minimum jobs/housing ratios.</p> <p>"Any proposed action by the Board that would constrain residential development shall require the preparation of a study for Board consideration and action that assesses the impacts on affected parties (e.g., the CSD, CFDs, private developers, bond shareholders, the County). This study shall also consider potential undesirable impacts arising from such Board action (e.g., possible restriction on the creation of a population-serving jobs and region-serving jobs due to a reduction in population growth; possible limitation on the operation of existing population-serving and some region-serving businesses)."</p> <p>(c) Guideline (d) under Monitoring and Enforcement should be moved to become an Implementation under Objective 1, Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing (Appendix C) and should be revised as follows:</p> <p>"Redesignation and rezoning of commercial and industrial land to non-employment uses (such as residential uses) shall be approved only if the County determines that the proposed redesignation or rezoning will not have a negative impact on the Mountain House Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing programs."</p>	

M4.9-2

The proposed project may not provide a sufficient supply of housing that is affordable to Very Low and Low Income workers employed in the community, especially if 25 percent of the planned second units were not occupied by Very Low and Low Income renters.

M4.9-2

(a) The Affordable Housing Program in the Draft Master Plan should be amended to include policies and an implementation program that ensures qualified Very Low Income and Low Income families can rent or buy the designated affordable housing units. An income test should be applied to all potential tenants and home buyers for the High Density and Medium-High Density units proposed for affordable rents or condominium prices. The Senior Citizen housing units should be subject to the same income tests and restrictions as the other affordable units. The assumptions for the Affordable Housing Program (Section 3.9.1 of the Draft Master Plan) should be amended to state that only one-quarter of the proposed number of Senior Citizen housing units is assumed to provide Very Low and Low Income housing opportunities. The income qualifying mechanism could be administered by the Mountain House Affordable Housing Trust Fund, by the County, or by a reputable non-profit housing organization.

The Affordable Housing Program should also be amended to include policies and implementation programs to provide reasonable assurance that the number of affordable housing units remain occupied by qualified Very Low and Low Income tenants or homeowners over time. The income test and verification process outlined above should be applied each time an affordable unit is vacated and re-rented or sold.

Alternatively, to increase the possibility that an adequate number of affordable housing units would be constructed earlier in the project and would continue to be occupied over time by Very Low and Low Income households, an additional 17 to 22 acres of land should be designated on the Land Use Map for High Density housing (which would create 300-400 units).

(b) The Affordable Housing Program goals for each 4,000-unit milestone should be amended so that the number of affordable housing units proposed for the first half of the project corresponds more closely with the proposed goals. The Affordable Housing Program policies and Table 3.12 in the Draft Master Plan should be revised to indicate the exact number of affordable units by income category in each 4,000-unit development increment, which would serve as the adopted Affordable Housing goals for the program.

(c) To clarify the assumed role of second units, the Draft Master Plan should be amended by adding a paragraph in the "Assumptions" section of the Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing discussion. The added paragraph should state the assumption that one-quarter of the 857 planned second units will be affordable to low income households.

(d) The Draft Master Plan should be amended with an Implementation that requires that the Design Manual include Second Unit land use, zoning and design regulations (prepared prior to the first Development Permit). The Second Unit regulations should specify development standards such as maximum square footage and lot coverage, required setbacks from the existing primary structure and structures on adjacent lots, maximum height, and the maximum number of units that can be located on any given block within a neighborhood. Table 4.1 (Lot and Structure Standards) in the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include the Second Unit standards, or a reference to where the detailed design standards are located.

(e) The Mountain House Affordable Housing and Housing Trust Fund (MHHTF) programs in the Draft Master Plan should include another example of how the MHHTF could be used to ensure the provision of affordable housing. It is recommended that the example provided describe the possible involvement of the Trust monies in constructing High Density, Medium-High Density, and Second Units, and marketing the units at affordable prices. The Affordable Housing Program should consider a plan to construct the High Density housing, and then dedicate and sell the units to an established non-profit housing corporation which can then manage the units. In this way, the independent non-profit corporation can take advantage of Federal tax incentives, and leverage additional funds from other housing programs. The Draft Master Plan should be amended to include policies concerning the construction, ownership, management, and maintenance of affordable units using Trust monies, and provide a projected phasing schedule for the marketing of affordable units and collection of Trust monies.

(f) Implementations k) and l) under Objective 2 of Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing (Appendix C) should be modified as follows:

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Population, Housing, and Employment

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
	<p>"(k) Affordable Housing Reviews. The Affordable Housing Program shall be monitored by the Review Authority as described in the monitoring and enforcement section below. In addition, the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors shall hold a Public Hearing to review the progress of the Affordable Housing Program at the following specified times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the approval of any Specific Plan, excluding the first Specific Plan or Specific Plan Amendment; • Every three years after residential construction begins, but no sooner than after 2,000 residential units have been constructed, provided a Public Hearing on the progress of the Affordable Housing Program has not already been conducted in the previous calendar year; or • At any other times determined appropriate by the Board of Supervisors (e.g., scheduling of an Affordable Housing Review by the Board to evaluate the circumstances for non-achievement of affordability indices). <p>"(l) Enforcement. To determine whether the Community is meeting its Affordable Housing goals, the specific minimum affordability indices presented in Table 3.12 will be tracked. The San Joaquin County Community Development Department shall prepare a written report and findings and determine through its monitoring of the Affordable Housing Program that the specified affordability indices have been achieved beginning after first three years of construction. Annual monitoring shall include an inventory of built and occupied residential units, broken down by sales price or rental price range. In the event that the minimum affordable housing indices have not been achieved, the Board of Supervisors shall decide whether to schedule public hearings before the County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to evaluate the circumstances for non-achievement, and to develop an appropriate course of action. The County Planning Commission shall make recommendations to the Board. Both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors shall consider the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The portion of new High Density, Medium High Density, and Second Units that are being offered for rent or sale at affordable levels and have been occupied by Very Low Income and Low Income families; • The amount of Housing Trust funds that has been collected and the Housing Trust programs that have been established and funded; • The involvement of other public or private housing program monies that have been leveraged with Trust funds, whether any other specific programs will contribute to the Affordable Housing Program within the next two years, and the effects of the programs to ensure affordable housing opportunities; • The types of the jobs created to date (e.g., wage scale or full or part-time) and what portion of the new jobs are "basic" (non-local); and • The relationship of the Affordable Housing Program to local, State, and national economic or market trends and financing availability. <p>"Following consideration of all public testimony, written materials, and recommendations of County staff and the Planning Commission, the Board shall decide on a course of action to address the affordable housing issue. Although the Board may take whatever action it deems appropriate to further affordable housing goals, the Board shall focus on taking one or more of the following actions:</p> <p>"(1) Find that no action is necessary and direct County staff to continue processing applications for the construction of additional residential units in the project as before; or</p> <p>"(2) Direct County staff to continue processing applications for the construction of additional residential units in the project according to revised Affordable Housing targets that will ensure that the Affordable Housing goals will be substantially met in the future; and/or</p>	

	<p>"(3) Recommend that certain actions be taken by the master developer, other developers, and/or by the MHHTF Board to increase the number and/or type of affordable units; and/or</p> <p>"(4) Direct County Staff to prepare a study for Board consideration and action that assesses the impacts of certain specified amendments to the Master Plan to achieve affordable housing goals (e.g., revising residential densities, adjusting the affordable housing fee, restructuring the Affordable Housing Program, etc.); and/or</p> <p>"(5) Approve future Specific Plans only if it can be demonstrated that the community will reach affordable housing targets.</p> <p>"Any proposed action by the Board that would constrain residential development shall require the preparation of a study for Board consideration and action that assesses the impacts on affected parties (e.g., the CSD, CFDs, private developers, bond shareholders, the County). This study shall also consider potential undesirable consequences arising from such Board action (e.g., interruption in the flow of affordable housing fees into the MHHTF possibly adversely affecting new affordable housing development)."</p> <p>(g) Guideline e) under Monitoring and Enforcement should be moved to become two Implementations under Objective 2. Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing (Appendix C) and should be revised as follows:</p> <p>"Redesignation of higher density residential land (e.g., multi-family R/H) to lower density land (e.g., single family R/M) uses shall be approved only if the County determines that the proposed redesignation or rezoning will not have a negative impact on the Mountain House Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing programs.</p> <p>"Subject to the provisions of Section 3.3: Land Use Regulations and Permitted Uses, residential densities in each land use category shall not fall below a specified minimum number of dwelling units per acre by neighborhood as indicated in Table 3.3: Maximum and Minimum Residential Units by Neighborhood."</p>	
<p>■ PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>M4.10-1 Public and environmental health may be affected by potential historic pesticide and/or herbicide residues in the environment, as well as by future pesticide and/or herbicide applications off-site.</p>	<p>M4.10-1</p> <p>(a) The following Implementation should be included under Objective 2 in Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C):</p> <p>"b) In anticipation of the development of specific areas, pesticide and/or herbicide applications shall be reduced or eliminated six months prior to Development Permit submittal."</p> <p>(b) The following Implementation under Objective 2 in Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C) should be added:</p> <p>"c) Aerial spraying shall be restricted within 500 feet of the nearest dwelling along the western site boundary."</p> <p>(c) Implementation b) under Objective 6 in Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C) should be revised as follows:</p> <p>"b) Site Searches. Prior to the submittal of any Development Permit for areas to be developed, the property owner shall submit a Site Assessment prepared in accordance with ASTM standards to assess the presence of any fuel..."</p>	1
<p>M4.10-2 Potential health impacts may result from public exposure to PCBs associated with transformers or electromagnetic fields associated with overhead electrical lines.</p>	<p>M4.10-2</p> <p>The following measures are recommended to be added as Implementations under Objective 2 in Electric and Magnetic Fields (Appendix C):</p> <p>"d) Prior to development permit submittal for areas containing electrical transformers, the developer shall request that PG&E investigate whether existing electrical transformers on the site contain PCBs and whether there are any records of spills from such equipment. If PCB-containing equipment (50 to 500 parts per million PCBs in the oil) or PCB equipment (over 500 parts per million) were identified, this equipment shall be replaced with non-PCB containing equipment prior to construction. Any identified spill areas shall be evaluated for cleanup.</p> <p>"e) An information packet shall be prepared by the developer; the packet shall include a summary of major studies regarding EMF effects and a list of reference studies, with copies available to residents upon request. The information packet shall be updated annually.</p>	1

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Population, Housing, and Employment

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation:
<p>M4.10-3 Asbestos, if present in existing farm structures, could cause adverse health impacts to workers during renovation and/or demolition.</p>	<p>"f) Any metal structures or objects located within and adjacent to transmission line easements shall be grounded to avoid nuisance induction effects such as shocks (experienced upon initial contact)."</p> <p>M4.10-3 The following are recommended to be added as Objective 7 to the Draft Master Plan under Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C):</p> <p>"Objective: "To protect the public from exposure to asbestos-containing materials.</p> <p>"Policy: "Demolition or renovation of structures that were built prior to the 1970s or are suspected to incorporate asbestos-containing materials shall be surveyed and abated as required by State and County guidelines and regulations.</p> <p>"Implementation: "a) Structures that would be removed or renovated as part of the project shall be screened or surveyed for the presence of asbestos-containing materials. Removal of structures shall only occur after obtaining a demolition release form from SJVUAPCD and a demolition permit approved by the Planning Division of the Community Development and Environmental Health Department. If asbestos were present, renovation and/or demolition shall be undertaken only by licensed asbestos abatement contractors trained in proper asbestos removal and disposal procedures.</p> <p>"b) A demolition permit, to be approved by the County Community Development Department and the Environmental Health Department, shall be required prior to all proposed building demolition."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.10-4 Materials disposed of at the small household landfill on the site may affect soil and groundwater quality.</p>	<p>M4.10-4 The following is recommended to be added as an Implementation under Objective 6 in Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C):</p> <p>"d) It must be demonstrated that disposed materials currently in the on-site landfill do not constitute a health or environmental hazard. Such demonstration shall be achieved through removal of disposed material in conjunction with soil sampling and groundwater sampling prior to construction in and within 500 feet of the affected area(s) to ensure minimum exposure to nearby residents and provide access for possible remediation activities, if needed."</p> <p>Alternatively, a health risk assessment could be performed to determine whether an engineered cap would effectively mitigate environmental and public health impacts associated with the landfill.</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.10-5 Open water bodies within the project site could provide active breeding sites for mosquitoes, potentially causing an environmental nuisance condition and disease transmission.</p>	<p>M4.10-5 The following Implementation should be added under Objective 1 in Mosquito Abatement (Appendix C):</p> <p>"a) The Flood Control/Storm Drainage Plans shall include general criteria and standards for implementation schedules and maintenance requirements for all wetland open bodies of water within the specific plan area. Implementation and maintenance schedules shall be approved by the Mosquito Abatement District prior to the construction of the improvements and shall include Mosquito Abatement operations to be assumed by the District."</p>	<p>I</p>

<p>M4.10-6</p> <p>The development of the project may increase the potential for public exposure to explosives, fire, or the release of materials during railway accidents on the railway line crossing the northern portion of the project site.</p>	<p>The following Implementation should be added to the Mosquito Abatement Program (Appendix 6-A of the Draft Master Plan):</p> <p>"m) Implementation and Maintenance Schedules. Construction plans for any detention basins and any plans for wetland enhancement/maintenance shall include implementation and maintenance schedules. Implementation and maintenance plans shall be developed in consultation with the Mosquito Abatement District."</p>	<p>M4.10-6</p> <p>(a) Policy a) under Objective 1 in Emergency Preparedness should be modified as follows:</p> <p>"a) Safety and protection services shall be provided to the community in the event of fire and natural disasters (including flooding and earthquakes), and emergencies resulting from accidents, including emergencies involving releases of hazardous materials."</p> <p>(b) Implementation b) under Objective 1 in Emergency Preparedness should be modified as follows:</p> <p>"b) Natural Disaster Response. Response shall be by Fire District staff with backup by OES staff. Earthquake preparedness and flood response training shall be an integral part of the Incident Action Plan."</p> <p>(c) The following should be added to Emergency Preparedness (Appendix C):</p> <p>"Objective: "To be prepared to respond to emergencies, including those involving releases of hazardous materials, associated with freight transport along railroads." "Policy: Emergency response shall be provided for the community for the protection of the public." "Implementation: "a) Specific plans shall establish buffer zones between structures proposed in areas adjacent to railroads and the track right-of-way to reduce potential public safety impacts from railway accidents. The specific plan for Neighborhood J shall include safety criteria for determining buffer zone widths north of Byron Road where residential uses are proposed. "b) Specific plans shall contain requirements for businesses and public institutions located adjacent to the railway buffer zones to maintain emergency contingency and evacuation plans in the event of a railway accident. "c) The Incident Action Plan for the project shall include a component on emergency response to railway accidents, including those involving releases of hazardous materials. This component shall be consistent with emergency response programs developed by owners of the railway right-of-way. The Incident Action Plan for the project shall be prepared in cooperation with the County Office of Emergency Services and completed prior to submittal of the first Development Permit for specific plan areas adjacent to railroad rights-of-way for all land uses."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.10-7</p> <p>Increased development along the natural gas pipelines traversing the site could increase the risk of pipeline rupture and fire or explosion which could result in death and injury or property damage.</p>	<p>M4.10-7</p> <p>(a) The following Objective, Policy, and Implementation are recommended to be added to Potential Site Hazards (Appendix C):</p> <p>"Objective: "To minimize the risk of human injury or property damage in the event of an explosion and/or fire at a natural gas pipeline." "Policy: "A Pipeline Safety Plan shall be part of the Incident Action Plan, developed to minimize risks associated with natural gas pipelines within the project site."</p>	<p>I</p>	

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Population, Housing, and Employment

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>M4.10-8 Improperly abandoned wells, wells without appropriate sanitary seals, and agricultural canals may act as conduits for agricultural chemical migration, potentially affecting surface and groundwater quality, or may represent a safety hazard.</p>	<p>Implementation: "a) Building sites within 220 yards of high pressure gas pipelines shall be chosen to minimize the risk of human injury or property damage in the event of an explosion and/or fire at the pipeline. The project densities in the vicinity of the pipelines should be limited to those allowed for a Class I Location designation, which corresponds to a density of 10 or fewer buildings intended for occupancy within an area of 220 yards on either side of the centerline of any continuous one-mile length of natural gas pipeline. Alternatively, the Class Location designation should be revised by the PUC and alternative routes for future gas pipelines should be identified by the developer and approved by the PUC. "b) Vapor barriers and/or vents shall be included in designs for utility trenches that are not under the jurisdiction of the PUC crossing or within 100 feet of the high pressure gas pipelines to reduce the potential for the migration and accumulation of gas, leaked from a pipeline, in utility trenches. The design of the utility trenches shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Department of Public Works prior to final map approval."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.10-8 The following Implementations are recommended to be added to the Draft Master Plan under Objective 2 in Potential Site Hazards: "d) A component of the required site assessment for pesticide and herbicide residues shall include an investigation of the location and condition of currently used and abandoned water wells. Wells in use that do not have appropriate sanitary seals shall be retrofitted to protect groundwater quality. Wells that are no longer in use shall be properly abandoned by a licensed well driller. All necessary work shall be completed prior to construction. "e) On-site agricultural canals and ditches, used to convey water from BBID, as well as the Delta-Mendota Canal, will be properly fenced and screened by the developer, as may be required by BBID to eliminate site hazards and to prohibit interference with water flow to agricultural BBID customers."</p>	<p>M4.10-8 The following Implementations are recommended to be added to the Draft Master Plan under Objective 2 in Potential Site Hazards: "d) A component of the required site assessment for pesticide and herbicide residues shall include an investigation of the location and condition of currently used and abandoned water wells. Wells in use that do not have appropriate sanitary seals shall be retrofitted to protect groundwater quality. Wells that are no longer in use shall be properly abandoned by a licensed well driller. All necessary work shall be completed prior to construction. "e) On-site agricultural canals and ditches, used to convey water from BBID, as well as the Delta-Mendota Canal, will be properly fenced and screened by the developer, as may be required by BBID to eliminate site hazards and to prohibit interference with water flow to agricultural BBID customers."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>■ BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>		
<p>M4.11-1 Project implementation would result in the elimination of over 4,000 acres of agricultural land and associated wildlife habitat on the site.</p>	<p>M4.11-1 Specific measures recommended to mitigate potential adverse impacts on San Joaquin kit fox, Swainson's hawk, other special-status taxa, the Mountain House Creek corridor, wetland features, and habitat associated with Old River would serve to partially mitigate the loss of existing wildlife habitat. However, the loss of over 4,000 acres of wildlife habitat is an unavoidable adverse impact, which cannot be fully mitigated to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>M4.11-2 Project implementation would result in elimination of suitable on-site foraging and dispersal habitat for San Joaquin kit fox.</p>	<p>M4.11-2 (a) The Draft Master Plan provisions related to San Joaquin kit fox should be revised and amended, based on the results of further negotiation with representatives of the USFWS and the CDFG. The revised Draft Master Plan should provide a coordinated approach to addressing the concerns of jurisdictional agencies. Adjacent agricultural lands in Alameda County may be considered as a suitable off-site mitigation area for San Joaquin kit fox, except for any wastewater storage ponds. Alternatively, mitigation lands within the "Core Conservation Area" identified in the County's draft HCP could be acquired by the applicant. Approval of the Draft Master Plan should be contingent on subsequent revisions necessary to comply with San Joaquin County General Plan 2010 policies regarding habitat protection and any possible requirements of jurisdictional agencies, pursuant to the provisions of the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts.</p>	<p>I</p>

If required by jurisdictional agencies, an incidental take permit and a Habitat Management Agreement for San Joaquin kit fox should be obtained by the project applicant, or by subsequent applicants for other specific plans within the project, or by subsequent applicants of individual Tentative Maps. A copy of any and all fully executed permits and/or management agreements should be submitted to the San Joaquin County Community Development Department prior to the issuance of any Development Permit, construction permits, or building permits, or initiation of any improvements such as construction of water or wastewater treatment plants, whichever occurs first.

(b) The Draft Master Plan provisions regarding kit fox should be revised to reflect the position of jurisdictional agencies and the likelihood that an incidental take permit would be required from the USFWS and a Habitat Management Agreement would be required from the CDFG before grading or other modifications to the site would be allowed. Revisions should be made to the relevant discussion, assumptions, policies, and implementation measures in section 7.3.3 of the Draft Master Plan and "The San Joaquin Kit Fox Report" contained in Appendix 7-D to reflect these likely requirements. These should include the following:

- Revise Assumption 7.3.3-1 b) of the Draft Master Plan, and Policy a) and Implementation a) for Objective 3 of Biological Resource Management section (Appendix C) to reflect that compensation for loss of suitable kit fox habitat could include off-site mitigation and/or other requirements to comply with the provisions of Section 10(a) of the Federal Endangered Species Act and Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code.
- Revise Implementation a) for Objective 3 of Biological Resource Management section (Appendix C) to indicate that the proposed "Kit Fox Pre-construction and Construction Protocol" contained in Appendix 7-F should be reviewed and meet with the approval of the USFWS and the CDFG, and that these protocol shall apply until jurisdictional agencies determine that their implementation is no longer required to prevent harm or injury to kit fox. A copy of the revised protocol should be submitted to the San Joaquin County Community Development Department, together with the written approval of jurisdictional agencies, prior to issuance of any construction permit or initiation of site improvements, whichever comes first.

(c) The proposed "Kit Fox Pre-construction and Construction Protocol" contained in Appendix 7-F of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to provide greater consistency with the preconstruction, construction, and operational recommendations specified in the survey report by BioSystems (1992), and at minimum should meet the "Standardized Recommendations of the Protection of the San Joaquin Kit Fox" (USFWS, 1989). This should include the following:

- Revise Pre-construction Protocol Measure 1 to adjust the pre-construction survey period from "six (6) months" to "within 60 days" prior to initiation of any construction activity, and to include the USFWS in the required notification of survey results within two weeks of completing a survey.
- Revise Pre-construction Protocol Measure 2 to include treatment of both known and "potential" kit fox dens encountered during pre-construction surveys. This should include provisions related to monitoring of den status (Measure 2a), den destruction (Measure 2b), and establishment of a protective exclusion zone if the potential den would not be destroyed by grading or other development activities (Measure 2c).
- Revise Pre-construction Protocol Measure 2d to read as follows:

"Prior to destruction of any known kit fox den, the USFWS shall be notified in writing of the intent to destroy the subject den(s), and disposition of the den shall be determined by the USFWS. Destruction of occupied known or suspected natal or pupping dens shall not be permitted during the breeding season (1 November through 31 July), until the den has been vacated or the kit fox pups have dispersed. Adequate measures, including restrictions or curtailment of construction activity and use of exclusion fencing, shall be developed in consultation with the USFWS and implemented to ensure protection of the natal or pupping dens while occupied by kit fox pups."

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Biological Resources

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>M4.11-3 Project implementation would result in elimination of all existing and potential on-site foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise Pre-construction Protocol Measure 2c to delete all references to specific distances for the protective exclusion zone and to indicate that the size (radius) of the zone shall be established in consultation with representatives of the USFWS and CDFG. Revise Construction Protocol Measure 1 to include the following provision at the end of the measure: "If live kit fox are encountered, ramps or structures should be installed immediately, if possible, to allow the animal(s) to escape." Revise Construction Protocol Measure 6 to state that all construction pipes of 4-24 inches in diameter shall be stacked "at least 3.5 feet above ground" prior to use. The end of this measure should include the following provision: "If during inspection, a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe should not be moved, or if necessary should be moved only once to remove it from the path of construction activity, until the kit fox has escaped." Revise Construction Protocol Measure 8 to include the following provisions at the end of the measure: "The designated ecological monitor shall notify USFWS and CDFG in writing within three working days of the findings of any such animal. Notification must include the date, time, and location of the incident, and any other pertinent information. Any kit fox found dead or injured must be turned over immediately to the CDFG for care and analysis." (d) If off-site mitigation is required by jurisdictional agencies, the management practices and habitat enhancement recommendations specified in the survey report by BioSystems (1992) should be incorporated into the habitat management plan to ensure long-term viability of mitigation areas as kit fox habitat. Any deviation from the BioSystems recommendations should be negotiated with representatives of the USFWS and CDFG, with adequate explanation provided to justify them from a biological standpoint. 	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.11-3 Approval of the Draft Master Plan (which includes the HMP) should be contingent on subsequent revisions necessary to comply with San Joaquin County General Plan 2010 policies regarding habitat protection and with Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code and the Habitat Management Agreement required by the CDFG.</p> <p>The Draft Master Plan and proposed HMP provisions regarding compensation for conversion of suitable foraging habitat should be revised to provide greater consistency with the "Draft Mitigation Guidelines for Swainson's Hawks in the Central Valley of California" prepared by the CDFG. Depending on the extent of any on-site preservation and the enhancement associated with off-site mitigation, replacement habitat requirements could be as high as 4,560 acres (includes 300 acres for off-site wastewater storage ponds).</p> <p>Revisions should be made to the relevant assumptions, policies, implementations of the Draft Master Plan, and the "Mountain House Multi-Purpose Habitat Management Plan" (Zentner & Zentner, 1994b). This should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise Assumptions 7.3.1 a) and b) of the Draft Master Plan, and Policy a) and Implementation c) for Objective 2 of Biological Resources Management section (Appendix C) to indicate that acreage requirements for the HMP would be determined through negotiation with CDFG in preparing a Habitat Management Agreement pursuant to Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code. 		

Delete specific references to a limited mitigation requirement of only 1,500 acres throughout the Draft Master Plan and revise the proposed HMP to indicate that an estimated 4,240 acres of on-site habitat could be converted to urban uses. Specific references that should be deleted or revised in the Draft Master Plan include: Assumptions 7.3.1 a) and b), Assumption 7.3.2 a), Table 7.3, and Figure 7.8 of the Draft Master Plan, as well as Policy a) for Objective 2 of Biological Resources Management section (Appendix C).

Resolve acceptability of establishing mitigation credit prescription ratios for foraging habitat based on proximity of mitigation lands to an active nest rather than distance of lost habitat from an active nest with the CDFG, and revise the proposed Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Program (Table 7-3 of the Draft Master Plan) accordingly. If the proposed approach is considered acceptable by the CDFG, mitigation ratios indicated in the Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Program should be revised. The proposed establishment of mitigation land greater than 10 miles from an active nest should be eliminated from the Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Program and deleted from Table 7-3 of the Draft Master Plan as these lands would have highly limited value to nesting pairs due to their distance from an active nest.

Resolve acceptability of establishing mitigation credit for nesting habitat, and as directed by the CDFG delete or revise the specified acreage ratios defined in the Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Program of the proposed HMP (Table 7.3 of the Draft Master Plan) for existing and potential nesting habitat.

Revise the relevant text of the Draft Master Plan and the proposed HMP regarding Swainson's hawk nesting habitat to reflect more recent data on distribution of nesting locations in the project vicinity, including the active nests on the site during the 1994 breeding season, that nesting locations change to varying degrees over time as new breeding pairs enter an area or disturbance factors reduce the suitability of historic nest locations, and the fact that trees on the site could be used for nesting in the future.

Revise the text of the Draft Master Plan and the proposed HMP to provide for preservation or adequate mitigation for loss of the active Swainson's hawk nests on the site. Adequate development setbacks should be provided around the active nest along Old River to ensure its long-term suitability for nesting, which may include establishment of permanent foraging habitat on the site. The land area of the proposed Regional Park along Old River should be expanded, as necessary, to provide for the protection of the nest and surrounding foraging habitat, with additional policies and implementations included in the Old River Regional Park section of the Draft Master Plan to prevent possible disturbance associated with recreational use of the parklands. This should also include provisions to prohibit or intensively monitor any disturbance, construction, or other project-related activities within 1/2 mile which may cause nest abandonment or forced fledging if the nest is in active use in future years. Details regarding appropriate setbacks, monitoring requirements, and development restrictions around an active nest, as well as appropriate mitigation if the active nest in the center of the site is lost, should be defined in consultation with the CDFG.

Revise Implementation g) for Objective 1 of Biological Resources Management section (Appendix C) and the proposed HMP to indicate that unacceptable crop types would not be planted on mitigation lands and that a mechanism would be established to ensure a minimum level of high-quality foraging habitat (i.e., alfalfa). Unacceptable crop types to be specified in the HMP should include vineyard, orchard, cotton, and other crop types where prey are inaccessible to foraging hawks. A mechanism to ensure that minimum acreage requirements for suitable foraging crop types are met is particularly important if unsuitable crops such as silage corn are to be permitted as part of crop rotation in the mitigation lands. A minimum acreage requirement for alfalfa within the mitigation area should be coordinated with the CDFG. Acreage devoted to alfalfa on mitigation lands should at a minimum meet the average for the project site, estimated at 41 percent, based on cropping patterns for 1989, 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Revise Implementation h) for Objective 1 of Biological Resources Management section (Appendix C) and the proposed HMP to indicate that use of rodenticide shall only be allowed when small mammal levels pose a serious threat to agricultural crops and populations levels reach a specified threshold. This threshold and procedures to determine and implement remedial action should be coordinated with the CDFG. A mean of 20 burrows per 100 feet were observed in alfalfa fields during the survey by BioSystems (1992) and would be a more acceptable threshold before use of rodenticides should be permitted.

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Biological Resources

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>M4.11-4 In addition to San Joaquin kit fox and Swainson's hawk, proposed development would affect a number of other special-status taxa.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise Assumption 7.3.2 c) of the Draft Master Plan to indicate that mitigated land dedicated as part of a specific Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Program needs to be at least 100 acres in size, consistent with the proposed HMP. Revise the proposed HMP to include information on all mitigation options, overall phasing and monitoring of all mitigation lands established as part of each specific Swainson's Hawk Mitigation Program, and relationship of implementing the specific programs to phasing of improvements associated with wastewater reuse. <p>A take permit or Habitat Management Agreement for loss of Swainson's hawk habitat should be obtained by the applicant, pursuant to Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code. A copy of the fully executed habitat management agreement with the CDFG should be submitted to the San Joaquin County Community Development Department prior to the issuance of any Development Permit, construction permit, or building permit, or initiation of any improvements such as construction of water or wastewater treatment plants, whichever occurs first.</p> <p>(h) The proposed HMP should be revised to include a combination of on-site habitat preservation and off-site replacement. Ideally, the entire area north of Byron Road, containing approximately 1,500 acres, should be set aside as an agricultural preserve to be enhanced and managed for Swainson's hawk and other protected wildlife species, with the required replacement habitat provided at a ratio negotiated and approved by the CDFG, and any additional compensation provided in the immediate vicinity off-site.</p> <p>As an alternative to a combination of on- and off-site habitat mitigation, Fabian Tract would be the preferred off-site mitigation area, due to its location within the Delta system, proximity to active nesting territories, and presence of existing and potential foraging habitat.</p> <p>With the possible exception of the area north of Byron Road, which is currently not within the boundary of the proposed secondary wastewater reuse area, the adjacent lands in Alameda County should not be used as mitigation lands for loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat on the site. The proposed alternative permanent reclamation area in Alameda County is unsuitable for Swainson's hawk mitigation due to its distance from Old River and the Delta system, lack of nesting habitat in close proximity to the area, potential conflicts with habitat requirements of other special-status taxa such as kit fox, and ultimate separation from other foraging habitat as the Mountain House project is implemented. Reference to use of adjacent lands in Alameda County as mitigation lands for loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat should be deleted from the Draft Master Plan and proposed HMP unless the mitigation area is restricted to north of Byron Road.</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.11-4 In addition to San Joaquin kit fox and Swainson's hawk, proposed development would affect a number of other special-status taxa.</p>	<p>M4.11-4</p> <p>(a) To provide for protection of any populations of special-status species along the Old River frontage of the site, the following should be included as part of the Parks and Open Space Master Plan as an additional implementation for Objective 4 of Biological Resources Management section (Appendix C):</p> <p>"j) A habitat protection plan shall be prepared for the population of Mason's lilaeopsis in the northwestern portion of the site prior to approval of the first specific plan adjacent to Old River in this area. The habitat protection plan shall be prepared by a qualified plant ecologist in consultation with and which meets with the approval of representatives of the USFWS and CDFG. The plan shall provide for the protection of identified populations, addressing potential impacts associated with boating, marina development, water diversion, storm drainage runoff, levee modifications, and recreational use of levee habitat.</p>	<p>I</p>

<p>M4.11-5 The project would block the movement of most terrestrial species between the eastern base of the Allamont Hills and the Delta-farmland region to the east.</p>	<p>"k) A habitat protection plan for Mason's lilaeopsis and other special-status taxa which may be encountered during further detailed surveys, shall be prepared prior to approval of any specific plan along Old River. Other special-status taxa of concern include delta smelt, Sacramento splittail, winter-run chinook salmon, and California hibiscus.</p> <p>"l) A survey shall be conducted along the banks of Old River to confirm the presence or absence of the California hibiscus on the site, prior to approval of any specific plan which could affect Old River. The survey shall preferably be conducted by a qualified botanist during the blooming period of this species, in August and September. If populations of this species are encountered, a habitat protection plan shall be prepared by a qualified plant ecologist in consultation with representatives of the USFWS and CDFG. The plan shall provide for the protection of identified populations, addressing potential impacts associated with boating, marina development, water diversion, storm drainage runoff, levee modifications, and recreational use of levee habitat.</p> <p>"m) A survey shall be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of delta smelt, winter-run chinook salmon, and Sacramento splittail along the river segment bordering the site, prior to approval of any specific plan which could affect Old River. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified fishery biologist using an otter trawl at intervals along the river segment during the spring spawning season and during migration periods. If any of the species is detected, a habitat protection plan should be prepared by a qualified fisheries biologist in consultation with and which meets with the approval of representatives of the USFWS and CDFG. The plan shall provide for the protection and enhancement of existing habitat conditions, addressing potential impacts associated with boating, marina development, water diversion, storm drainage runoff, levee modifications, and recreational use of levee habitat."</p> <p>(b) Several aspects of the Draft Master Plan provisions regarding Other Special-Status Species should be revised to ensure protection of active nests and compliance with applicable State and Federal regulations, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Implementation b) for Objective 4 of Biological Resources Management (Appendix C) to include pre-construction raptor surveys along the Old River frontage of the site as well. • Revise Implementation c) for Objective 4 of Biological Resources Management to indicate that any relocation of an active burrowing owl nest should be performed in accordance with CDFG guidelines and that a permit must be obtained prior to any disturbance to the nest. • Revise Implementation i) for Objective 4 of Biological Resources Management to indicate that pre-construction raptor and burrowing owl surveys would still be required to protect active nests until young birds have fledged even if an applicant participates in the HMP or other conservation plan. <p>M4.11-5</p> <p>(a) The Mountain House Creek Planting and Restoration Measures contained in Appendix 7-A to the Draft Master Plan, referred to in Implementations l), n), dd), ee), and ff) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation section (Appendix C), should be expanded to include provisions for monitoring, replacement plantings, and re-evaluation of the restoration plan, similar to the provisions contained on pages 27-33 of the "Mountain House Creek Phase One Habitat Restoration Plan" (Zentner & Zentner, 1993c).</p> <p>Several aspects of Draft Master Plan provisions regarding Mountain House Creek should be revised to ensure successful implementation of proposed restoration and enhancement efforts, provide for establishment of protective cover prior to development of adjacent lands, and to limit disturbance to wildlife along the enhanced corridor. This should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Implementation p) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) to read as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "p) The restored Mountain House Creek corridor shall accommodate a multi-purpose trail along one side of the creek, but other recreational uses such as picnic areas, playgrounds, and turf shall be restricted outside the corridor to minimize human activity within sensitive wildlife habitat. The location of the multi-use path can vary from either side of the Creek, but the opposite side of the Creek corridor shall remain without a paved path to limit disturbance to wildlife."
	<p>I</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Biological Resources

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Implementation q) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) to read as follows: <p>"q) Active recreational uses may be located along the perimeter of the corridor, but shall require additional land area separate from the minimum corridor width of 200 feet. Trails shall meander on the outside edge of the corridor, encroaching no closer than 50 feet from the creek channel or other surface water features, providing views of the creek and a sense of community participation without degrading the wildlife habitat value of the corridor."</p> • Revise Implementation s) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) to read as follows: <p>"s) Recreational activities shall be buffered from wetlands and sensitive wildlife habitat along the Creek. These buffers may include vegetative screens or hedges composed of native plant materials which allow views but discourage access to sensitive areas."</p> • Revise Implementation u) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) to read as follows: <p>"u) A post-and-cable or similar barrier shall be provided along all Creek corridor edges which front public spaces such as roads. 'Good neighbor' fencing (open fencing promoting views of the corridor) shall be used to minimize the potential for dumping of debris and yard clippings into the corridor where private residential and commercial uses border the Creek and no trail system is proposed."</p> • Merge and revise Implementations w) and x) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) into a single measure to read as follows: <p>"w) A multi-use path shall be constructed along the Creek from Marina Boulevard to Old River. A minimum 16-foot right-of-way shall be reserved for the path. Within the right-of-way, a minimum eight-foot width shall be improved with asphalt, and painted with a center stripe. The path shall be grade-separated where it crosses the SP tracks."</p> • Revise Policy e) for Objective 5 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) to read as follows: <p>"e) Passive recreational uses such as bird watching, nature trails, and observation areas are normally compatible with wetlands and may be permitted adjacent to wetlands. Active recreational uses such as ballfields, paved bike trails, or other such uses shall not be located within or immediately adjacent to wetlands areas."</p> <p>The Mountain House Creek Community Park section of the Draft Master Plan, including Implementation v) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C), should be revised to define timing of the creek restoration component of the park plans during the specific plan phase. Implementation v) should indicate that:</p> <p>"v) All channel modifications, wetland enhancement, and revegetation associated with the Creek restoration component of the park plans shall be funded and implemented as backbone improvements during the specific plan phase and not deferred as a requirement of individual tentative map or phased flood control improvements along the Creek corridor."</p>	

<p>M4.11-6 Development of the project site would eliminate seasonal wetlands and temporarily flooded areas such as irrigated pastures and drainage swales.</p>	<p>(b) All exhibits depicting the creek corridor in the Draft Master Plan should be modified to show a single multi-use path, possible alternating from one to the other side of the corridor as it follows the length of the creek (and should include provisions for access for maintenance vehicles). This should include Figures 7.4 and 7.5 referred to in Implementations b), g), and p) for Objectives 3 and 4 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C).</p> <p>M4.11-6 The Draft Master Plan provisions regarding Wetlands Management should be revised to ensure adequate setbacks from wetlands and coordination with jurisdictional agencies. This should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Policy d) for Objective 5 of Biological Resources Management (Appendix C) to read as follows: "d) Wetlands shall be protected from damage caused by adjoining development. Buildings and structures shall be setback from the edge of wetlands a minimum of 50 feet. This setback distance should be increased where wetlands are of high value, or restoration and enhancement is proposed." • The following should be included as an additional Implementation for Objective 5 of Biological Resources (Appendix C): "j) Any proposed modifications to wetlands or waters of the U.S. should be prepared in consultation with and meet, where required, with the approval of representatives of the Corps and the CDFG prior to approval of any specific plans encompassing these features." 	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.11-7 Construction and operation of the proposed 60-acre marina would impact the productive inshore zone and riparian edge habitat of Old River.</p>	<p>M4.11-7 (a) To ensure adequate protection of the aquatic habitat of Old River, the following should be included as an additional policy for Objective 9 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C): "d) Unless detailed study demonstrates that the potential impacts of the proposed marina on biotic resources could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the proposed 60-acre marina shall be eliminated in favor of a boat launch ramp and day use parking lot for the private use of the residents of the new community. This facility could be fashioned along the lines of other San Joaquin County public use ramps and picnic areas such as those located off Manley Road in the Mossdale area and at the end of Dos Reis Road west of Lathrop. This mitigation would provide easy access to the Delta system for the residents of Mountain House New Town while at the same time eliminate many of the potential hazards to the Old River aquatic system caused by a marina operation. Recommended further study shall be conducted as part of the environmental review for the specific plan encompassing the marina area."</p> <p>(b) Implementation b) for Objective 9 of Parks and Recreation (Appendix C) should be expanded to include provisions to minimize disturbance to fish and wildlife habitat of Old River, prevent water quality degradation, and conduct further detailed surveys for special-status taxa as recommended in Mitigation Measures 4.11-4(a), (b), and (c).</p> <p>(c) To minimize disturbance to wildlife and riparian habitat along Old River, the following should be included at the end of Implementation f) for Objective 6 of Parks and Recreation section (Appendix C): "... This shall include signage along the length of the site fronting Old River, limiting boat speeds to 5 mph to prevent disturbance to wildlife and riparian habitat."</p>	<p>I</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Biological Resources

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>M4.11-8 Off-site improvements, such as the raw water conveyance pipeline and pumping facilities, wastewater storage ponds, and application of wastewater irrigation could adversely affect sensitive biological resources.</p>	<p>M4.11-8 (a) Detailed field surveys of any proposed off-site mitigation locations should be conducted by a qualified biological consultant to determine the presence of any special-status taxa, sensitive natural communities, or wetland resources. Surveys for special status taxa should focus on the presence of critical habitat features (i.e., nest and den locations of highly mobile species, and breeding habitat for amphibians and insect taxa of concern) which could be adversely affected by construction of the wastewater storage ponds, conveyance pipelines, and other improvements. If sensitive resources are encountered, proposed improvements should be modified, and as necessary, to provide compliance with the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts, a habitat protection plan should be prepared by a qualified biologist in consultation with representatives of the USFWS and CDFG. These provisions could include appropriate setbacks and construction restrictions from a nest or den during the breeding season for the taxa of concern, or relocation of proposed structural improvements such as storage ponds or pipeline alignments. (b) Also refer to mitigation measures in Section 4.4.2 of this DEIR. Wastewater, for additional provisions to adequately monitor and adjust the proposed effluent reuse plan to prevent excessive levels of salts and metals in wastewater irrigation.</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>■ TRANSPORTATION</p>		
<p>M4.12-1 At buildout, the project would generate approximately 273,000 daily vehicle trips to, from, or within the site. The added vehicle trips would contribute significantly to projected traffic growth, increases in vehicle miles traveled, and LOS deficiencies on the road system, particularly in the vicinity of the site. Some of these associated impacts would be unavoidable. The project would also generate the need for public transit services to, from, and within the site. Since transit services are proposed in the Master Plan to accommodate the projected transit ridership, this trip generation impact is not significant or unavoidable.</p>	<p>M4.12-1 (a) The County should prepare and implement a countywide Transportation Systems Management (TSM) program to promote and facilitate use of alternative modes to the single-occupant vehicle within the County. The program should include measures such as continuation and expansion of the County rideshare program, transportation coordinators at employment sites, provision of park-and-ride lots throughout the County, and development of a network of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on corridors of high travel demand. (b) The Transportation Management Association (TMA) should promote, with State and County assistance, lanes for priority HOV access to/from the project site (e.g., HOV bypass lanes at metered on-ramps to I-580 at Grant Line Road, and at on-ramps to I-205 at Patterson Pass Road). The TMA should promote the construction of HOV lanes when I-205 is widened. A policy stating this commitment should be added under Freeway Improvements and TDM Measures (Appendix C). (c) Local transit service (using clean fuel-transit buses, if feasible) proposed in the Draft Master Plan should be increased, with more frequent service during peak periods to facilitate non-vehicle travel on internal roads, and more direct routing to destinations and fewer transfers than proposed in the Draft Master Plan. (d) A new Policy should be added under Commercial Objective 2 (Appendix C): "f) Neighborhood commercial areas shall be located so as to optimize accessibility for local pedestrians and cyclists, and to reduce automobile trips." A new Implementation should be added under Commercial Objective 2 (Appendix C): "c) Neighborhood commercial areas shall be sited so that as many homes as possible are located within one-quarter mile walk of the closest neighborhood or community shopping area."</p>	<p>SU</p>

(e) To reduce peak hour vehicle trip generation, employers should be encouraged to provide flexible work hour programs and/or "9/80" and "4/40" week schedules. This mitigation measure should be added as an implementation to the Transportation Demand Management section (Appendix C).

(f) The Draft Master Plan should be amended with a policy in the Transportation Demand Management section under Objective 1 (Appendix C), as follows:

"j) Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines shall be considered in the design of each neighborhood center. Review and approval of TOD provisions by the County Community Development Department shall be required prior to approval of the first Development Permit."

(g) Implementation c) under Objective 2 in Transit (Appendix C) should be amended as follows:

"c) The Community shall contribute on a "fair share" basis to any Altamont Station study. The Community shall contribute a fair share toward the capital costs of building an Altamont Station and to the operating and maintenance costs that are identified. The fair share contribution of the Community toward constructing the station shall be based on ridership projections. Bus Service between the community and the Altamont Station shall be included in the Community's transit commitment."

(h) Implementation c) under Objective 1 in Transportation Demand Management should be revised as follows:

"c) The applicant shall develop an annual Transportation Monitoring Program, which would be conducted at the same time as the annual monitoring for the Jobs/Housing and Affordable Housing Programs. The monitoring program would serve as a means of comparing the actual traffic generated by the project to the traffic projections, and would allow revisions to mitigation measures and trigger points for needed transportation improvements."

The annual reports should identify various data including land use occupancy information, traffic counts, and progress of planned transportation improvements and planning studies such as PSRs. Traffic monitoring should include traffic counts and level of service analysis on all community gateways and other impacted County roads. Adequacy of the near-term trigger points and progress toward implementation of the required transportation improvements should also be reviewed.

Should traffic impacts of the project be found during the annual monitoring to be different (i.e., higher than projected levels), then the County shall hold hearings, receive testimony, make findings, and take appropriate action. The County shall adopt findings related to whether the adopted trigger points for transportation improvements and the project's fair share of costs should be revised to ensure the timely construction of needed improvements, as a condition of further development approvals."

(i) The following Implementation should be added under Objectives 2 and 3 of Telecommunication Systems (Appendix C):

"b) One or more telecommuting centers furnished with satellite telecommunication devices and computer equipment shall be constructed within the project site to reduce commuting to off-site locations."

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Transportation

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>M4.12-2 Within 10 miles of the site, the project would typically increase traffic volumes on I-205, I-580 and I-5 by 10,000-23,000 daily vehicles over levels projected in 2010 without the project, representing increases of 8-20 percent. These traffic increases would exacerbate highly deficient levels of service already projected at some locations in 2010 without the project, and would increase the extent and duration of traffic congestion on these freeways. Most of the projected traffic impacts on I-205 could potentially be mitigated with regional improvements, but the impacts on I-580 west of I-205 and on I-5 north of I-205 are unavoidable.</p>	<p>M4.12-2 The mitigation measures should be implemented to reduce impacts of the project on freeways, however, the impact would remain an unavoidable adverse impact. Three Implementations should be included under Objective 1 in Freeway Improvements (Appendix C), as follows: "d) The project shall fund its fair share of the cost of widening I-205 from four lanes to six lanes, and from six lanes to eight lanes between I-580 and I-5, either as HOV lanes or mixed flow lanes. As an alternative to widening the I-205 freeway beyond 6 lanes, the project sponsor shall contribute a fair share to development of a parallel east-west roadway system north of I-205, extending between Mountain House and the City of Lathrop's Gold Rush City development, including the necessary multi-jurisdictional alternative/feasibility studies. "e) As an alternative to widening the I-580 freeway, the project sponsor shall contribute a fair share to safety and operational improvements and/or to the widening of Altamont Pass Road west of Grant Line Road to four lanes (as HOV or truck lanes), if determined to be consistent with Alameda County policy. "f) The Public Financing Plan shall reflect the most current cost estimates and agreed upon fair share contributions, based on refined San Joaquin County Travel Model estimates."</p>	<p>SU</p>
<p>M4.12-3 The project would increase traffic volumes on freeway interchanges near the site and would require interchange improvements at Grant Line Road/I-580, Patterson Pass Road/I-205 and Patterson Pass Road/I-580.</p>	<p>M4.12-3 (a) Table 9.1 in the Draft Master Plan, Schedule of Freeway Interchange Improvements, should be expanded to add "Upgrade interchange, PPR/I580" with a footnote indicating that "Extent and phasing of improvements to be determined prior to approval of second Specific Plan." (b) Table 9.1 in the Draft Master Plan should be expanded to include a PSR for Grant Line/I-580 interchange improvements and a trigger point for its completion. The PSR should explicitly consider other planned projects affecting the interchange such as truck climbing lanes. (c) Two Implementations should be added under Freeway Improvements (Appendix C) as follows: "Interchange improvements on I-205 and on I-580 (west of I-205 junction) shall provide for ramp metering with HOV bypass lanes." "Prior to approval of the first Development Permit in Specific Plan I and prior to approval of each subsequent Specific Plan, the County shall review and, if appropriate, revise the trigger points listed in Table 9.1 of the Draft Master Plan. These reviews shall use the latest version of the COG Travel Model and most current projections of growth, and shall be funded by the applicant."</p>	<p>I</p>

M4.12-4

The project would contribute to the need for improvements on several County and other roads in the project vicinity, including portions of Grant Line Road, Patterson Pass Road, Byron Highway, Altamont Pass Road, 11th Street, State Route 4, and Tracy Boulevard leading to SR 4. Most of these impacts could be mitigated by widening or upgrading the roadways to increase their capacities.

M4.12-4

(a) Policy f) under Objective 1 in County Arterials should be amended to specifically call out 11th Street, Grant Line Road (east), Altamont Pass Road, and Byron Highway, as follows:

"f) The community shall, to the extent of its fair share, participate in appropriate traffic studies and improvement measures with other counties or cities whose roadways are impacted by the community. The specific roadway improvements that should be studied include 11th Street and Grant Line Road (east of Patterson) (City of Tracy), Altamont Pass Road (Alameda County), and Byron Highway (Alameda and Contra Costa counties). Where roadway widening for additional capacity is not feasible or acceptable, safety and operational improvements should be considered in order to better accommodate increased traffic."

(b) Implementation a) under Objective 1 in Transit (Appendix C) should be amended as follows:

"a) . . . No later than occupancy of the twenty-fifth dwelling unit, a service agreement shall be executed to establish bus service between Mountain House and Tracy."

(c) Table 9.2 of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include the realignment of Grant Line Road to form a continuous segment where it meets Byron Road. A trigger point should be established for this improvement. Also, a new Implementation should be added under Objective 1 in County Arterials (Appendix C):

"g) The community shall, to the extent of its fair share, participate in study and implementation of a grade-separated crossing of the existing Southern Pacific railroad tracks at Grant Line Road to accommodate traffic associated with the proposed project and the proposed Tracy regional mall."

(d) Table 9.2 of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include the road segment of Grant Line Road, Patterson Pass Road to the Tracy regional mall. The "Lanes" column should read "To 4", and a trigger point should be established for this improvement. A footnote to Table 9.2, referring to the new segments, should state: "The Master Developer shall provide fair share funding for the widening of Grant Line Road, based on more detailed studies that identify both Mountain House and City of Tracy fair share contributions to the widening."

(e) Table 9.2 of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include Byron Road, east of Lammers Road with a footnote to indicate this improvement would be required if the County does not accept LOS D on this route. The "lane" column should read "To 4" and a trigger point should be established.

(f) Table 9.2 of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include the road segment of Altamont Pass Road, Greenville Road to Grant Line Road. Under the "Lanes" and "Trigger DU's" columns, the notation "n.a." (not applicable) should be entered. A footnote to Table 9.2, referring to the new segment, should state: "Safety and operational improvements may include passing lanes, realignments, and shoulder widening. No additional capacity improvements may be constructed on Altamont Pass Road if it is determined that such improvements would violate Alameda County policy."

(g) Three new Implementations should be added under Objective 1 in County Arterials (Appendix C), as follows:

"h) The community shall, to the extent of its fair share, participate in upgrading of existing pavement sections and/or safety improvements (e.g., standard pavement widths and paved shoulders) on rural roads (such as Bethany, Kelso, Hansen, Von Sostem, Reeve, Middle, and Tracy Boulevard), where necessary to accommodate additional traffic caused by the project."

"i) Prior to initial occupancy of any specific plan, the County shall review and, if appropriate, revise the trigger points listed in Table 9.2 of the Draft Master Plan. These revisions shall use the latest version of the COG Travel Model and most current projections of growth, and shall be funded by the applicant. Revisions shall be incorporated into subsequent specific plans. Improvements shall be constructed at or before issuance of building permits for the number of units specified in the applicable trigger point."

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
<p>M4.12-5 Project-generated trips would result in significant traffic levels on roadways internal to the site, requiring construction of adequately sized internal roadways and intersections to maintain acceptable LOS at buildout of the project.</p>	<p>(j) The community shall submit a Construction Truck Traffic Management Plan to the County prior to the issuance of the first Development Permit. The plan shall identify the preferred routes for trucks bringing construction materials to the site, and shall include measures to ensure compliance by general contractors.</p> <p>(h) The existing footnote to Table 9.2 of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to delete the reference to "the Mountain House EJR traffic model," because it was not used to determine the "trigger DU's." The footnote should also explain that the "Trigger DU's" column refers to when during project buildout the improvements would be completed.</p> <p>M4.12-5 The following revisions should be made under Objective 1 in Arterial Intersections (Appendix C):</p> <p>(a) Implementation c) and the accompanying Figure 9.3 in the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include possible signalization when warranted at the following three intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De Anza Boulevard/Von Sosten • C Street/Mountain House Boulevard • D Street/Mountain House Boulevard <p>(b) Implementation d) should be revised to provide channelization at 18 intersections. Figure 9.3 of the Draft Master Plan should be revised to include channelization at the intersection of Central Parkway and Patterson Pass Road North, where an exclusive westbound left-turn lane should be added.</p> <p>(c) A Policy should be added under Objective 1 in On-Site Roadway Circulation and Design (Appendix C) as follows:</p> <p>"p) Unnecessary cul-de-sacs shall be avoided to ensure that access between adjacent neighborhoods is not restricted."</p> <p>(d) Figure 9.4 of the Draft Master Plan (Roadway Classification Diagram) should be revised to indicate Mascot Boulevard as a minor arterial (4 lanes) from Marina Boulevard to Patterson Pass Road. Figure 9.19 (Mascot Boulevard-Collector) should likewise be revised to reflect the minor arterial designation.</p> <p>(e) For consistency with the Draft Master Plan, and to promote transit/HOV usage and efficient land use, the County should amend its General Plan policy that requires LOS C on all county road segments in the Tracy planning area, as follows: "Permit LOS D on new community gateways that are used as major commute routes, subject to the approval of the county."</p> <p>(f) Amend Table IV-8 (page IV-102) of the General Plan to indicate that major arterials may be up to 8 lanes wide in some segments if needed for capacity and if operationally feasible. Also amend this table to indicate that the daily capacities are approximate only, and may be superseded by more detailed level of service analysis based on peak hour volumes and controlling intersections and will be higher on roadway segments where LOS D is approved by the county.</p> <p>(g) Mitigation Measures M4.2-1 (e) and (f) in the General Plan and Development Title Consistency section of this DEIR call for the conflicting language and standards in the Master Plan transportation chapter to be revised or, <u>alternatively</u>, a General Plan Text Amendment should be submitted that would allow new communities, or projects that have an adopted Master and/or Specific plan, to deviate from the General Plan standards.</p>	<p>I</p>

<p>M4.12-6 The project would generate a significant demand for parking.</p>	<p>M4.12-6 (a) Policy a) under Objective 1 in Vehicular Parking (Appendix C) should be amended as follows: "Within mixed-use districts, including community commercial areas, the shared parking guidelines published by the Urban Land Institute shall be used wherever feasible to reduce total parking supply." (b) A new policy should be added under Objective 1 in Vehicular Parking as follows: 1) "For non-residential uses, use of the minimum parking space requirements shall be encouraged where possible in order to promote use of alternatives to the automobile, subject to completion of a Parking Demand Study for the site use(s)."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.12-7 The project would increase the demand for bicycle travel within the project site as well as between the site and adjacent developed areas.</p>	<p>M4.12-7 Implementation i) under Objective 1 in Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation (Appendix C) should be revised: "The community shall participate on a fair share basis in the planning and implementation of off-site bicycle facilities on and connecting with regional bike routes designated on the County Regional Bicycle Plan within five miles of the project, including those along Grant Line Road, Patterson Pass Road, Byron Road, Schulte Road, and the Edmund G. Brown Aqueduct."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M4.12-8 The project would increase the number of vehicles crossing the existing Southern Pacific railroad track that runs through the site.</p>	<p>M4.12-8 Implementation a) under Objective 3 in Transit (Appendix C) should be revised to include: "... Any proposed new vehicular, pedestrian, or bicycle railroad crossing..."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>AIR QUALITY</p>		
<p>M4.13-1 The project would increase regional emissions of criteria pollutants through new vehicle travel and area-source emissions associated with residential and industrial uses in excess of threshold levels established by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. These emissions would add to the regional emission burdens within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and the adjacent San Francisco Bay Air Basin, and delay eventual attainment of air quality standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter (PM-10).</p>	<p>M4.13-1 (a) The County should incorporate a Countywide requirement for an air quality mitigation fee as part of the Development Title. Such a fee could be imposed when new projects generating more than 200 trips per day are not able to reduce trip generation by at least 25 percent. This fee could be used for air quality mitigation improvements, such as park and ride facilities, transit, vehicle inspection, or old car buy-back programs. (b) Industrial or commercial operations at the project site with equipment that causes or has a potential for air pollution or that controls such air pollution may need to apply for an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate according to regulations of the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. (c) The Implementation under Objective 1 of Houses and Buildings, Air Quality and Transportation Demand Management (Appendix C) shall be revised as follows: "The following items shall be required as conditions of approval of tentative subdivision maps for residential development: "a) Gas Outlets. Natural gas lines outlets shall be provided to backyards to encourage use of natural gas or electric barbecues. "b) Electrical Outlets. 220 volt electrical outlets for recharging electric automobiles shall be provided in each garage. Electrical outlets shall be located on the outside of single family homes to accommodate electric lawn maintenance equipment and electric barbecues. "c) Water Heaters. Low nitrogen oxide (NOx) emitting and/or high efficiency water heaters shall be required for all dwelling units.</p>	<p>SU</p>

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Air Quality

Table 2.1, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation ¹
M4.13-2 The project would increase the potential for nuisance complaints due to adjacent agricultural activities.	"d) Fireplaces. Each single family residence shall have no more than one zero clearance fireplace or free-standing wood stove. Only EPA certified fireplaces and wood stoves shall be installed." M4.13-2 Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.1-2.	I
M4.13-3 The project would increase the potential for odor-related land use conflicts.	M4.13-3 None required.	I
M4.13-4 The project would increase carbon monoxide concentrations along streets and intersections providing access to the project site.	M4.13-4 None required.	I
M4.13-5 Construction activities would generate dust and particulate matter that could exceed the PM-10 threshold of significance.	M4.13-5 The Implementation under Objective 1 in Construction Program for Air Quality (Appendix C) should be amended to include the following: "a) Transport of Materials. All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. "b) Equipment Maintenance. All internal combustion engine driven equipment shall be properly maintained and well tuned according to the manufacturer's specifications."	I
<p>■ NOISE</p>		
M4.14-1 Residential development, schools, and other noise sensitive land uses on the project site would be exposed to excessive traffic noise levels.	M4.14-1 (a) The following Policies should be added under Objective 1, Mobile Source Noise Control: "d) Noise levels in primary outdoor use areas of new residential development, schools, and other noise-sensitive land uses shall not exceed an L_{dn} of 60 dB unless the project design includes effective mitigation measures to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to an L_{dn} of 60 dB. Noise-sensitive land uses include, but are not limited to, schools, group care facilities, hospitals, and park facilities. "e) Interior noise levels for housing proposed to be located in areas exposed to an exterior noise level of an L_{dn} above 60 dB shall be maintained below an L_{dn} of 45 dB. Compliance with this recommended mitigation measure shall be verified prior to issuance of building permits."	I

	<p>(b) The following Implementation should be added under Objective 2 in Mobile Source Noise Control (Noise) (Appendix C):</p> <p>"b) Residential development shall be set back 500 to 600 feet from the centerline of I-205 to ensure that the L_{dn} would be below 60 dB. The exact setback distance shall be determined by additional noise analysis, revising the distances in Table 11.1 in the Draft Master Plan, by assuming six lanes on I-205, not eight. Alternatively, earth berms or soundwalls shall be built between the noise source and the noise-impacted area. Alternatively, noise level reductions to an L_{dn} of 60 dB shall be achieved through site planning and building orientation, construction of earth berms or soundwalls, or a combination of more than one of these methods. Site-specific noise reduction measures shall be determined prior to Development Permit approval."</p> <p>(c) Implementation a) under Objective 2 in Noise (Appendix C) should be replaced with:</p> <p>"Specific Plan and Development Permit Application Requirements. Applications for a specific plan or a Development Permit shall include acoustical studies for noise-sensitive land uses proposed to be located in areas exposed to noise levels above an L_{dn} of 60 dB. These studies shall be submitted to the County with each specific plan. Appropriate mitigation measures shall be recommended in these studies and implemented by the appropriate party to ensure that the L_{dn} of 60 dB is maintained."</p> <p>(d) The following Implementation should be added under Objective 1 in Mobile Sources Noise Control (Noise) (Appendix C):</p> <p>"d) Noise studies for specific residential projects proposed in noise impacted areas (exposed to an L_{dn} above 60 dB) shall address how noise levels in outdoor use areas, such as backyards, patios, decks, and other noise-sensitive land uses could be maintained below an L_{dn} of 60 dB. Noise studies and recommendations shall be submitted with each Tentative Map application."</p> <p>(e) Table 11.1 in the Draft Master Plan should be revised to reflect the most recent average daily traffic projections for I-205 (assuming six lanes in the future, not eight lanes) and for all other roadways.</p>
<p>M4.14-2 Existing residences located adjacent to existing roads in and around the project site would be significantly impacted by project-generated traffic.</p>	<p>M4.14-2 A new Objective, Policy, and Implementation under Mobile Source Noise Control (Noise) (Appendix C) should be added:</p> <p>"Objective: "To minimize impacts on existing residences located along the roads to the Mountain House community.</p> <p>"Policy: "Outdoor use areas of existing residences that are projected to be impacted (i.e., would experience an increase of five dB in the L_{dn}) by project-generated traffic noise at buildout shall be protected from excessive noise. Individual residences could take the form of constructing soundwalls along the roadways, soundproofing homes, or building barriers around specific portions of yards to provide shielded outdoor spaces. Because of the nature of the development in the area, solutions will have to be tailored to each specific situation, based on individual noise studies.</p> <p>"Implementation: "A plan for mitigating noise levels at existing residences shall be submitted with each specific plan application. The plan shall identify the mitigation necessary to reduce exterior noise levels to an L_{dn} of 60 dB and interior noise levels to an L_{dn} of 45 dB or less."</p>

Table 2.1, continued

2.1 MASTER PLAN SUMMARY TABLE
Noise

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Level of Significance After Mitigation:
<p>M4.14-3 Proposed noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to agricultural lands could be significantly impacted by agricultural machinery and equipment noise.</p>	<p>M4.14-3 The following should be added to Implementation a) under Objective 6 under Mobile Source Noise Control (Noise) (Appendix C): "A 500-foot wide on-site or off-site buffer would reduce noise levels generated by agricultural machinery and helicopters by approximately 20 dB and would significantly reduce the potential for noise impacts." Alternatively, "Helicopter use shall not be permitted within 500 feet of the nearest residential dwelling along the western site boundary."</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>M.14-4 Noise levels generated by the noisiest of individual aircraft flyovers would reach 76 dBA on portions of the site. The L_{dn} due to aircraft flyovers would be less than 60 dB.</p>	<p>M4.14-4 The following Implementation should be added under Objective 5, Mobile Source Noise Control (Noise) (Appendix C): "b) In the airport overflight zone, the applicant shall provide a disclosure to potential home buyers that property offered for sale is located in an area subject to aircraft flyover noise."</p>	<p>I</p>

Types of Impacts

- SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact
- I = Insignificant impact after mitigation. When more than one mitigation measure is identified, the combination of measures would be required to result in insignificant impacts.
- NA = Impacts related to "Population, Housing, and Employment" are not normally considered significant under CEQA.

2.2 SPECIFIC PLAN I SUMMARY TABLE
Land Use and Agricultural Issues

TABLE 2.2

SUMMARY TABLE OF SPECIFIC PLAN I IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND MITIGATION-MONITORING PROGRAM

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Plan I Subarea:			Level of Significance After Mitigation?
		C	O	M	
LAND USE AND AGRICULTURAL ISSUES					
<p>S4.1-1 (C.O.M) The proposed phasing of growth during Specific Plan I may not be possible if Williamson Act contracts have not expired. This could decrease the number of jobs projected for the initial years and could affect the land use balance.</p>	<p>S4.1-1 (O.M) (a) The following policy should be added to Specific Plan I, Section 4.4.1: "b) If the jobs/housing goals are not being met, as determined during annual monitoring, the Old River Industrial Park Expansion Areas should be amended into Specific Plan I, in order to maximize industrial land opportunities within Specific Plan I." (b) The Draft Specific Plan I should be amended to include the following Objective and Policy in the Land Use section to ensure that enough non-contracted industrial lands are available for development in the early years of the project. "Objective: To ensure that an adequate amount of industrial land is available, not subject to Williamson Act contracts or conflicting non-renewal schedules, for development in the early years of Specific Plan I." "Policy: "a) Lands zoned I-P and C-O on Patterson Pass Road, adjacent to Neighborhood F, shall be provided with on-site infrastructure during the early years of Specific Plan I."</p>	•	•	•	I
		•	•	•	I
<p>S4.1-2 (C.O.M) Inclusion of lands within the Community Services District that are not proposed for development in Specific Plan I could result in premature curtailment of agricultural operations.</p>	<p>S4.1-2 (C.O.M) Agricultural properties outside the Specific Plan I boundaries that are not proposed for development within five years should be deleted from the initial CSD boundaries, unless policies are added to the Draft Specific Plan I, Development Agreement, and Public Financing Plan that indicate existing agricultural landowners or operator lessees will not be subject to the same high level of benefit assessment fees as properties that will be developed as part of Specific Plan I.</p>	•	•	•	I

2.2 SPECIFIC PLAN I SUMMARY TABLE
Land Use and Agricultural Issues

Table 2.2, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Plan I Subarea			Level of Significance After Mitigation?
		C	O	M	
<p>S4.1-3 (C.O.M) Conflicts between urban/rural land uses could occur within Specific Plan I, particularly where ongoing agricultural operations abut planned residential and industrial development. Such conflicts could result in adverse impacts on the existing Byron-Bethany Irrigation District facilities, and on the existing access routes used by farm workers and equipment to reach agricultural fields. These impacts could in turn lead to the curtailment of agricultural operations, an increase in applications to cancel existing Williamson Act contracts, and the premature conversion of agricultural lands within the project to non-agricultural uses.</p>	<p>S4.1-3 (C.O.M) (a) Specific Plan I should be amended to provide interim buffers, setbacks, and/or appropriate landscaping treatment along the boundaries of the three Specific Plan subareas, to reduce land use conflicts between planned urban uses and the existing agricultural operations. Any interim buffer areas or larger than normal setbacks should remain in place until the adjacent agricultural operations cease and/or a specific plan is adopted for the adjacent properties. (C.O.M) (b) Agricultural lessees who farm lands owned by the applicant which are within 1,000 feet and upwind of neighborhoods under construction in the Central Mountain House subarea shall be prohibited from cultivating sugar beets. (C) (c) To mitigate the potential for significant temporary agricultural/urban land use conflicts along the western side of the Mountain House Business Park, where no roadway forms a boundary, the Specific Plan I should be amended to require a landscaped area incorporating a combination of windrows, hedges, and evergreens to reduce the impacts of aerial spray and dust from the adjacent agricultural operations. The intent of this mitigation measure is to provide a buffer strip that would ultimately be a part of the final landscaping design for the Business Park buildout. (M) (d) Specific Plan I contains no policies requiring notification to all buyers (not just properties located within 1,000 feet of the western and eastern boundaries) that all properties are surrounded by agricultural operations. The following policy should be inserted in Chapter Three of Specific Plan I: "The deed of each newly created parcel within Specific Plan I shall include a clear statement to inform new buyers that they are purchasing land or homes in a predominantly agricultural area and that the County has adopted a Right-to-Farm ordinance to protect farmers from nuisance suits as a result of normal farming practices." (C.O.M)</p>	•	•	•	I
GENERAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT TITLE CONSISTENCY					
No Specific Plan I impacts identified.					
PUBLIC SERVICES/Parks and Recreation					
<p>S4.3.1-1 (C) Specific Plan I does not provide regional park land in accordance with the requirements of the San Joaquin County General Plan 2010.</p>	<p>S4.3.1-1 (C) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.3.1-1(a) for alternate methods of mitigation for the regional park land deficiency.</p>	•			I
<p>S4.3.1-2 (C) Community parks may not be available to the first site residents.</p>	<p>S4.3.1-2 (C) Habitat restoration and community park development along Mountain House Creek shall be implemented concurrently.</p>	•			I

■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Schools									
S4.3.2-1 (C)	Specific Plan I is not in conformance with the requirements of the Draft Master Plan. A School Facilities Plan is proposed to be prepared prior to submittal of the first Tentative Map.	S4.3.2-1 (C)	Specific Plan I should be amended to ensure that a School Facilities Plan be prepared and approved by the State and the school districts prior to submittal of the first Development Permit.	•	•	•	•	•	I
■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Fire Protection									
S4.3.3-1 (C.O.M)	Specific Plan I is inconsistent with requirements for providing institutional arrangements for fire protection services.	S4.3.3-1 (C.O.M)	(a) Documentation pertaining to finalized institutional arrangements, fire flow data, and funding and ownership of stations from construction through buildout should be provided prior to the first Development Permit. (b) The Fire Protection sections in the Draft Master Plan and Draft Specific Plan I should be amended to state that the first permanent fire station shall be provided when 1,800 dwelling units have been constructed and occupied or as determined by the Fire Protection District.	•	•	•	•	•	I
■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Police Protection									
S4.3.4-1 (C.O.M)	The proposed project would increase the demand for police services from the County Sheriff's Department.	S4.3.4-1 (C.O.M)	Deputy officers should be added to the Sheriff's Department when the first residence in the Specific Plan I area has been constructed. Sworn officers should be provided in the Mountain House community as the population grows at a ratio of 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents.	•	•	•	•	•	I
■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Solid and Hazardous Waste									
S4.3.5-1 (C.O.M)	The Draft Specific Plan I does not comply with the waste reduction and recycling objectives of the Draft Master Plan.	S4.3.5-1 (C.O.M)	Specific Plan I should be revised to comply with Master Plan implementation measure "j," as recommended in Mitigation Measure M4.3.5-1 above, regarding alternative on-site waste management sites.	•	•	•	•	•	I
S4.3.5-2 (C.O.M)	The Draft Specific Plan I does not allocate land for a proposed waste transfer station and/or compost facility in the Old River Industrial Park as specified by the Draft Master Plan.	S4.3.5-2 (C.O.M)	Alternative site locations for the transfer/compost facilities shall be identified in the Specific Plan I Land Use Map, and shall be located in the southern portion(s) of the area.	•	•	•	•	•	I
■ PUBLIC SERVICES/Libraries									
	No impacts identified.								--
■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Water Supply									
	No Specific Plan I impacts identified.								--
■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Wastewater									
	No Specific Plan I impacts identified.								--
■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Storm Drainage									
	No Specific Plan I impacts identified.								--

2.2 SPECIFIC PLAN I SUMMARY TABLE
Public Utilities

Table 2.2, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Plan I Subarea ¹			Level of Significance After Mitigation ²
		C	O	M	
<p>■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Gas and Electricity</p> <p>S4.4.4-1 (C.O.M) The Draft Specific Plan I does not include specifications for complying with the Draft Master Plan's objective to minimize the consumption of nonrenewable energy and encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources at the site.</p>	S4.4.4-1 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.4.4.2.	.	.	.	I
<p>■ PUBLIC UTILITIES/Telephone</p> <p>None identified</p>					
<p>■ CULTURAL RESOURCES</p> <p>S4.5-1 (C.O.M) Historic and prehistoric resources may be impacted by Specific Plan I development.</p>	<p>S4.5-1 (C.O.M) Specific Plan I should include a section on cultural resources, containing the following Objectives, Policies, and Implementations, at a minimum:</p> <p>Objective: To preserve and enhance significant cultural resources.</p> <p>Policy: Significant historic and prehistoric resources shall be located and either integrated into new development, recorded, or relocated.</p> <p>Implementation:</p> <p>a) Areas proposed for development, wastewater treatment and reuse, water treatment, and the alternative raw water pipeline alignments not previously subject to intensive archaeological surveys shall be surveyed and the results shall be submitted with the first Development Permit, including those required for the water and wastewater treatment plants and related facilities. The recommendations of the archaeologist regarding preservation, recordation, or relocation shall be implemented to the greatest extent possible, and shall, at a minimum, contain the measures in Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> <p>b) Potential historic structures shall be evaluated for the entire Specific Plan I area by an architectural historian and recommendations regarding incorporation into the project development, recordation, or relocation shall be implemented prior to submittal of the first Development Permit.</p> <p>c) If, during construction activities, buried prehistoric cultural resources and/or human remains were found, excavation shall cease and an archaeologist shall be contacted immediately to evaluate these resources.</p>	.	.	.	I
<p>■ GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY</p> <p>No Specific Plan I impacts identified.</p>					

■ HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY						
S4.7-1 (C)	Specific Plan I is inconsistent with the Master Plan regarding timing of development of streambed modification plans.	S4.7-1 (C)	The Draft Master Plan should be revised to require streambed modification proposals to be submitted to the County prior to submittal of the first Development Permit.	•	•	I
■ VISUAL QUALITY						
S4.8-1 (M)	Potentially adverse visual impacts could occur along the I-205 corridor if signage in the Freeway Service Area, and the design of the entrance monument, is not controlled.	S4.8-1 (M)	The Specific Plan and Special Purpose Plan for Mountain House Business Park should include a comprehensive sign program for the Freeway Service Commercial district which would limit pole signs identifying the Freeway Service area to no more than two locations; height and size restrictions shall be imposed where feasible to lessen the visual impact. The height limits of the one or two pole signs shall not exceed the heights specified in the Development Title for C-FS areas.	•	•	I
S4.8-2 (C,O,M)	Roadways and other development in Specific Plan I could remove significant mature trees, which frame views along public roads.	S4.8-2 (C,O,M)	The Parks and Open Space Plan should include a detailed tree survey, as required by Draft Master Plan policy. The specific trees that are proposed for protection and the criteria to be used should be identified. Prior to approval of any tentative map or any construction plans for major roadways with existing mature trees, especially Grant Line and Patterson Pass roads, the map or plans shall identify the specific mature trees that would be preserved. Other significant trees that are to be protected in open space, residential, commercial, or industrial areas should be identified in the detailed figures that are included in the Specific Plan.	•	•	I
■ POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT						
S4.9-1 (O,M)	Specific Plan I may not attain an adequate balance between jobs and housing, especially during the initial phases of the project. Job creation on the site, particularly the creation of non-local-serving jobs, may substantially lag housing construction due to lack of available industrial sites that are serviced by available infrastructure, competition, and other market forces.	S4.9-1	(a) To maximize the availability of industrial sites for job creation in the early years of Specific Plan I, the Draft Specific Plan I boundaries should be amended to incorporate the Old River Industrial Park expansion areas that are not subject to Williamson Act Contracts (see also Mitigation Measure S4.1-1(a)). <u>Alternatively</u> , or in addition, the Draft Specific Plan I should be amended to include a policy that states the County and the CSD will support applications to expand the Specific Plan I boundaries to maximize job creation efforts. (O) (b) Policies and implementations that specifically encourage the extension of infrastructure to the Mountain House Business Park in the early years of development should be added to Specific Plan I. (M)	•	•	NA
S4.9-2 (C,O,M)	Specific Plan I may not have a sufficient supply of housing that is affordable to Very Low and Low Income workers employed in the community.	S4.9-2 (C,O,M)	(a) To increase the number of affordable housing opportunities in Specific Plan I and attain the Affordable Housing goals, four to five acres of land should be redesignated from Low and Medium Density Residential to High Density housing to create 72 to 90 additional affordable units (see also Mitigation Measure M4.9-2(a)). <u>Alternatively</u> , or in addition to the redesignation of lands for more High Density housing, the Affordable Housing goals for Specific Plan I should be lowered to more accurately reflect the portion of total Very Low and Low Income housing that is expected to be completed during Specific Plan I. The Affordable Housing Program should be amended to comply with the other provisions of Mitigation Measure M4.9-2(a), e.g., establish income controls on the affordable housing units or assume that only one-quarter of the Senior Housing units will be available for Very Low and Low Income households. <u>Alternatively</u> , or in addition to the above measures, the number of High Density Residential units in each project or building could be increased, if affordable housing goals are not being achieved.	•	•	NA

2.2 SPECIFIC PLAN I SUMMARY TABLE
Population, Housing, and Employment

Table 2.2, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Plan I Subareas			Level of Significance After Mitigation?
		C	O	M	
	(b) If annual monitoring of the Affordable Housing Program after year four of Specific Plan I indicates that the number of affordable units marketed and occupied in the High Density, Second Units, and/or Medium High Density categories has not reached a level that indicates the Affordable Housing indices will be achieved by the end of the Specific Plan, the County shall hold hearings, receive testimony, make findings, and take action as indicated in Mitigation Measure M4.9-2(f).	•	•	•	I
■ PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY					
S4.10-1 (C.O.M) Proposed landscaping within utility line easements may not conform to PG&E requirements.	S4.10-1 (C.O.M) Specific Plan I should limit proposed landscaping within utility line easements to trees and shrubs that would not exceed 15 feet in height at maturity.	•	•	•	I
S4.10-2 (C.O.M) Mosquito abatement is likely to be required within Specific Plan I areas. An implementation and maintenance schedule for mosquito abatement was not included as part of the storm drainage and flood protection system in Specific Plan I, as required by the Draft Master Plan.	S4.10-2 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.10-5.	•	•	•	I
■ BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
S4.11-1 (C.O.M) Specific Plan I would result in elimination of suitable foraging and dispersal habitat for San Joaquin kit fox on over 700 acres of the site.	S4.11-1 (C.O.M) (a) Specific Plan I section 7.2.2 should be revised to include appropriate discussion, policies, and implementation measures regarding San Joaquin kit fox, consistent with the recommendations in Mitigation Measures 4.11-2(a), (b), (c), and (d). Approval of Development Permits should be contingent on subsequent revisions necessary to comply with the State and Federal Endangered Species Acts. (b) The Kit Fox Pre-construction and Construction Protocol contained in Appendix 7-B of the Draft Master Plan should be revised as recommended in Mitigation Measure M4.11-2(c), and section 7.2.2 of the Draft Specific Plan I should be expanded to include an implementation measure which requires that these protocols shall apply until jurisdictional agencies determine that their implementation is no longer required to prevent harm or injury to kit fox.	•	•	•	I
S4.11-2 (C.O.M) Specific Plan I would result in elimination of over 1,000 acres of suitable foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk on the site.	S4.11-2 (C.O.M) The Draft Specific Plan I section 7.2.1 should be revised to include appropriate discussion, policies, and implementation measures regarding Swainson's hawk and the proposed Habitat Management Plan, consistent with the recommendations in Mitigation Measures 4.11-3(a) and (b). This should include deleting the reference to loss of only 175 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat on the site, and providing a clear description of the timing and relationship of required mitigation to wastewater reuse if the proposed HMP is to be implemented during Specific Plan I. Approval of the Draft Specific Plan I should be contingent on subsequent revisions necessary to comply with the required habitat management agreement with the CDFG.	•	•	•	I

	<p>A take permit for loss of Swainson's hawk habitat shall be required, pursuant to Section 2081 of the State Fish and Game Code. If required, a copy of the fully executed habitat management agreement with the CDFG should be submitted to the San Joaquin Community Development Department prior to the issuance of any Development Permit, construction permit, or building permit, or initiation of any improvements, such as construction of the water or wastewater treatment plants, whichever occurs first.</p>			
<p>S4.11-3 (C) The proposed Mountain House Creek Linear Park includes trail and landscape improvements which would contribute to intensive human activity along the Creek and would limit the potential wildlife habitat value of the corridor.</p>	<p>S4.11-3 (C) The Draft Specific Plan I section 7.1.3 should be revised to include appropriate discussion, policies, and implementation measures regarding treatment of the Mountain House Creek corridor, consistent with the recommendations in Mitigation Measure 4.11-5(a).</p>			I
<p>S4.11-4 (C.O.M) Off-site improvements, such as the raw water conveyance pipeline and pumping facilities, wastewater storage ponds, and application of wastewater irrigation could adversely affect sensitive biological resources.</p>	<p>S4.11-4 (C.O.M) Additional detailed field surveys, necessary modifications to all proposed off-site improvements to be used during any phase of implementation of Specific Plan I, and appropriate monitoring provisions recommended in Mitigation Measures M4.11-8(a), (b), and (c) should be implemented prior to approval of any Development Permit within the Specific Plan I area, or initiation of any improvements such as construction of water or wastewater treatment plants, whichever occurs first.</p>			I
TRANSPORTATION				
<p>S4.12-1 (C.O.M) The project, under the Full Employment scenario, would generate approximately 71,500 daily vehicle trips to, from, or within the site. With the Expected Employment scenario, the project would generate about 55,300 daily vehicle trips, or 23 percent fewer than the Full Employment scenario in year 2000. The added vehicle trips would cause associated impacts such as traffic growth and LOS deficiencies on the road system, particularly in the vicinity of the site, and increases in vehicle miles of travel. Some of these associated impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The project would also generate the need and demand for transit services to, from, and within the site. Since transit services are proposed in the Draft Specific Plan I to accommodate the projected transit ridership, this trip generation impact is not significant.</p>	<p>S4.12-1 (C.O.M) In addition to mitigation measures proposed for the Master Plan (Mitigation Measure M4.12-1), the following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce vehicle trips generated by the Specific Plan I project: (a) Local bus service should extend from the interim central transfer facility on Patterson Pass Road into Neighborhoods E, F, and G, providing no-transfer service within one-quarter mile walking distance to a majority of the residents, and providing convenient connections to regional commute period bus routes at the interim transfer facility. For example, this could be a one-way loop along westbound Mountain House Boulevard, northbound Central Parkway, westbound Main Street, southbound Marina Boulevard, and eastbound Mascot Boulevard. (b) The Specific Plan I land use map should be revised so that as many homes as possible are within one-quarter mile walk of the closest neighborhood or community shopping area. (c) A park and ride lot should be established in the Mountain House Business Park.</p>			SU
<p>S4.12-2 (C.O.M) The project would contribute to cumulative traffic growth and resulting Level of Service deficiencies on I-205, I-580 and I-5 freeways, with projected year 2000 peak hour traffic demand in the peak direction exceeding capacity. Due to the lead time required for freeway widening and, in the case of I-580, current policy limitations on widening, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>S4.12-2 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.12-2. This is an unavoidable adverse impact.</p>			SU

2.2 SPECIFIC PLAN I SUMMARY TABLE
Transportation

Table 2.2, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Plan I Subareas			Level of Significance After Mitigation?
		C	O	M	
<p>S4.12-3 (C.O.M) The project would increase traffic volumes at nearby freeway interchanges, requiring improvements to the Patterson Pass Road/I-205 interchange.</p>	<p>S4.12-3 (a) As a part of a Land Use/Traffic Monitoring program (Mitigation Measure M4.12-1(j)), traffic growth trends and levels of service at the Grant Line Road/I-580 interchange shall be monitored and reported to the County. Should the review indicate the need for interchange improvements at I-580/Grant Line at or before buildout of Specific Plan I, the required interchange improvements should be added to Table 9.1 of Draft Specific Plan I accordingly. (C) (b) The I-205 Interchange section of Table 9.1 should be amended to specifically provide for future ramp metering with HOV bypass lane. This may involve widening and lengthening of the westbound on-ramp. (C,O,M)</p>	.	.	.	I
<p>S4.12-4 (C.O.M) The project would contribute to the need for improvements on several County and other roads in the project vicinity, including portions of Grant Line Road, Patterson Pass Road, Byron Road, and Altamont Pass Road.</p>	<p>S4.12-4 (C.O.M) Table 9.1 in Section 9.4 of Specific Plan I should be amended to include the following arterial improvements, and to add trigger points for each: a) Byron Road widening east of Patterson Pass road to four lanes, concurrently with the beginning of construction of the Old River Industrial Park (unless the General Plan is amended to accept LOS D as the gateway standard). b) North-South arterial or widening of Patterson Pass Road north of Grant Line Road. A traffic analysis shall be carried out prior to beginning construction of housing over the 3,200 unit level to determine the need and feasibility of extending Central Parkway or De Anza Boulevard southerly to at least Grant Line Road, and/or widening of Patterson Pass Road beyond four lanes. Subject to findings of this study and review by the County, Figures 9.3 and 9.4 will be revised accordingly. c) Grant Line Road widening between I-580 and Mountain House Road to four lanes. Widening shall proceed concurrently with the beginning of construction of the Mountain House Business Park. d) Grant Line Road safety and operational improvements between Mountain House Road and Byron Road. These improvements shall begin concurrently with approval of the first discretionary permit. e) Initiation of discussions with Contra Costa and Alameda county representatives regarding mutually agreeable measures to address traffic increases on Byron Highway in accordance with the Draft Master Plan (Policy g) under Objective 1 in County Arterials (Appendix C). Interim improvements to accommodate traffic growth to year 2000 may consist of safety/operational improvements. f) Initiation of discussions with Alameda County representatives regarding mutually agreeable measures to address traffic increases on Altamont Pass Road and all Alameda County roads, in accordance with the Draft Master Plan (Policy g) under Objective 1 in County Arterials (Appendix C), and Alameda County Policy 164(a).</p>	.	.	.	I

<p>S4.12-5 (C,M) Project-generated trips would result in significant traffic levels on roadways internal to the site, requiring construction of adequately sized internal roadways and intersections in order to maintain acceptable LOS at buildout of the project.</p>	<p>g) Initiation of discussions and improvement plans with City of Tracy regarding improvements to Grant Line Road east of Byron Road (widening to 4 lanes) to accommodate traffic between Mountain House and Tracy Regional Mall. The Master Developer shall provide fair share funding for the widening of Grant Line Road, based upon more detailed studies that identify both Mountain House and City of Tracy fair shares.</p>	<p>•</p>	<p>•</p>
<p>S4.12-5 (C,M) (a) Figure 9.4 of Specific Plan I should be revised to include the following intersections: • De Anza Boulevard/Mascot Boulevard • D Street/Mountain House Boulevard Both intersections would operate acceptably (LOS D or better) in both peak hours when signalized. Note that no additional lanes were assumed for the mitigation analysis. Additional turning lanes may be needed to accommodate left-turning vehicles. (C) (b) Figure 9.7 of Specific Plan I should be revised to include the following intersection: • Patterson Pass Road/Von Sosteen Road This intersection would operate acceptably (LOS D or better) in both peak hours when signalized. Note that no additional lanes were assumed for the mitigation analysis. Additional turning lanes may be needed to accommodate left-turning vehicles. (M) (c) Figure 9.3 of Specific Plan I (Road Classification Diagram) should be revised to designate Mascot Boulevard as a minor arterial from Marina Boulevard to Patterson Pass Road, with four lanes to be provided between Central Parkway and Patterson Pass Road at a minimum. (C) (d) Figure 9.4 of Specific Plan I (Central Mountain House Street System) should be revised to designate an interim width of two lanes on Marina Boulevard while retaining the ultimate four-lane width. (C)</p>	<p>S4.12-5 (C,M) (a) Figure 9.4 of Specific Plan I should be revised to include the following intersections: • De Anza Boulevard/Mascot Boulevard • D Street/Mountain House Boulevard Both intersections would operate acceptably (LOS D or better) in both peak hours when signalized. Note that no additional lanes were assumed for the mitigation analysis. Additional turning lanes may be needed to accommodate left-turning vehicles. (C) (b) Figure 9.7 of Specific Plan I should be revised to include the following intersection: • Patterson Pass Road/Von Sosteen Road This intersection would operate acceptably (LOS D or better) in both peak hours when signalized. Note that no additional lanes were assumed for the mitigation analysis. Additional turning lanes may be needed to accommodate left-turning vehicles. (M) (c) Figure 9.3 of Specific Plan I (Road Classification Diagram) should be revised to designate Mascot Boulevard as a minor arterial from Marina Boulevard to Patterson Pass Road, with four lanes to be provided between Central Parkway and Patterson Pass Road at a minimum. (C) (d) Figure 9.4 of Specific Plan I (Central Mountain House Street System) should be revised to designate an interim width of two lanes on Marina Boulevard while retaining the ultimate four-lane width. (C)</p>	<p>•</p>	<p>•</p>
<p>S4.12-6 (C) The project would generate a significant demand for parking.</p>	<p>S4.12-6 (C) Policy a) of Section 9.7 of the Draft Master Plan should be amended to state "Within mixed-use districts, including community commercial areas, the shared parking guidelines published by the Urban Land Institute shall be used wherever feasible to reduce total parking supply."</p>	<p>•</p>	<p>•</p>
<p>S4.12-7 (C) The project would increase the demand for bicycle and pedestrian travel within the project site as well as between the site and adjacent developed areas.</p>	<p>S4.12-7 (C) Should Central Parkway or another north-south arterial be extended south to or beyond Grant Line Road as described in Mitigation Measure S4.12-4 b), bicycle provisions should be included as prescribed in the Master Plan.</p>	<p>•</p>	<p>•</p>
<p>S4.12-8 (O) The project would increase the number of vehicles crossing the existing Southern Pacific railroad track that runs through the site.</p>	<p>S4.12-8 (O) Implementation c) under Rail Crossings in the Draft Master Plan should be revised to add: "Improvements to the rail crossing shall include provisions for bicyclists."</p>	<p>•</p>	<p>•</p>
<p>■ AIR QUALITY</p>			
<p>S4.13-1 (C) Specific Plan I does not include a 500-foot buffer along the western site boundary.</p>	<p>S4.13-1 (C) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.13-2.</p>	<p>•</p>	<p>•</p>

2.2 SPECIFIC PLAN I SUMMARY TABLE
Air Quality

Table 2.2, continued

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Plan I Subarea ¹			Level of Significance After Mitigation ²
		C	O	M	
<p>S4.13-2 (C.O.M) The project would increase regional emissions of criteria pollutants through new vehicle travel and area-source emissions associated with residential and industrial uses in excess of threshold levels established by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. These emissions would add to the regional emission burdens within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin and the adjacent San Francisco Bay Air Basin, and delay eventual attainment of air quality standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter (PM-10).</p>	<p>S4.13-2 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.13-1.</p>	.	.	.	SU
<p>S4.13-3 (C.O.M) Construction activities associated with Specific Plan I would generate dust and particulate matter that could exceed the PM-10 threshold of significance.</p>	<p>S4.13-3 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measures M4.13-5.</p>				I
■ NOISE					
<p>S4.14-1 (C.O.M) The Specific Plan does not define how an L_{max} of 60 dB will be achieved at noise sensitive areas.</p>	<p>S4.14-1 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measures M4.14-1(a) and M4.14-2.</p>	.	.	.	I
<p>S4.14-2 (M) Specific Plan I does not include a 500-foot buffer along the western site boundary or a restriction on helicopter use.</p>	<p>S4.14-2 (M) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.14-3.</p>	.	.	.	I
<p>S4.14-3 (C.O.M) The Draft Specific Plan I does not mitigate noise impacts at existing residences along Grant Line Road, Patterson Pass Road, Von Sosten Road, Hansen Road, and Byron Road.</p>	<p>S4.14-3 (C.O.M) Refer to Mitigation Measure M4.14-2.</p>	.	.	.	I

Mountain House Subareas

- C = Mitigation Pertaining to Central Mountain House
- O = Mitigation pertaining to Old River Industrial Park
- M = Mitigation pertaining to Mountain House Business Park

¹

Types of Impacts

SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

I = Insignificant impact after mitigation. When more than one mitigation measure is identified, the combination of measures would be required to result in insignificant impacts.

NA = Impacts related to "Population, Housing, and Employment" are not normally considered significant under CBQA.