

**Resolution "Exhibit B" Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations**

**CEQA FINDINGS**

# FINDINGS FOR THE 2043 MANTECA GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

REQUIRED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  
(Public Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.)

## I. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the City of Manteca (City), as the CEQA lead agency to: 1) make written findings when it approves a project for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified, and 2) identify overriding considerations for significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR.

These findings explain how the City, as the lead agency, approached the significant and potentially significant impacts identified in the environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for the 2043 General Plan (General Plan or Original Project). The statement of overriding considerations identifies economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project that override any significant environmental impacts that would result from the Project.

As required under CEQA, the Final EIR describes the Original Project, adverse environmental impacts of the project, and mitigation measures and alternatives that would substantially reduce or avoid those impacts. The information and conclusions contained in the EIR reflect the City's independent judgment regarding the potential adverse environmental impacts of the Project.

The Final EIR (which includes the Recirculated Draft EIR, comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR, responses to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR, and any revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR) for the Project, examined several alternatives to the Original Project that were not chosen as part of the approved project (Alternative A: No Project Alternative, Alternative B: Residential and Balanced Employment Growth, Alternative C: Increased Intensity Residential and Balanced Employment Growth, and Alternative D: Previous Proposed Project [March 2021]).

The Original Project has been modified to: 1) change the Land Use Element to create additional job-generating and recreational opportunities in the Planning Area west of Highway 99 through revisions to the Land Use Map and inclusion of Policy LU-8.8 and Figure LU-9, 2) to revise the Circulation Element to modify the future Roth Road alignment and include an express policy requiring project applicants to pay for their fair share towards roadway and related impacts, 3) to revise Figures LU-3, LU-7, ED-1, and S-3 to ensure internal consistency, and 4) to

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

modify Title 17, Table 17.22.020-1 to specify that a) business and business office, b) agricultural processing, c) commercial, and d) agriculture related ancillary uses are allowed in the M-1 Light Industrial Zoning Classification and to prohibit permanent and temporary residential uses in the M-1 Light Industrial Zoning Classification. These changes are collectively referred to as the "Modified Project."

When an EIR has been certified for a project, Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 set forth the criteria for determining whether a subsequent EIR, subsequent negative declaration, addendum, or no further documentation be prepared in support of further agency action on the project. The City reviewed the changes to the 2043 General Plan (Original Project) as analyzed in the General Plan EIR to determine if the 2043 General Plan Amendment and Zoning Code Text Amendment (Modified Project) would require a subsequent EIR, subsequent negative declaration, addendum, or no further documentation. The environmental analysis for the Modified Project is presented in the City of Manteca General Plan EIR Addendum (Addendum). As demonstrated in the Addendum, the Modified Project would result in no new significant environmental effects and no substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental effects, and no new information of substantial importance that would require major changes to the Original Project EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) has been identified. Therefore, a subsequent EIR or supplemental EIR is not warranted for the 2043 General Plan Amendment and an addendum is appropriate.

The Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth below ("Findings") are presented for adoption by the City Council (Council) as the City's findings under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code, §21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 15000 et seq.) relating to the Modified Project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of this Council regarding the Modified Project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives to the Project, and the overriding considerations, which in this Council's view, justify approval of the Manteca General Plan, despite its environmental effects.

## II. GENERAL FINDINGS AND OVERVIEW

State law requires the City to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of its planning area. The Plan must include land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety elements, as specified in Government Code Section 65302, to the extent that the issues identified by State law exist in the City's planning area. Additional elements that relate to the physical development of the City may also be addressed in the Plan. The degree of specificity and level of detail of the discussion of each Plan element need only reflect local conditions and circumstances. The Plan has been prepared to address

**CEQA FINDINGS**

the requirements of State law and the relevant items addressed in Government Code Section 65300 et seq.

**A. Procedural Background**

In April of 2016, the City issued a request for proposals (RFP) inviting bids from qualified consulting firms to assist the City in the preparation of a comprehensive update to the General Plan. The process to update the Manteca General Plan began in August 2016. The Manteca General Plan Update (General Plan Update or proposed General Plan) was developed with extensive community input and reflects the community's vision for Manteca.

The City of Manteca circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project on January 6, 2020 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse, and the public. A scoping meeting was held on January 27, 2020 at the City of Manteca City Hall. No public or agency comments on the NOP related to the EIR analysis were presented or submitted during the scoping meeting. During the 30-day public review period for the NOP, which ended on February 5, 2020, eleven written comment letters were received on the NOP. A summary of the NOP comments is provided later in this chapter. The NOP and all comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR.

On May 7, 2021, the City released the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR for public review. The City provided multiple opportunities for community engagement, including a series of workshops with the City Council and Planning commission, community workshops, and outreach to stakeholders. In May and June 2021, the city hosted two workshops to present the Draft General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report to the community. The workshops included an overview of the components of the Draft General Plan, including the Land Use Map and Major Streets Circulation, and the Draft EIR, including alternatives to the proposed project.

The City received over 200 oral and written comments on the Draft General Plan and Draft EIR. In response to the comments, the City Council directed that the General Plan Draft EIR be revised to address removal of the truck route, land use modifications, and the inclusion of an additional alternative. The proposed project addressed in the Recirculated Draft EIR is the Revised Draft General Plan which has been modified to reduce the potential for conflicts between intensive uses and potentially sensitive uses, to remove the truck route, and to refine policies and implementation measures.

The Revised Draft General Plan was modified based on direction from the decision-makers and comments received on the May 2021 Draft General Plan and Draft EIR. The Plan is intended to be an expression of the community's vision for the City and Planning Area and constitutes the policy and regulatory framework by which future development projects will be

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

reviewed and public improvements will be implemented. The City will implement the Plan by requiring development, infrastructure improvements, and other projects to be consistent with its policies and by implementing the actions included in the Plan. The key components of the General Plan will include broad goals for the future of Manteca, and specific policies and actions that will help implement the stated goals.

The City of Manteca published a public NOA for the Recirculated Draft EIR on November 22, 2022, inviting comments from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2020019010) and was published in the Manteca Bulletin pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Recirculated Draft EIR was available for public review from November 22, 2022 through January 6, 2023. The Revised Public Draft General Plan was also available for public review and comment during this time period.

The Recirculated Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts. Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparing the analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

The City received 21 comment letters during the 45-day review period for the Recirculated Draft EIR and one late comment letter after the 45-day review period ended. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this Final EIR responds to the written comments received on the Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft EIR. The Final EIR also contains minor edits to the Draft EIR, which are included in Chapter 3.0 (Errata). The Final EIR document and the Draft EIR, as amended by the Final EIR, constitute the Final EIR.

### **B. Record of Proceedings and Custodian of Record**

For purposes of CEQA and the findings set forth herein, the record of proceedings for the City's findings and determinations consists of the following documents and testimony, at a minimum:

- The NOP, comments received on the NOP, Notice of Availability, and all other public notices issued by the City in relation to the Manteca General Plan Update EIR.
- The Manteca General Plan Update Recirculated Draft EIR, associated appendices in the Recirculated Draft EIR, and technical materials cited in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

**CEQA FINDINGS**

- The Manteca General Plan Update Final EIR, including comment letters and technical materials cited in the document.
- The Manteca 2043 General Plan EIR Addendum.
- All non-draft and/or non-confidential reports and memoranda prepared by the City of Manteca and consultants in relation to the EIR.
- Minutes and/or recordings of the discussions regarding the Original Project, Modified Project, Original Project components, and/or Modified Project components at public hearings held by the City.
- Staff reports associated with Planning Commission and City Council meetings on the Original Project and Modified Project.
- Those categories of materials identified in Public Resources Code Section 21167.6.

The City Clerk is the custodian of the administrative record. The documents and materials that constitute the administrative record are available for review at the City of Manteca Legislative Offices/City Clerk at 1001 West Center Street, Manteca, California 95337.

**D. Consideration of the Environmental Impact Report**

In adopting these Findings, this Council finds that the Final EIR was presented to this Council, the decision-making body of the lead agency, which reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the Manteca General Plan. By these findings, this City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the Final EIR. The City Council finds that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Final EIR represents the independent judgment and analysis of the City.

**E. Severability**

If any term, provision, or portion of these Findings or the application of these Findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these Findings, or their application to other actions related to the Manteca General Plan, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by the City.

**III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

### A. Agricultural and Forest Resources

**1. General Plan implementation would result in the conversion of farmlands, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, to non-agricultural use (EIR Impact 3.2-1)**

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in the conversion of farmlands, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, to non-agricultural uses is discussed at pages 3.2-16 through 3.2-20 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 13 and 14 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.2-16 through 3.2-20 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes numerous policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 13 and 14 of the Addendum. The General Plan includes policies and actions that are intended to reduce the conversion of farmlands, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, to non-agricultural uses. These include policies that encourage the development of vacant lands within City boundaries prior to conversion of agricultural lands and ensure that urban development near existing agricultural lands will not unnecessarily constrain agricultural practices or adversely affect the economic viability of nearby agricultural operations. Overall, the policies and actions included in the General Plan are intended to support and preserve the agricultural heritage of Manteca as development continues to occur within the Planning Area. However, the General Plan does allow for urbanization of agricultural lands. The only mitigation available to fully avoid this impact would be to restrict growth to occur only on non-agricultural lands and to not allow agricultural-support operations on agricultural lands; this limitation of growth would not be consistent with the goals and objectives as identified in the EIR and stated throughout the General Plan.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

Therefore, this would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with conversion of farmlands.

**2. General Plan Implementation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract (EIR Impact 3.2-2)**

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract, is discussed on pages 3.2-21 and 3.2-22 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 13 and 14 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.2-21 and 3.2-22 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies which would reduce the impact of development resulting in the conversion of existing farmland. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 13 and 14 of the Addendum. The policies encourage coordination LAFCO on issues of the conservation of agricultural land; promote the enrollment in Williamson Act contracts; promote the establishment of adequate buffers between agricultural and urban land uses; prohibit the redesignation of Agricultural lands to other land use designations unless specific findings are made; and require future development projects to reduce impacts on agricultural lands through the use of buffers, such as greenbelts, drainage features, parks, or other improved and maintained features. However, the General Plan would allow new urban uses that have the potential to conflict with existing agricultural operations, regardless of whether the operations are conducted on Williamson Act lands and lands

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

zoned for agricultural use as discussed under Impact 3.2-2 above. The only mitigation available to fully avoid this impact would be to restrict growth to occur only on non-agricultural lands; this limitation of growth would not be consistent with the goals and objectives as identified in the EIR and stated throughout the General Plan. Therefore, this would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act Contract conflicts.

### B. Air Quality

1. **General Plan implementation would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants (EIR Impact 3.3-1)**
  - (a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants is discussed at pages 3.3-23 through 3.3-42 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 15 and 16 of the Addendum.
  - (b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.
  - (c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:
    - (1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.3-23 through 3.3-42 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project would assist the city in achieving a more balanced jobs to housing ratio, and would increase opportunities for transit ridership in Manteca and the surrounding areas. As discussed on pages 15 and 16 of the Addendum, the Modified Project retains the General Plan policies and actions of the Original Project that would work to further reduce criteria pollutant emissions, including reviewing

CEQA FINDINGS

---

projects for conformance with applicable air quality plans and regulations, reducing energy demands, and implementing methods to reduce VMT and further improves the jobs to housing ratio. The General Plan policies ensure that individual projects will be reviewed for compliance and adherence to SJVAPCD standards. Nevertheless, since implementation of the Modified Project, similar to the Original Project, may result in population growth, and an increase in vehicle miles traveled, that exceed the growth projections assumed in the applicable air quality plans, the Modified Project has the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of an applicable air quality plan. Mitigation measures that would limit population or VMT growth to the levels assumed in the applicable air quality plans in order to ensure consistency would conflict with the General Plan's goals to encourage high quality housing types and a variety of housing for all income levels and to provide and promote high-paying, local employment opportunities and retain and attract high-quality businesses and industry so that residents can live, shop, and work in Manteca. Therefore, this would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with air quality and criteria pollutant emissions.

## C. Noise

1. **General Plan implementation may result in exposure to significant traffic noise sources (EIR Impact 3.12-1)**
  - (a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in exposure to significant traffic noise sources is discussed on pages 3.12-20 through 3.12-34 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 32 and 33 of the Addendum.
  - (b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 3.12-20 through 3.12-34 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 32 and 33 of the Addendum. General Plan Policies S-6.1 through S-6.4, S-6.7 through S-6.12, S-6.15 and Implementation measure S-5 are intended to minimize exposure to excessive noise, including noise associated with traffic. Specifically, Policies S-6.1, S-6.2, S-6.4, and S-6.7 support noise-compatible land uses in the vicinity of traffic noise sources and require that new development and infrastructure projects be reviewed for consistency with the noise standards established in Tables S-1. The General Plan standards required under Policy S-6.4, for exposure to traffic noise shown in Tables 3.12-14 and 3.12-15, meet or exceed the noise level standards of the prior General Plan shown in Table 3.12-8. Policy S-5.7 and Implementation measure S-5 would ensure that new development mitigates potential noise impacts through incorporating the noise control treatments necessary to achieve acceptable noise levels. Implementation measure S-6d sets criteria for evaluating future increases in traffic noise levels. Implementation measure S-6c would ensure that the Municipal Code, including the updated noise ordinance, is consistent with the noise standards established in the General Plan. Action S-5i would encourage working with Caltrans to ensure that adequate noise studies are prepared and that noise mitigation measures are considered in State transportation projects. Implementation of the Modified Project's policies and actions, which have been retained from the Original Project, will reduce noise and land use compatibility impacts from vehicular traffic noise sources and would ensure that new development is designed to include noise-attenuating features. However, there are no mitigation measures that can eliminate significant traffic noise exposure while still allowing the City's economy to grow through new development, particularly residential, industrial, and commercial uses. Therefore, this would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with transportation noise sources.

#### D. Transportation and Circulation

1. **General Plan implementation may result in VMT per dwelling unit and VMT per employee increases that are greater than 85 percent of Baseline conditions (EIR Impact 3.14-1)**
  - (a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in VMT impacts is discussed at pages 3.14-28 through 3.14-36 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum.
  - (b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.
  - (c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:
    - (1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.14-28 through 3.14-36 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies designed to reduce vehicle travel and vehicle miles traveled. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum. The Circulation Element addresses providing adequate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities and opportunities, promoting non-vehicle travel modes, requiring development projects that accommodate or employ 50 or more employees to implement TDM programs, and ensuring regional coordination on trip and VMT reduction efforts. General Plan policies and actions that contribute to VMT reductions are identified below. These policies and actions minimize VMT impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, reductions in VMT per employee from 15 to 51 percent would be required to achieve thresholds. The City at this time cannot demonstrate that VMT will be reduced to the degree that it meets these thresholds. This would represent a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with transportation VMT impacts.

2. **General Plan implementation may conflict with a program, plan, policy or ordinance addressing the circulation system, including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities (EIR Impact 3.14-2)**

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to conflict with a program, plan, policy, or ordinance addressing the circulation system is discussed on pages 3.14-36 through 3.14-42 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.14-36 through 3.14-42 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project contains policies and implementing actions that support access to and the performance of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum. These applicable policies and implementing actions are listed below. Further, the Plan includes mixed-use development that is supportive of non-automotive modes. The proposed General Plan includes policies and actions that support implementation of applicable bicycle and pedestrian plans and ensure new transportation infrastructure includes adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The proposed General Plan includes implementation actions to promote roadway safety, including preparation of a Vision Zero Action Plan or Local Road Safety Plan that prioritizes systems-based approach to preventing traffic fatalities (Implementing Action 2n), updating the PFIP to address recommended safety improvements by the Vision Zero Action Plan or Local Road Safety Plan (Implementing Action 2o), and creation of an surveillance program of above average vehicle, bicyclist, and pedestrian collisions with an emphasis on early

CEQA FINDINGS

---

detection and correction of conditions that create safety issues for users (Implementing Action 2k). The City cannot demonstrate definitively at this time that implementation of these policies would maintain the number of collisions for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists at current or lower levels. Therefore, the plan may conflict with policies for safe travel, including by transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Therefore, this impact is considered a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with a conflict with a program, plan, policy, or ordinance addressing the circulation system, including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

**3. General Plan implementation may increase hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access (EIR Impact 3.14-3)**

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to increase hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access is discussed at pages 3.14-41 through 3.14-48 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts as discussed at pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 3.14-41 through 3.14-48 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum. The General Plan policies and actions support of safe circulation by all modes and adequate emergency access. Policy 2.8 requires traffic management, calming, and safety techniques to be applied according to industry standards at residential and collector street intersections to allow

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

bicyclists and pedestrians to travel more safely from one neighborhood to another. Policy C-2.18 prohibits the creation of traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian hazards and prohibits conflicts with vehicular traffic movements, thereby ensuring that development and infrastructure projects are designed to avoid conflicting uses or design hazards that would result in traffic, bicycle, or pedestrian hazards. Policy C-6.2 ensures emergency access is provided in development and infrastructure projects. Actions C-1k, C-2n, and C-2o require the preparation of a Vision Zero Action Plan or Local Road Safety Plan that focuses on prevention of traffic fatalities, with the plan to be completed within four years of General Plan adoption. These measures also include updating the PFIP to address recommended safety improvements, and ongoing identification, surveillance, and correction of high vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian collision locations. Although the General Plan policies and actions related to circulation, hazards, and emergency access would reduce the impacts to emergency circulation and access associated with implementation of the General Plan Update, increased vehicle traffic may increase the number of collisions on Manteca roadways, and therefore result in an increase in hazards. Therefore, this impact is considered a significant and unavoidable impact of the Modified Project and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with increased hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access.

## F. Cumulative Impacts

### 1. Cumulative impact to agricultural lands and resources. (EIR Impact 4.2)

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in a cumulative loss of agricultural land and resources, including important farmlands, significant farmlands, land under the Williamson Act, and other farmlands, is discussed on pages 4.0-7 and 4.0-8 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts or contribution to impacts as discussed at pages 13 and 14 of the Addendum.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts**. As described on pages 4.0-7 and 4.0-8 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 13 and 14 of the Addendum. However, even with implementation of adopted policies and actions, the General Plan has the potential to considerably contribute to permanent conversion of agricultural land and resources. No feasible mitigation is available to fully reduce the cumulative effect on these resources, or to mitigate the contribution to a less-than-significant level. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Modified Project to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact and is consistent with the impact and contribution of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations**. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with cumulative impacts to agricultural lands and resources.

2. Cumulative impact on the region's air quality (EIR Impact 4.3)

(a) **Potential Impact**. The potential for the Original Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact on the region's air quality is discussed on page 4.0-8 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts or contribution to impacts as discussed at pages 15 and 16 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures**. Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings**. Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

CEQA FINDINGS

---

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on page 4.0-8 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 15 and 16 of the Addendum. However, even with implementation of adopted policies and actions, the General Plan has the potential to considerably contribute to an impact on the region's air quality. No feasible mitigation is available to fully reduce the cumulative effect, or to mitigate the contribution to a less-than-significant level. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Modified Project to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact and is consistent with the impact and contribution of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with cumulative impacts on the region's air quality.

3. **Cumulative impacts related to noise (EIR Impact 4.12)**

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative noise impacts is discussed on pages 4.0-15 and 4.0-16 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts or contribution to impacts as discussed at pages 32 and 33 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on pages 4.0-15 and 4.0-16 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 32 and 33 of the Addendum. However, it may not be feasible to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level in all instances, particularly in areas where existing development is located near proposed

CEQA FINDINGS

---

development and existing roadways. Although the policy and regulatory controls for noise related impacts are in place in the cumulative analysis area, subsequent development projects may result in an increase in ambient noise levels at specific project locations, which may subject surrounding land uses to increases in ambient noise levels. No feasible mitigation is available to fully reduce the cumulative effect on noise, or to mitigate the proposed project's contribution to a less-than-significant level. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Modified Project to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact, consistent with the impact and contribution of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with cumulative increases in noise levels.

## 6. Cumulative impacts on the transportation network (EIR Impact 4.14)

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Modified Project to result in a considerable contribution to the cumulative impacts on the transportation network is discussed on pages 4.0-17 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in any new or increased impacts or contribution to impacts as discussed at pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on page 4.0-17 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on pages 36 through 38 of the Addendum. However, it may not be feasible to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level in all instances as the Original Project and Modified Project would result in VMT increases exceeding the threshold for employment-related land

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

uses. No feasible mitigation is available to fully reduce the cumulative effect on VMT, or to mitigate the Original Project's or Modified Project's contribution to a less-than-significant level. This would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution by the Modified Project to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact and is consistent with the impact and contribution of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with cumulative impacts on the transportation network.

### G. Significant Irreversible Effects

#### 1. Irreversible and adverse effects (EIR Impact 4.17)

(a) **Potential Impact.** The potential for the Original Project to result in a significant irreversible effect associated with the consumption of nonrenewable resources and irretrievable commitments/irreversible physical changes is discussed on page 4.0-29 of the Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in an increase in impacts or in new impacts related to this topic as discussed at page 44 of the Addendum.

(b) **Mitigation Measures.** Minimized to the greatest extent feasible through General Plan Policies and Actions. No feasible mitigation is available.

(c) **Findings.** Based upon the EIR, Addendum, and the entire record before this Council, this Council finds that:

(1) **Mitigation and Remaining Impacts.** As described on page 4.0-29 of the Draft EIR, the Original Project includes policies and actions that would reduce the severity of this impact to the extent feasible. The Modified Project retains these General Plan policies and actions as described on page 44 of the Addendum. In summary, the General Plan includes an extensive policy framework that is designed to address land use and environmental issues to the greatest extent feasible, while allowing growth and economic prosperity for the City. However, even with the policies and actions that will serve to reduce potential significant impacts, the Modified Project will result in

CEQA FINDINGS

---

significant irreversible changes and has the potential to result in adverse effects as described above. This impact is considered a significant and unavoidable impact under CEQA and is consistent with the impact of the Original Project.

(2) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Modified Project, as stated more fully in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VI, override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Modified Project associated with irreversible effects.

#### IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THOSE IMPACTS WHICH ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT, LESS THAN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE, OR HAVE NO IMPACT

A. Specific impacts within the following categories of environmental effects were found to be less than significant for the Original Project as set forth in more detail in the Draft EIR and the Modified Project was found to have no increase in such impacts as set forth in more detail in the Addendum.

1. **Aesthetics and Visual Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:
  - a. Impact 3.1-1: General Plan implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista
  - b. Impact 3.1-2: General Plan implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway
  - c. Impact 3.1-3: General Plan implementation would not, in a non-urbanized area, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, or in an urbanized area, conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality
  - d. Impact 3.1-4: General Plan implementation would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area
2. **Agricultural and Forest Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:
  - a. Impact 3.2-3: General Plan implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use

CEQA FINDINGS

---

- b. Impact 3.2-4: General Plan implementation would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use
- 3. **Air Quality:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:
  - a. Impact 3.3-3: General Plan implementation would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)
- 4. **Biological Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:
  - a. Impact 3.4-1: General Plan implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
  - b. Impact 3.4-2: General Plan implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
  - c. Impact 3.4-3: General Plan implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means
  - d. Impact 3.4-4: General Plan implementation would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites
  - e. Impact 3.4-5: The General Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance
  - f. Impact 3.4-6: General Plan implementation would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan

CEQA FINDINGS

---

5. **Cultural and Tribal Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.5-1: General Plan implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5
- b. Impact 3.5-2: General Plan implementation would not lead to the disturbance of any human remains
- c. Impact 3.5-3: General Plan implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency

6. **Geology and Soils:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.6-1: General Plan implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides
- b. Impact 3.6-2: General Plan implementation would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil
- c. Impact 3.6-3: General Plan implementation would not result in development located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse
- d. Impact 3.6-4: General Plan implementation would not result in development on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property
- e. Impact 3.6-5: General Plan implementation does not have the potential to have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water
- f. Impact 3.6-6: General Plan implementation would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

7. **Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change and Energy:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:
  - a. Impact 3.7-1: General Plan implementation would not generate GHG emissions that could have a significant impact on the environment
  - b. Impact 3.7-2: General Plan implementation would not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions
  - c. Impact 3.7-3: General Plan implementation would not result in a significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, or conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency
8. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:
  - a. Impact 3.8-1: General Plan implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment
  - b. Impact 3.8-2: General Plan implementation would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school
  - c. Impact 3.8-3: General Plan implementation would not have projects located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5
  - d. Impact 3.8-4: The General Plan would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within an area covered by an airport land use plan, or two miles of a public airport or public use airport
  - e. Impact 3.8-5: General Plan implementation would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
  - f. Impact 3.8-6: General Plan implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires

CEQA FINDINGS

---

**9. Hydrology and Water Quality:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.9-1: General Plan implementation would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan
- b. Impact 3.9-2: General Plan implementation would not result in the depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge or conflict with a groundwater management plan
- c. Impact 3.9-3: General Plan implementation would not alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, impeded flows, or polluted runoff
- d. Impact 3.9-4: General Plan implementation would not release pollutants due to project inundation by flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche

**10. Land Use, Population and Housing:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant or to have no impact:

- a. Impact 3.10-1: General Plan implementation would not physically divide an established community
- b. Impact 3.10-2: General Plan implementation would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect
- c. Impact 3.10-3: General Plan implementation would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)
- d. Impact 3.10-4: General Plan implementation would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

**11. Mineral Resources:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.11-1: General Plan implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state
- b. Impact 3.11-2: General Plan implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan

**12. Noise:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.12-2: General Plan implementation may result in exposure to excessive railroad noise sources
- b. Impact 3.12-3: Implementation of the General Plan could result in the generation of excessive stationary noise sources
- c. Impact 3.12-4: General Plan implementation may result in an increase in construction noise sources
- d. Impact 3.12-5: General Plan implementation may result in construction vibration
- e. Impact 3.12-6: General Plan implementation may result in exposure to groundborne vibration

**13. Public Services and Recreation:** The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.13-1: General Plan implementation would not result in adverse physical impacts on the environment associated with the need for new governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts
- b. Impact 3.13-2: General Plan implementation would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities or the construction of new parks and recreation facilities

**14. Utilities and Service Systems:** The following specific impact was found to be less than significant:

- a. Impact 3.15-1: General Plan implementation would result in sufficient water supplies available to serve the City and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years
- b. Impact 3.15-2: General Plan implementation would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects
- c. Impact 3.15-3: General Plan implementation would not have the potential to result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it does not have

CEQA FINDINGS

---

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

- d. Impact 3.15-4: General Plan implementation may require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects
- e. Impact 3.15-5: General Plan implementation would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded storm water drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects
- f. Impact 3.15-6: General Plan implementation would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste, would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and would not exceed of the capacity of local infrastructure

**15. Wildfires:** The following specific impact was found to have no impact:

- a. Impact 3.16-1: General Plan implementation would not have a significant impact related to wildfire risks associated with lands in or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

**B.** The Original Project was found to have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to specific impacts within the following categories of environmental effects as set forth in more detail in the Draft EIR and the Modified Project was found to have no increase in such impacts as set forth in more detail in the Addendum.

- a. **Impact 4.1:** Cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region
- b. **Impact 4.4:** Cumulative loss of biological resources, including habitats and special status species
- c. **Impact 4.5:** Cumulative impacts on known and undiscovered cultural resources
- d. **Impact 4.6:** Cumulative impacts related to geology and soils
- e. **Impact 4.7:** Cumulative impacts related to greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy
- f. **Impact 4.8:** Cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and human health risks
- g. **Impact 4.9:** Cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality
- h. **Impact 4.10:** Cumulative impacts related to local land use, population, and housing
- i. **Impact 4.11:** Cumulative impacts related to mineral resources
- j. **Impact 4.13:** Cumulative impacts to public services and recreation
- k. **Impact 4.15:** Cumulative impacts related to utilities
- l. **Impact 4.16:** Cumulative impact related to wildfire

**C.** The above impacts are less than significant or less than cumulatively considerable for one of the following reasons:

- 1. The EIR determined that the impact is less than significant for the Original Project.
- 2. The EIR determined that the Original Project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact.
- 3. The Manteca 2043 EIR Addendum determined that the impact is less than significant for the Modified Project.
- 4. The Manteca 2043 General Plan EIR Addendum determined that the Modified Project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact.

## V. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

### A. Identification of Project Objectives

An EIR is required to identify a “range of potential alternatives to the project [which] shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects.” Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR identifies the Original Project’s goals and objectives. The Original Project objectives include:

- Reflect the current goals and vision expressed by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders;
- Address issues and concerns identified by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders;
- Provide for logical, orderly growth from the city’s compact, historic center extending to well-delineated residential neighborhoods, employment centers, and community amenities;
- Maintain Manteca’s family-oriented community character with gathering places, activities, and parks/recreation opportunities for all ages located in attractive, sustainable, and safe neighborhoods and throughout the community;
- Preserve access to the area’s agricultural and natural characteristics, including green space, farmland, and orchards;
- Revitalize and enhance the Downtown;
- Provide and encourage high-quality housing options and a variety of housing types for all income levels;
- Provide and promote high-paying, local employment opportunities and retain and attract high-quality businesses and industry so that residents can live, shop, and work in Manteca;
- Maintain strong fiscal sustainability that ensure efficient and adequate public services and amenities and supports improved multimodal transportation opportunities, and, through promoting land uses that increase local revenues and ensuring development pays its fair-share;
- Provide a basis for City decision-makers, City departments, other public agencies, and private developers to design projects that enhance the character of the community and achieve the City’s desired growth, safety, and conservation objectives; and
- Address requirements of State law, including addressing environmental justice, safety, climate adaptation and resilience, and transportation, including complete streets and VMT.

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

The Addendum identified that the Modified Project would not result in any new impacts, result in an increase in the level of existing impacts analyzed for the Original Project. Therefore, the alternatives analyzed for the Original Project continue to be applicable and new alternatives and analysis of such alternatives was not required for the Modified Project. Resolution 2023-99 adopted by the City Council on July 10, 2023 for the General Plan EIR described each alternative to the Original Project and provided findings and an explanation for the rejection of each alternatives. The Addendum identified that the Modified Project would not result in any new impacts, result in an increase in the level of existing impacts analyzed for the Original Project. Therefore, the alternatives analyzed for the Original Project continue to be applicable and new alternatives and analysis of such alternatives was not required for the Modified Project. The alternatives analyzed for the Original Project are described below.

### **B. Alternatives Analysis in EIR**

#### **1. Alternative A: No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-3 through 5.0-7 and pages 5.0-19 through 5.0-39 of the Draft EIR.

Under Alternative A, the City would not adopt the General Plan Update. The existing Manteca General Plan would continue to be implemented and no changes to the General Plan, including the Land Use Map, Major Street Master Plan, goals, policies, or actions would occur. Subsequent projects, such as amending the Municipal Code (including the zoning map) and the City's Design Guidelines, would not occur. The existing General Plan Land Use Map is shown on Figure 5.0-1.

As shown in Table 5.0-1, when compared to the Proposed General Plan, Alternative A offers fewer opportunities to develop by providing a more focused area for development within the Planning Area through committing over 5,000 acres for urban reserve uses. As shown in Table 5.0-1, Alternative A would provide for a decrease in residential uses by 757 acres, a decrease in commercial/industrial/professional uses by 1,034 acres, and a decrease in mixed uses by 264 acres. Additionally, public land uses would also decrease by 354 acres. Alternative A would result in increased housing and job growth within the Manteca city limits when compared to existing conditions, but substantially less overall growth than all other alternatives. Under Alternative A at full buildout, there would be an increase over existing conditions in residential growth (approximately 26,152 dwelling units) and non-residential growth (approximately 24,541,050 square feet) within City limits. Under cumulative conditions, development in the Planning Area combined under Alternative A would result in a population of 172,998 and 42,457 jobs.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

Under Alternative A, the existing General Plan policy framework would still be in effect, which would constitute a status quo approach to land use regulation in the City. As shown in Table 5.0-1, the proposed General Plan Land Use Map consolidates a number of existing land use designations, as well as establishes new land use designations (i.e., Downtown and Agricultural Industrial). The proposed General Plan, along with the policy framework proposed by the General Plan Update, encourages and aims to provide the framework and land use pattern for logical, orderly growth from the City's compact, historic center extending to well-delineated residential neighborhoods, employment centers, and community amenities to meet the City's long-term housing, employment, and civic needs. The land uses allowed under the proposed General Plan provide opportunities for cohesive new growth at in-fill locations within existing urbanized areas of the city, as well as new growth adjacent to existing urbanized areas. A mix and balance of uses to provide an improved ratio of local jobs to population, would ensure that development pays its fair-share of necessary roadway, public service, and other infrastructure improvements, and that provides for increased protection of natural resources would occur. The proposed General Plan was prepared in conformance with State laws and regulations associated with the preparation of general plans, including requirements for environmental protection.

- a. **Findings:** The No Project Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the Project's objectives.
- b. **Explanation:** This alternative would not realize the benefits of the Project and fails to achieve some of the Project objectives. Alternative A would not include updated policies, particularly those related to greenhouse gases, community health, equity/environmental justice and complete streets policies to address safety, access, and mobility for all roadway users, as required by State law. This alternative would not include various policies proposed in the General Plan update to ensure protection of environmental resources, both at a project level and under cumulative conditions, consistent with the objectives of CEQA. Alternative A fails to meet several of the basic project objectives, including addressing new requirements of State law; and addressing emerging transportation, housing, and employment trends. Therefore, Alternative A (No Project) is rejected from further consideration.

## **2. Alternative B: Residential and Balanced Employment Growth**

The Residential and Balanced Employment Growth Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-7 through 5.0-9 and pages 5.0-19 through 5.0-39 of the Draft EIR.

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

Alternative B continues to provide for a balance of job-creating and residential development land uses. Alternative B would continue to encourage infill development throughout the City, as well as new growth in greenfield areas that extend the City's existing development pattern. Figure 5.0-2 shows the Land Use Map for Alternative B, which includes the following major changes from the Proposed General Plan:

1. The Urban Reserve overlay is applied in the area north of Roth Road and West of Airport Way to identify long-term desires for future industrial and employment-generating growth in this area and to promote efficient delivery of City services (same as Alternative C).
2. A residential/commercial node with High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Mixed Use Commercial uses is created east of Airport Way between Lovelace Road and the future Roth Road extension and Low Density Residential uses are extended to Airport Way.
3. In the majority of the Planning Area, the Urban Reserve overlay is removed and replaced with the Agriculture designation.
4. An underutilized infill site northeast of Union Road and W. Alameda Street is changed from High Density Residential to Commercial and Public/Quasi-Public.
5. Policy Area 1 is revised to support the relocation of the Lovelace Materials Recovery Facility and Transfer Station through envisioning the facility and surrounding area for Commercial Mixes Use and residential use.
6. Policy Area 2 is revised to focus on jobs- and employment-generating uses in the vicinity of future transit uses.
7. Policy Area 5 is revised to increase Medium Density Residential uses and include a Park site.
8. An unincorporated island between Moffat Boulevard and Industrial Park Drive is changed from Commercial Mixed Use to Industrial.
9. The Urban Reserve overlay is removed from the Oakwood Lakes area.
10. Infill opportunities in the select areas in the City southwest of Atherton Road and Main Street are changed from Commercial to residential designations, Low, Medium, and High Density Residential, from High Density Residential to Commercial southwest of the Highway 120/Union Road interchange (same as Alternative C).

Alternative B would adopt most of the goals, policies, and actions of the proposed General Plan Update policy document, which would apply to subsequent development, planning, and infrastructure projects under this alternative, except for the changes to address the Land Use Map revisions as previously described. As shown in Table 5.0-2, Alternative B would provide for approximately 279 more acres of residential uses;

CEQA FINDINGS

---

however, this alternative would provide 66 fewer acres of land designated for medium density residential uses and 88 fewer acres designated for mixed use development. Additionally, Alternative B would provide for 145 more acres of employment-generating commercial, professional, and industrial uses, when compared to the Proposed Land Use Map.

**Findings:** Alternative B is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the Project's objectives.

**Explanation:** CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The environmentally superior alternative is that alternative with the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.

As discussed in Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR and summarized in Table 5.0-26 of the Draft EIR, Alternative B (Residential and Balanced Employment Growth Alternative) is the environmentally superior alternative when looked at in terms of all potential environmental impacts. While Alternatives C and D are also superior to the proposed General Plan, Alternative B is slightly superior in several categories, including air quality, greenhouse gases, climate change, and energy, and transportation and circulation impacts resulting in a higher overall score for Alternative B. Overall, Alternative B is the environmentally superior alternative as it is the most effective in terms of overall reductions of impacts compared to the proposed General Plan and all other alternatives. It is noted that, when compared to the proposed General Plan, Alternative B would slightly increase the severity of impacts related to noise, public services and recreation, and utilities.

This alternative would achieve all of the Project objectives, but some objectives would be met to a lesser extent than the Project. Alternative B would provide for fewer opportunities for multifamily residential land uses and fewer opportunities new jobs-generating land uses, which provide employment opportunities and revenues to the City, which are used to fund public services and infrastructure improvements. Under this alternative, the amount of new residential growth in the multi-family category would decrease from 17,212 units to 11,453 units. The seventh Project objective aims to provide and encourage high-quality housing options and a variety of housing types for all income levels. This alternative would not meet this objective to the same extent as the Project as this

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

alternative would result in a decrease in lands to accommodate medium and higher density housing opportunities, as shown by the decrease in lands designated for medium density residential and mixed use, which would decrease the range of housing types and income levels accommodated under this alternative. Additionally, the reduced residential densities under this alternative would promote urban sprawl and a less orderly growth pattern. For these economic and social reasons, the Project is considered superior to Alternative 2.

### **3. Alternative C: Increased Intensity Residential and Balanced Employment Growth**

The Increased Intensity Residential and Balanced Employment Growth Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-9 through 5.0-13 and pages 5.0-19 through 5.0-39 of the Draft EIR.

Alternative C would revise the General Plan Land Use Map to place more emphasis on identifying specific areas for residential growth, including medium and high density residential land uses and encouraging the distribution of these uses throughout residential neighborhoods. However, this alternative would provide 66 fewer acres of land designated for medium density residential uses and 88 fewer acres designated for mixed use development Alternative C continues to provide for a balance of job-creating and residential development land uses, but would reduce commercial and other employee-generating uses in order to reduce vehicle miles travelled. Alternative C would continue to encourage infill development throughout the City, as well as new growth in greenfield areas that extend the City's existing development pattern. Figure 5.0-3 shows the Land Use Map for Alternative C, which includes the following major changes from the Proposed General Plan:

1. The Urban Reserve overlay is applied to an expansion of the Planning Area in the area north of Roth Road and West of Airport Way to identify long-term desires for future industrial and employment-generating growth in this area and to promote efficient delivery of City services (same as Alternative B).
2. A residential/commercial node with High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Mixed Use Commercial uses is created east of Airport Way between Lovelace Road and the future Roth Road extension with Low Density Residential uses extending south from the future Roth Road extension. Alternative C differs from Alternative B in this location as Alternative C includes extended Commercial designation along the future Roth Road extension and includes a narrow swath of the Park land use designation between Airport Way and the proposed Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential uses.

**CEQA FINDINGS**

3. The Urban Reserve overlay is placed on a portion of lands north of the future Roth Road extension and east of Union Road and this area, including both the Urban Reserve area as well as future growth areas, is designated Business Industrial Park, increasing the potential for industrial and employment-generating uses in this area (same as Alternative B).
4. The Urban Reserve overlay is removed from a portion of Industrial and Business Industrial Park identified in the northern portion of the Planning Area east of Highway 99.
5. An underutilized infill site northeast of Union Road and W. Alameda Street is changed from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential.
6. Policy Area 1 is revised to support the relocation of the Lovelace Materials Recovery Facility and Transfer Station through envisioning the facility and surrounding area for Commercial Mixes Use and residential use.
7. Policy Area 2 is revised to focus on jobs- and employment-generating uses in the vicinity of future transit uses.
8. Policy Area 5 is revised to increase Medium Density Residential uses and include a Park site.
9. An unincorporated island between Moffat Boulevard and Industrial Park Drive is changed from Commercial Mixed Use to Industrial.
10. The Urban Reserve overlay is removed from the Oakwood Lakes area.
11. Infill opportunities in the select areas in the City southwest of Atherton Road and Main Street are changed from Commercial to residential designations, Low, Medium, and High Density Residential, from High Density Residential to Commercial southwest of the Highway 120/Union Road interchange (same as Alternative C).
12. Lands south of Graves Road are revised to replace a portion of the proposed Mixed Use and Business Industrial Park designations with Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, and a narrow Parks strip separating residential designations from Industrial uses and Highway 99.

This alternative emphasizes an increase in residential development, with an emphasis on increasing low and high density residential development within neighborhoods, a decrease in mixed uses, and an increase in business professional and business industrial parks uses to improve the jobs/housing balance. This alternative was developed to potentially reduce the severity of significant impacts associated with transportation and circulation and also to reduce the severity of impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gases, and noise.

Alternative C would provide for approximately 238 more acres of residential uses overall; however, there would be a decrease of 60 acres of medium density residential uses and 87 fewer acres of mixed use development within the Planning Area, when

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

compared to the Proposed Land Use Map. Additionally, Alternative B would provide for 189 more acres of employment-generating commercial, professional, and industrial uses, when compared to the Proposed Land Use Map. As shown in Table 5.0-3, Alternative C would allow for more residential growth than the proposed General Plan, less mixed uses, and more job growth. Compared to Alternative B, Alternative C would provide for slightly more nonresidential and multi-family residential growth, but slightly less overall residential growth. Additionally, Alternative C would facilitate more residential and nonresidential growth than Alternative A, the existing General Plan.

- a. **Findings:** The Increased Intensity Residential and Balanced Employment Growth Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not reduce many of the significant impacts under the proposed Project to a less than significant level.
- b. **Explanation:** This alternative would result in slightly worse impacts in eight resource areas, and would result in slightly better impacts in two resource areas. This alternative would not reduce any significant impacts to a less than significant level. This alternative would achieve the basic Project objectives. However, the seventh Project objective aims to provide and encourage high-quality housing options and a variety of housing types for all income levels. This alternative would not meet this objective to the same extent as the Project as this alternative would increase in low density residential land uses and decrease lands designated to accommodate medium and higher density housing opportunities, as shown by the decrease in lands designated for medium density residential and mixed use, which decreases the range of housing types and income levels accommodated under this alternative. Additionally, the reduced residential densities under this alternative would promote urban sprawl and a less orderly growth pattern.

For these reasons, the Project is considered superior to Alternative C.

### 4. Alternative D: Previous Proposed Project (March 2021)

The Previous Proposed Project (March 2021) Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-13 through 5.0-16 and pages 5.0-39 through 5.0-251 of the Draft EIR.

Alternative D is identical to the previously proposed Draft General Plan, including the Land Use Map, which was analyzed in the Draft EIR for the Manteca General Plan Update (dated March 2021). Alternative D is included to ensure transparency in the General Plan Update process by providing for a comparison between the previously

**CEQA FINDINGS**

proposed Draft General Plan that was circulated for public review and analyzed in the May 2021 Draft EIR and the Revised Draft General Plan, as described in Chapter 2.0, Project Description.

Alternative D continues to provide for a balance of job-creating and residential development land uses. Alternative D would continue to encourage infill development throughout the City, as well as accommodate new growth in greenfield areas that extend the City's existing development pattern. Alternative D includes the proposed Truck Route from the previously proposed Draft General Plan. Figure 5.0-4 shows the Land Use Map for Alternative D, which includes the following major changes from the Proposed General Plan:

1. The Planning Area is expanded in the area north of Roth Road and West of Airport Way to identify long-term desires for future commercial, industrial, and employment-generating growth in this area and to promote efficient delivery of City services (similar to Alternatives B and C), with the Urban Reserve overlay applied to the northern portion of the extension.
2. East of Airport Way and north of the Roth Road extension, Business Industrial Park uses are added with the Urban Reserve overlay applied to the northern portion to focus growth in the northwest portion of the Planning Area closer to the Roth Road extension.
3. The Villa Ticino policy area reverts from the approved land use plan to establish an area for Industrial growth.
4. West of Airport Way and south of Lathrop Road, Industrial uses are added between Lathrop Road and the UPRR railroad tracks, increasing the Industrial designation along Airport Way.
5. Policy Area 1 is reduced to support the relocation of the Lovelace Materials Recovery Facility and Transfer Station through envisioning the facility and surrounding area for a range of residential uses, with Commercial Mixed Use located along Airport Way to buffer residential uses from more intensive uses. The area south of Policy Area 1 along Lovelace Road is changed to Low Density Residential to be consistent with the modifications north of Lovelace Road.
6. Policy Area 2 is revised to focus on jobs- and employment-generating uses in the vicinity of future transit uses.
7. Policy Area 5 is revised to increase Medium Density Residential uses and include a Park site.
8. An underutilized infill site northeast of Union Road and W. Alameda Street is changed from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential.
9. The Commercial designation is applied to the area southwest of the Union Road and Highway 120 interchange, reducing the potential for high density residential uses in this area.

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

10. The area west of the intersection of Moffat Boulevard and Industrial Park Drive is designated Industrial to promote employment-generating uses and increase compatibility with adjacent uses designated Industrial.
11. The Commercial designation is applied to the area southwest of the Main Street and Highway 120 interchange, reducing residential uses adjacent to Highway 120.
12. The Urban Reserve overlay is removed from the Oakwood Lake area in the southwest portion of the Planning Area outside of the City limits.

As shown in Table 5.0-4, Alternative D would provide for approximately 20 more acres of residential uses and 102 fewer acres of mixed use development when compared to the Project. Additionally, Alternative D would provide for 770 more acres of employment-generating commercial, professional, and industrial uses, when compared to the Project.

- a. **Findings:** The Previous Proposed Project (March 2021) Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not reduce any significant impacts to a less than significant level.
- b. **Explanation:** This alternative would achieve the basic Project objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Project. Alternative D includes the proposed Truck Route from the previously proposed Draft General Plan. Because of this, the Previous Proposed Project (March 2021) Alternative does not reflect the current goals and vision expressed by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders. Additionally, by including the Truck Route, this alternative does not address issues and concerns identified by city residents, businesses, decision-makers, and other stakeholders. Further, this alternative would result in slightly worse impacts in 13 resource areas and would not reduce any significant impacts to a less than significant level. Further, the seventh Project objective aims to provide and encourage high-quality housing options and a variety of housing types for all income levels. This alternative would not meet this objective to the same extent as the Project as this alternative would result in an increase in low density residential land uses to support primarily single family residential development while decreasing lands designated to accommodate medium and higher density housing opportunities, as shown by the decrease in lands designated for medium density residential, high density residential, and mixed use, which decreases the range of housing types and income levels accommodated under this alternative.

CEQA FINDINGS

---

For these economic, social, market conditions, and other reasons, the Project is considered superior to Alternative D.

## VI. STATEMENTS OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b) and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City of Manteca has balanced the benefits of the Modified Project against the following unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the Modified Project and has included all feasible mitigation measures as policies and action items within the Modified Project. Manteca has also examined alternatives to the Original Project, determined that additional alternatives are not required for the Modified Project, and has determined that adoption and implementation of the Modified Project is the most desirable, feasible, and appropriate action. The other alternatives are rejected as infeasible, failed to meet project objectives, were not able to reduce any significant impacts to a less than significant levels, or increased the severity on significant impacts based on consideration of the relevant factors discussed in Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR.

### A. Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Based on the information and analysis set forth in the EIR and reiterated in Section III of these Findings, implementation of the Modified Project would result in the following project-specific significant impacts related to: agricultural resources, air quality, noise, transportation and circulation, and irreversible effects. These impacts are identified below:

- **Impact 3.2-1:** General Plan implementation would result in the conversion of farmlands, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, to non-agricultural use;
- **Impact 3.2-2:** General Plan implementation would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract;
- **Impact 3.3-1:** General Plan implementation would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants;
- **Impact 3.12-1:** General Plan implementation may result in exposure to significant traffic noise sources;
- **Impact 3.14-1:** General Plan implementation may result in VMT per dwelling unit and VMT per employee increases that are greater than 85 percent of Baseline conditions;
- **Impact 3.14-2:** General Plan implementation may conflict with a program, plan, policy or ordinance addressing the circulation system, including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities;
- **Impact 3.14-3:** General Plan implementation may increase hazards due to a design feature, incompatible uses, or inadequate emergency access;

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

- **Impact 4.2:** Cumulative impact to agricultural lands and resources;
- **Impact 4.3:** Cumulative impact on the region's air quality;
- **Impact 4.12:** Cumulative impacts related to noise;
- **Impact 4.14:** Cumulative impacts on the transportation network;
- **Impact 4.17:** Irreversible and adverse effects.

### **B. Benefits of the Modified Project/Overriding Considerations**

The City of Manteca has (i) independently reviewed the information in the EIR and the record of proceedings; (ii) made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially lessen the impacts resulting from the proposed General Plan to the extent feasible by including policies and actions in the General Plan that effectively minimize or reduce potential environmental impacts to the greatest extent feasible; and (iii) balanced the project's benefits against the project's significant unavoidable impacts.

Adoption and implementation of the Modified Project would provide the following economic, social, legal, and other considerable benefits:

1. The Modified Project promotes compact and environmentally sustainable development through goals and policies that balance the need for adequate infrastructure, housing, and economic vitality with the need for resource management, environmental protection, and preservation of quality of life for Manteca residents.
2. The Modified Project provides a land use map and policy document that accounts for existing development, physical constraints, economic development, flood and other hazards, and incompatible uses and assigns densities and use types accordingly to enhance the safety, livability, and economic vitality of Manteca.
3. The Modified Project improves mobility options through the development of a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity, supports community development patterns, limits traffic congestion, promotes public and alternative transportation methods, supports the goals of adopted regional transportation plans, and improves the effectiveness of the future Roth Road extension.
4. The Modified Project promotes parks and recreation opportunities through establishing future park sites, including a regional park of at least 50 acres in the northern area of the City, and establishes open space/park/greenbelt connectors to increase opportunities for non-vehicular modes of transportation between community destinations.
5. The Modified Project promotes environmental justice through establishing policies and actions to reduce exposure of disadvantaged areas, underrepresented populations and sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants, noise, and adverse

CEQA FINDINGS

---

environmental effects and to improve equitable distribution and access to a safe and healthy environment, including access to healthy foods, active lifestyle opportunities including parks, recreation, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, and opportunities for meaningful involvement by all people.

6. The Modified Project directs the preservation and environmental stewardship of the vast array of natural, cultural, and historic resources that uniquely define the character and ecological importance of the City and greater region.
7. The Modified Project addresses adverse environmental effects associated with climate change by facilitating sustainable development, promoting energy efficiency, and promoting development that reduces greenhouse gas emissions.
8. The Modified Project enhances the local economy and provides opportunities for future jobs and business development growth by planning for commercial and industrial development near existing urbanized areas and transportation corridors.
9. The Modified Project supports accommodating a variety of housing types and housing costs, through identifying lands that increase housing opportunities for lower density residential development through the very low and low density land use designations, and increasing opportunities for higher density development, including triplexes, fourplexes, townhomes, condominiums, and apartments, through the medium density and high density residential land use designations, and opportunities for townhomes, condominiums, apartments, mixed use, and live-work housing, through the mixed use and downtown land use designations. These designations support a range of housing densities and mixed use development opportunities and will increase the variety of housing types and costs by providing opportunities to expand the variety of housing options available.
10. The Modified Project reflects the comprehensive General Plan Update public planning effort driven by members of the public, the General Plan Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission and the City Council through a series of public meetings, hearings and workshops that resulted in a thoughtful balance of community, economic, and environmental interests.
11. The Modified Project implements the requirements of State law (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.) to address all required General Plan topics, including environmental justice and climate adaptation and resilience.

## VII. CONCLUSION

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the proposed project, the City Council finds that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified may be considered “acceptable” due to the specific considerations listed above which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the Modified Project.

## CEQA FINDINGS

---

The Manteca City Council has considered information contained in the EIR prepared for the Original Project and contained in the Addendum for the Modified Project, and the public testimony and record of proceedings in which the Original Project and Modified Project were considered. Recognizing that significant unavoidable agricultural resources, air quality, noise, transportation and circulation, and irreversible effects impacts may result from implementation of the Modified Project, the Council finds that the benefits of the General Plan and overriding considerations outweigh the adverse effects of the Modified Project. Having included all feasible methods to reduce environmental impacts at the programmatic, General Plan level as policies and actions in the Modified Project, and recognized all unavoidable significant impacts, the Council hereby finds that each of the separate benefits of the proposed General Plan, as stated herein, is determined to be unto itself an overriding consideration, independent of other benefits, that warrants adoption of the Modified Project and outweighs and overrides its unavoidable significant effects, and thereby justifies the adoption of the Modified Project.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, the Council hereby determines that:

1. All significant effects on the environment due to implementation of the Modified Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible;
2. There are no feasible alternatives to the Modified Project which would fully mitigate or substantially lessen the impacts to a less than significant level; and
3. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations above.