RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ENVISION STOCKTON 2040 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE (GENERAL PLAN) AND UTILITY MASTER PLAN SUPPLEMENTS (UMPS), ADOPTING THE FINDINGS OF FACT, ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, REJECTING LAND USE ALTERNATIVES, AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The proposed Envision Stockton 2040 General Plan (General Plan) is the principal policy and planning document for guiding future conservation and development in the city. It represents the basic policy direction of the Stockton City Council on community values, ideals, and aspirations to govern a shared environment through the year 2040. The General Plan addresses all aspects of development including, among others, land use, transportation, housing, economic development, public facilities and infrastructure, and open spaces.

The overall purpose of the proposed General Plan is to create a policy framework that articulates a vision for the City's physical form, while preserving and enhancing quality of life for Stockton residents. The key components of the proposed General Plan include broad community goals for the future of Stockton and specific policies and implementing actions to help meet the goals. The proposed General Plan contains the following chapters:

- Introduction
- Planning Framework
- Land Use
- Transportation
- Safety
- Community Health

The State of California encourages cities to look beyond their borders when undertaking the sort of comprehensive planning required of a general plan. For this reason, the proposed General Plan delineates three partly overlapping areas outside the city limit: the Urban Services Area Boundary (USAB), the Sphere of Influence (SOI), and the Planning Area. The General Plan also delineates the Greater Downtown and Downtown Core areas, and proposes policies and land use standards that are specific to these geographic regions. These planning boundaries are shown in Figure 3-2 of the Draft General Plan and UMPS EIR (Draft EIR) and are more particularly described below. The City has jurisdiction only over land that is within the city limit; however, it is probable that some of the land within the SOI will be annexed by the City of Stockton within the horizon of the proposed General Plan, and would, therefore, be subject to the City's jurisdiction in the future.

Accordingly, the Final General Plan and UMPS EIR (Final EIR) focuses on the analysis of potential changes within the city limit and SOI. This area is referred to herein as the

EIR Study Area. The EIR Study Area boundary is shown on Figure 3-2, Planning Boundaries, of the Draft EIR.

The proposed UMPS identify needed infrastructure improvements to serve future development. Specifically, the UMPS evaluate and identify the following types of infrastructure improvement needs:

- Water storage
- Water pumping facilities
- Water distribution pipelines
- Sewer collection systems
- Wastewater treatment facilities
- Stormwater detention storage
- Stormwater pumping facilities

These facilities are sized for the amount of development included in the 2040 development projection, including approved and pending development projects. The proposed UMPS also present approximate cost information for new infrastructure improvements.

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Final EIR describes the potential environmental impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan and UMPS. Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines establishes that the physical environmental conditions at the time of the issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) constitute the baseline conditions by which an impact is determined to be significant. The NOP for the proposed General Plan and EIR was published on May 24, 2017 (California State Clearinghouse #2017052062), and subsequently reissued on August 23, 2017. The City of Stockton is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project.

The Final EIR provides the information and findings on which the City Council may certify that it has prepared the Final EIR for the proposed project in compliance with all of CEQA's procedural and substantive requirements (see **Section II** of this attachment). **Section III** of this attachment provides information and findings regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and the effectiveness and feasibility of mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR and the City's adoption of those mitigation measures as conditions of approval of the proposed project. **Sections IV & V** provide information and findings on CEQA-related considerations regarding irreversible or growth inducing impacts and findings on which the City Council may reject or adopt alternatives to the proposed project studied in the Final EIR. Finally, **Section VI** provides a statement of overriding considerations by which the City Council may justify its approval of the proposed project despite the fact that implementation of the proposed project may result in significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

II. FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AND UTILITY MASTER PLAN SUPPLEMENTS

The City Council finds, based on substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, that the Final EIR for the proposed General Plan and UMPS, which consists of the Draft EIR and its appendices, Responses to Comments and associated modifications to the Draft EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, has been completed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the Stockton Municipal Code and all other applicable laws and regulations.[1]

Specifically, the City Council finds, based on substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, that:

1. The City of Stockton caused an EIR for the proposed project to be prepared pursuant to CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Stockton Municipal Code.

2. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft EIR was filed with the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research on May 24, 2017 for a 30-day review period and was circulated for public comments. On August 23, 2017, the NOP was subsequently reissued to revise a figure in the project description that shows the extent of proposed urban to agriculture/open space changes, which began a second 30-day review period. Notices for the NOP were mailed to other agencies (local and federal) and to interested persons and community members. Notices for the NOP were also posted at the County Clerk's Office and in Stockton City Hall.

3. On June 8, 2017, the City held a public meeting to conduct a scoping session for the Draft EIR. Comments were received on the NOP, which were subsequently incorporated into the Draft EIR.

4. A Notice of Completion (NOC) and copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to the California State Clearinghouse on June 26, 2018, to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the project, and to other interested parties and agencies. The City sought the input of such persons and agencies through various means, including direct communication to agency staff. Additional copies of the Draft EIR were distributed by the City to agencies who requested them. The 45-day public review and comment period ended on August 10, 2018.

5. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR was distributed to all responsible and trustee agencies; other local and federal agencies; and interested groups,

---

[1] CEQA is codified at sections 21000, *et seq.* of the California Public Resources Code. The CEQA Guidelines are set forth at California Code of Regulations, Title 14, sections 15000, *et seq*. The Stockton Development Code is set forth at Title 16 of the Stockton Municipal Code. The custodian of the record of this proceeding is the City of Stockton, Community Development Department, 345 N El Dorado Street, Stockton, California.

organizations, and individuals on June 26, 2018. The NOA stated that the City had completed the Draft EIR and that copies were available at the City of Stockton, 425 North El Dorado Street, Stockton and that the document was available for review on the City of Stockton "Envision Stockton" website. The NOA was also delivered electronically to all persons who had requested such notice up to that date. The notice indicated that the official public review period for the Draft EIR was from June 26, 2018 to August 10, 2018.

6. On August 2, 2018, the City's Planning Commission held a review and comment meeting on the Draft EIR, at which time the Commission accepted public comments on the Draft EIR. The comments received at that hearing were included and responded to in the Final EIR.

7. On October 10, 2018, the City published the Final EIR, which included responses to the comments received on the Draft EIR. The City emailed notices of the Final EIR's availability for review to interested persons, including State, federal, and local agencies. The notice further advised that the project and Final EIR would be discussed at the Planning Commission's October 25, 2018 meeting. The City also made available for review the Final EIR at City Hall and on the City's "Envision Stockton" website.

8. On October 10, 2018, the City posted a display ad in The Record, a newspaper of general circulation within the city, advertising the October 25, 2018 meeting of the Planning Commission, when the Commission would discuss and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the Final EIR for the proposed General Plan and UMPS, the Draft General Plan, and the UMPS. Notice of this meeting was also sent to all responsible and trustee agencies; other local and federal agencies; interested groups, organizations, and property owners; and individuals.

9. On October 25, 2018, and November 15, 2018, the Planning Commission of the City of Stockton held a duly noticed public hearing regarding the General Plan and UMPS EIR, Adoption of Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Draft General Plan and UMPS. The Commission voted 6-1, Davie dissenting, to recommend that the City Council certify the EIR and approve the General Plan and UMPS.

10. On November 20, 2018, the City posted a display ad in The Record, a newspaper of general circulation within the city, advertising the December 4, 2018, public hearing of the Stockton City Council to consider certification of the EIR and approval of the General Plan and UMPS. This notice advertised the location and availability of the Final EIR and all documents related to the project.

11. Testimony, documentary evidence, and all correspondence submitted or delivered to the City in connection with the Planning Commission and City Council hearings

on this project and the Final EIR and from community meetings held during the review process have been reviewed and considered by the City Council.

12. All staff reports, memoranda, maps, letters, minutes of meetings, and other documents relied upon or prepared by City staff relating to the project, including but not limited to, the proposed General Plan and UMPS, the Draft EIR, and Final EIR, have been reviewed and considered by the City Council.

Based on the foregoing and substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, the City Council hereby finds, declares, and certifies that:

1. The Final EIR was prepared, published, circulated, reviewed and completed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Stockton Municipal Code, and constitutes an adequate, accurate, objective, and complete Final EIR in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the Stockton Municipal Code.

2. The Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR, Responses to Comments and associated modifications to the Draft EIR, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, all appendices, and the documents and materials incorporated by reference into the EIR.

3. The Final EIR has been presented to the City Council, and the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained therein prior to acting on the proposed project, and the City Council finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City of Stockton.

4. The Final EIR reflects the best efforts of the City of Stockton to undertake all reasonably feasible and prudent actions to discover, analyze, disclose, and mitigate all potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.

5. The changes and additions to the Draft EIR made in the Final EIR do not constitute “significant new information” within the meaning of Public Resources Code Section 21092.1, and therefore recirculation of the Draft EIR for public review and comment is not required.

6. The Final EIR has been presented to the City Council, and the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained therein and in the record prior to making these findings or taking action on the proposed General Plan and UMPS.

7. The City Council hereby adopts the attached Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to require and ensure that all mitigation measures found to be reasonably feasible and effective are implemented.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ENVISION STOCKTON 2040 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND UTILITY MASTER PLAN SUPPLEMENTS INCLUDING THE MITIGATION MEASURES ANALYZED AND RECOMMENDED IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The EIR for the proposed General Plan and UMPS evaluates all potentially significant environmental impacts that could result from the approval of the proposed project, alternatives to the proposed project, and measures designed to mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the proposed General Plan and UMPS and is included in the project record. This section lists all identified potentially significant or significant impacts of the proposed project and, where applicable, mitigation measures adopted to avoid, reduce, or attempt to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level.

A. Less-than-Significant Impacts and Potentially Significant Impacts that are Avoided or Reduced to a Less-than-Significant Level.

Findings: As authorized by Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091, 15092, and 15093, the City finds that, unless otherwise stated, all of the changes or alterations to the proposed project listed below have been required, or incorporated into, the proposed project so as to mitigate or avoid the significant or potentially significant environmental impacts listed below, as identified in the Final EIR; that these mitigation measures will be effective to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts as described in the Final EIR; and that these mitigation measures are feasible to implement and are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Stockton to implement or enforce. These Findings of Fact are supported by substantial evidence in the record of proceedings before the City as stated below.

AESTHETICS

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Impact AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway.

Impact AES-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Impact AES-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

a. No Impact

Impact AG-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact AG-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Impact AG-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmlands of concern under CEQA to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

AIR QUALITY

a. Less-than-Significant Impact after mitigation

Impact AQ-5: Implementation of the proposed General Plan could expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations from non-permitted sources.

Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Prior to discretionary project approval, applicants for industrial or warehousing land uses in addition to commercial land uses that would generate substantial diesel truck travel (i.e., 100 diesel trucks per day or 40 or more trucks with diesel-powered transport refrigeration units per day based on the California Air Resources Board recommendations for siting new sensitive land uses), shall contact the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) or the City of Stockton in conjunction with the SJVAPCD to determine the appropriate level of health risk assessment (HRA) required. If preparation of an HRA is required, all HRAs shall be submitted to the City of Stockton and the SJVAPCD for evaluation.

The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the SJVAPCD. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E 06) or the risk thresholds in effect at the time a project is considered, or that the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0 or the thresholds as determined

by the SJVAPCD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms.

Measures to reduce risk impacts may include but are not limited to:

- Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible.
- Electrifying warehousing docks.
- Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles.
- Restricting offsite truck travel through the creation of truck routes.

Measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AQ-5: After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact AQ-6: Operation of new industrial land uses accommodated under the proposed General Plan has the potential to create objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Prior to project approval, if it is determined during project-level environmental review that a project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan shall be prepared and submitted by the project applicant prior to project approval to ensure compliance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Rule 4102. The following facilities that are within the buffer distances specified from sensitive receptors (in parentheses) have the potential to generate substantial odors:

- Wastewater Treatment Plan (2 miles)
- Sanitary Landfill (1 mile)
- Transfer Station (1 mile)
- Composting Facility (1 mile)
- Petroleum Refinery (2 miles)
- Asphalt Batch Plan (1 mile)
- Chemical Manufacturing (1 mile)
- Fiberglass Manufacturing (1 mile)
- Painting/Coating Operations (1 mile)
- Food Processing Facility (1 mile)
- Feed Lot/ Dairy (1 mile)
- Rendering Plant (1 mile)

The Odor Management Plan prepared for these facilities shall identify control technologies that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Control technologies may include but are not limited to scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at an industrial facility. Control technologies identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AQ-6: After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact BIO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Impact BIO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Impact BIO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

Impact BIO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Impact BIO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Impact BIO-6: Implementation of the proposed project 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.

CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact CULT-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

Impact CULT-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Impact CULT-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Impact CULT-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not disturb any human remains.

Impact CULT-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

GEOLOGY, SOILS, SEISMICITY, AND MINERAL RESOURCES

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides.

Impact GEO-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Impact GEO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units or soils or result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

Impact GEO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create substantial risks to property as a result of its location on expansive soil, as defined by Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code.

Impact GEO-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

Impact GEO-6: Implementation of the proposed project would a) 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, or b) result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact GHG-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a. No Impact

Impact HAZ-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact HAZ-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Impact HAZ-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Impact HAZ-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school.

Impact HAZ-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Impact HAZ-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working within the airport land use plan area.

Impact HAZ-7: Implementation of the proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Impact HAZ-8: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact HYDRO-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements.

Impact HYDRO-2.1: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Impact HYDRO-2.2: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge.

Impact HYDRO-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Impact HYDRO-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

Impact HYDRO-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Impact HYDRO-7: Implementation of the proposed project would place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

Impact HYDRO-8: Implementation of the proposed project would not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

Impact HYDRO-9: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Impact HYDRO-10: Implementation of the proposed project would not cause substantial flood hazards arising from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

b. Less-than-Significant Impact after mitigation

Impact HYDRO-5: Development allowed under the proposed General Plan could result in existing and planned stormwater drain infrastructure to be undersized or otherwise inadequate, which could lead to flooding and polluted runoff.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-5: Complete a citywide storm drainage master plan, including hydrologic and hydraulic models for existing land use conditions and for the land uses anticipated in 2040 under the proposed General Plan. The master plan should identify the future stormwater infrastructure needs and develop a current stormwater capital improvement plan. As part of this process, identify areas that have constraints, prioritize watersheds to be modeled, and evaluate the City stormwater fee program for potential revisions. In addition, require new development to complete stormwater plans covering drainage, flood control, and storm water quality/permitting. Use the master plan and project-level stormwater plans to assess future development, and require that future development construct the required on- and off-site infrastructure. Implementation of this mitigation measure should be timed to anticipate and precede significant developments that would be most likely to place large demands on the current stormwater system.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact HYDRO-5: After the implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, potential impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact LU-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community.

Impact LU-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Impact LU-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

NOISE

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact NOISE-1: The proposed project would not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan or the Municipal Code, and/or the applicable standards of other agencies.

Impact NOISE-2: The proposed project would not expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Impact NOISE-4: The proposed project would cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

Impact NOISE-5: The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the vicinity of the project area to excessive aircraft noise levels from a public airport or public use airport.

Impact NOISE-6: The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact POP-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact POP-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact PS-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Impact PS-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Impact PS-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.

Impact PS-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur, or be accelerated.

Impact PS-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not include recreational facilities and or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Impact PS-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.

Impact PS-7: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact TRAF-3: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

Impact TRAF-4: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Impact TRAF-5: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in inadequate emergency vehicle access.

Impact TRAF-6: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

a. Less-than-Significant Impact, no mitigation required

Impact UTIL-1: Implementation of the proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the proposed project from existing entitlements and resources, and would not require new or expanded entitlements.

Impact UTIL-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.

Impact UTIL-3: Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the CVRWQCB.

Impact UTIL-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.

Impact UTIL-5: The City of Stockton Municipal Utilities Department, which would serve the project, has sufficient wastewater treatment capacity to serve the project as well as existing developments in its service area.

Impact UTIL-6: Implementation of the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Impact UTIL-7: Implementation of the proposed project would be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

Impact UTIL-8: Implementation of the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Impact UTIL-9: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in natural gas and electrical service demands that would require new energy supply facilities and transmission infrastructure or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.

B. Significant Impacts that Cannot be Avoided

Findings: The City finds that, where feasible, the changes or alterations that have been required or incorporated into the proposed project will reduce the significant environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR, which are listed below, but not to a less-than-significant level. That is because specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations render the mitigation measures analyzed infeasible, as supported by substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding. Unless otherwise noted, the City of Stockton hereby finds the following mitigation measures infeasible or ineffective, and therefore finds the following impacts significant and unavoidable.

AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

a. Significant and Unavoidable Impact after mitigation

Impact AG-1: Although the proposed General Plan includes policies and actions that would reduce and partially offset the conversion of farmland, it designates

approximately 16,160 acres of farmlands of concern under CEQA for non-agricultural uses.

Mitigation Measure AG-1: Prior to project approval, if a development project will convert prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or unique farmland to a non-agricultural use, the project applicant shall demonstrate participation in the City's agricultural conversion program, which requires either dedication of an agricultural conservation easement at a 1:1 ratio or payment of an in-lieu agricultural mitigation fee.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AG-1: Conservation easements will not fully mitigate the impact because farmland of concern under CEQA would still be converted to a non-agricultural use. Because these farmland areas are located near existing urbanized areas, they may not be viable for agricultural operations due to conflicts with nearby urbanized areas. The only way to fully mitigate this impact would be to prohibit any development on farmland of concern. CEQA does not require that the project be changed in order to avoid an impact, and much of the farmland of concern that is designated for a non-agricultural use is already entitled for development; no additional mitigation is available, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

b. Significant and Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation available)

Impact AG-2: The proposed General Plan designates 2,464 acres of lands with active Williamson Act contracts for non-agricultural uses.
Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AG-2: Because these parcels with Williamson Act contracts are located near existing urbanized areas, they may not be viable for agricultural operations due to conflicts with nearby urbanized areas. As discussed under Impact AG-1, above, no additional mitigation is available, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

AIR QUALITY

a. Significant and Unavoidable Impact after mitigation

Impact AQ-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in the generation of substantial long-term criteria air pollutant emissions that would exceed the SJVAPCD regional significance thresholds and would therefore not be considered consistent with the existing AQMPs.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3 to further reduce long-term criteria air pollutant emissions.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AQ-1: The various goals, policies, and actions of the proposed General Plan, in addition to applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations and Mitigation Measure AQ-1, would contribute to reducing long-

term criteria air pollutant emissions to the extent feasible. However, due to the magnitude and intensity of development accommodated by the proposed General Plan, as well as current and future regional air quality influences beyond the control of the City of Stockton, Impact AQ-1 would remain significant and avoidable.

Impact AQ-2: Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed General Plan and UMPS could exceed the SJVAPCD regional significance thresholds.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Prior to issuance of any construction permits for development projects subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the City of Stockton Planning and Engineering Division a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. The prepared evaluation for projects that meet the SJVAPCD Small Projects Analysis Level (SPAL) screening criteria shall at minimum, identify the primary sources of construction emissions and include a discussion of the applicable SJVAPCD rules and regulations and SPAL screening criteria to support a less than significant conclusion.

For projects that do not meet the SPAL screening criteria, project-related construction emissions shall be quantified. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD adopted thresholds of significance, as identified in the Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), the City of Stockton Planning and Engineering Division shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds. These identified measures shall be incorporated into appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning and Engineering Division. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions could include, but are not limited to:

- Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. A list of construction equipment by type and model year shall be maintained by the construction contractor on-site, which shall be available for City review upon request.
- Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards.
- Use of alternative-fueled or catalyst-equipped diesel construction equipment, if available and feasible.

- Clearly posted signs that require operators of trucks and construction equipment to minimize idling time (e.g., five minute maximum).
- Preparation and implementation of a fugitive dust control plan that may include the following measures:
    - Disturbed areas (including storage piles) that are not being actively utilized for construction purposes shall be effectively stabilized using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or covered with a tarp or other suitable cover (e.g., revegetated).
    - On-site unpaved roads and offsite unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
    - Land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled utilizing application of water or by presoaking.
    - Material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained when materials are transported offsite.
    - Operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions.) (Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.) (Utilize electric-powered vacuums or devices to capture materials.)
    - Following the addition of materials to or the removal of materials from the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
    - Within urban areas, trackout shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site and at the end of each workday.
    - Any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day shall prevent carryout and trackout.
    - Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
    - Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than 1 percent.
    - Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the project area.
    - Adhere to Regulation VIII's 20 percent opacity limitation, as applicable.
- Enter into a Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA) with the SJVAPCD. The VERA shall identify the amount of emissions to be reduced, in addition to the amount of funds to be paid by the project applicant to the SJVAPCD to implement emission reduction projects required for the project.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AQ-2: Implementation of the proposed project would occur over a period of 23 years or longer. Construction activities associated with development allowed under the proposed General Plan and UMPS could generate short-term emissions that exceed the SJVAPCD's significance thresholds during this time and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SJVAB. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2, in addition to applicable regulatory measures (e.g., SJVAPCD Rules 9510 and Regulation VIII) and the proposed Action SAF-4.1.A related to reducing construction-related emissions, would reduce criteria air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities to the extent feasible and may result in reducing construction-related regional air quality impacts of subsequent individual projects to less-than-significant levels. However, due to the programmatic nature of the proposed project, construction time frames and equipment for individual site-specific projects are not available and there is a potential for multiple developments to be constructed at any one time, resulting in significant construction-related emissions. Therefore, despite adherence to Mitigation Measure AQ-2, Impact AQ-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-3: Operation of development projects allowed under the proposed General Plan would generate emissions that would exceed the SJVAPCD regional significance thresholds for VOC, NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5.

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Stockton for development projects subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the City of Stockton Planning and Engineering Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SJVAPCD-adopted thresholds of significance, as identified in the Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), the City of Stockton Planning and Engineering Division shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions can include, but are not limited to the following:

- For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plug-in of the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.
- Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.

- Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with Section 2485 of 13 CCR Chapter 10.
- Provide changing/shower facilities as specified, at minimum, or greater than in the guidelines in Section A5.106.4.3 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).
- Provide bicycle parking facilities equivalent to or greater than as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.
- Provide preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles equivalent to or greater than Section A5.106.5.1 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).
- Provide facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code.
- Applicant-provided appliances shall be Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star-certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check.
- Applicants for future development projects along existing and planned transit routes shall coordinate with the City Stockton and San Joaquin Regional Transit District to ensure that bus pad and shelter improvements are incorporated, as appropriate, and that these transit improvements consider and implement design features (e.g., pullout lanes for buses) to avoid or reduce impediment/queuing of vehicles.
- Applicants for future development projects shall enter into a Voluntary Emissions Reduction Agreement (VERA) with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). The VERA shall identify the amount of emissions to be reduced, in addition to the amount of funds to be paid by the project applicant to the SJVAPCD to implement emission reduction projects required for the project.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AQ-3: Application of State and SJVAPCD rules and regulations, such as Rules 9510 and 9410, and implementation of the proposed General Plan goals, policies, and actions would contribute to reducing operation-related criteria air pollutants generated from energy, area, and mobile sources to the extent feasible. Incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would also contribute to reducing criteria air pollutants. Implementation of the aforementioned rules, goals and policies, and mitigation could contribute to reducing operation-phase regional air quality impacts of future individual projects to a less than significant level. However, Impact AQ-3 would remain significant and unavoidable due to the magnitude of the overall development associated with the proposed General Plan, combined with current and future regional air quality influences beyond the control of the City of Stockton.

Impact AQ-4: Development allowed under the proposed General Plan and UMPS could result in short- and long-term emissions that could cause or contribute to a violation of the AAQS.

Mitigation Measure AQ-4a: Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2 and AQ-3 to further reduce construction and operation-related criteria air pollutant emissions.

Mitigation Measure AQ-4b: Prior to discretionary approval, applicants for development projects that are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall assess their projects to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) Rule 9510 Applicability Thresholds as follows:

- 50 residential units;
- 2,000 square feet of commercial space;
- 25,000 square feet of light industrial space;
- 100,000 square feet of heavy industrial space;
- 20,000 square feet of medical office space;
- 39,000 square feet of general office space;
- 9,000 square feet of education space;
- 10,000 square feet of government space;
- 20,000 square feet of recreational space; or
- 9,000 square feet of space not identified above.

Applicants for development projects subject to CEQA that do not meet the SJVAPCD Rule 9510 Applicability Thresholds shall assess whether project-related construction and operational emissions exceed the SJVAPCD 100 pounds per day ambient air quality screening threshold. Applicants for development projects that exceed this ambient air quality screening threshold shall prepare or have prepared an ambient air quality analysis, consistent with the SJVAPCD Guidance for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (GAMAQI), to assess whether the subject development project would cause or contribute to a violation of any California Ambient Air Quality Standard or National Ambient Air Quality Standard. The ambient air quality analysis shall identify measures to reduce impacts as necessary. Recommended measures may include those identified in Mitigation Measures AQ-2 and AQ-3. The related recommendations of the ambient air quality analysis shall be incorporated into all construction management and design plans and which shall be submitted to the City and verified by the City's Planning and Engineering Division.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact AQ-4: Application of State and SJVAPCD rules and regulations, implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions, and incorporation of Mitigation Measures AQ-4a and AQ AQ-4b would reduce construction and operation-related criteria air pollutants to the extent feasible. However, despite implementation of the proposed plans, policies, and adherence to the mitigation measures, Impact AQ-4 would remain significant

and unavoidable due to the magnitude of development associated with the proposed General Plan and UMPS, combined with current and future regional air quality influences beyond the control of the City of Stockton.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMMISSIONS

a. Significant and Unavoidable Impact after mitigation

Impact GHG-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan would result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Within 24 months of adoption of the proposed General Plan, the City of Stockton shall proceed to adoption hearings for an update to its Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP shall provide:

- GHG inventories of existing and 2030 GHG levels;
- Targets for 2030 from land uses under the City's jurisdiction based on the goals of SB 32; and
- Tools and strategies for reducing GHG emissions in accordance with the 2030 goals of the CAP.

The City shall consider the following GHG reduction measures in its CAP Update:

- Reevaluate the City's current green building requirements (Stockton Municipal Code Chapter 15.72, Green Building Standards) every five years to consider additional requirements for substantial new residential and non-residential development to ensure that new development achieves a performance objective consistent with the best performing (top 25 percent) of city green building measures in the state.
- Require financing and/or installing energy-saving retrofits on existing structures as potential mitigation measures for discretionary projects that have significant GHG impacts as part of the CEQA process.
- Utilize transfer of development rights and other mechanisms, such as an infill mitigation bank, to enhance the viability of development in the Greater Downtown.
- Establish a goal for 15 percent of existing development to install solar panels over carports.
- Establish a goal to achieve 10 percent of non-residential electricity and 5 percent of residential electricity entirely by solar.
- Offer incentives for contractors that use electric equipment when bidding on City contracts.
- Limit non-essential idling of large construction equipment to no more than 3 minutes.

In addition, to implement the CAP, the City shall develop key ordinances, programs, and policies required to promote voluntary, incentive- based measures in the CAP, establish the planning framework for the performance-based development review process, and support and implement the local mandatory GHG reduction measures. These implementation tasks include:

- Update the community GHG inventory to monitor emissions trends every five years.
- In 2030, develop a plan for post-2030 actions.
- Appoint an Implementation Coordinator to oversee the successful implementation of all selected GHG reduction strategies. The primary function of the Implementation Coordinator will be to create a streamlined approach to manage implementation of the CAP. The Implementation Coordinator will also coordinate periodic community outreach to leverage community involvement, interest, and perspectives.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact GHG-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions, combined with Mitigation Measure GHG-1, would reduce GHG emissions to the extent feasible. However, due to the magnitude of growth associated with the proposed General Plan, it is anticipated that an increase in GHG emissions would remain substantial and would not contribute to net achievement of the State's long-term climate stabilization goals. While adherence to the City of Stockton's CAP would also contribute to reducing GHG emissions in the EIR Study Area and to progress in meeting the year 2020 AB 32 reduction target, additional federal, State, and local measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals under Executive Order S-03-05. At this time, there is no plan past 2030 to achieve the long-term GHG reduction goal established under Executive Order S-03-05. As identified by the California Council on Science and Technology, the State cannot meet the 2050 goal without major advancements in technology. Since no additional statewide measures are currently available, Impact GHG-1 would remain significant and unavoidable.

NOISE

a. <u>Significant and Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation available)</u>

Impact NOISE-3: Increased traffic from projected development allowed by the proposed General Plan would result in a significant increase in traffic noise levels compared to existing conditions along the following roadway segments:

1. SR-99 between Farmington Road and Mariposa Road
2. SR-4 west of I-5
3. Eight Mile Road between Mokelumne Drive and Trinity Parkway
4. Eight Mile Road between West Lane and SP Railroad
5. Eight Mile Road between SR-99 and west of Bear Creek
6. March Lane between West Land and Bianchi
7. French Camp Road between McDougald and E.W.S Wood

8. California Street between Park and Weber
9. California Street between Weber and Crosstown Freeway
10. Airport Way between Main and Market
11. Airport Way between Ninth and Tenth
12. Airport Way between Sperry and CE Dixon St
13. Mariposa Road between Stagecoach and SR-99
14. B Street between Ralph Avenue and Arch Airport

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact NOISE-3: The following mitigation measures were considered, but as described below, were found to be infeasible.

Technological Advances for Noise-Generating Vehicles

Implementation of improved technologies for the prevention or muffling of noise from vehicles could theoretically prevent substantial increases to ambient noise levels; however, this approach would be infeasible as much of this implementation is beyond the jurisdiction of the City.

Beyond currently-accepted State and industry standards and best practices, developing and/or requiring novel technological improvements for noise-generating vehicles would not be affordable, scientifically plausible, or within the City's jurisdiction. Therefore, this potential mitigation measure is regarded as infeasible.

Universal Use of Noise-Attenuating Features

The universal use of noise attenuating features such as rubberized asphalt, soundwalls, berms, and improved building sound-insulation, could prevent transmission of excessive noise to the outdoor and indoor areas of sensitive land uses and/or could prevent projected increases in ambient noise levels. However, this approach would be infeasible. Specifically, rubberized asphalt reduces tire-pavement noise and when new, achieves a reduction of approximately 4 dB when compared to normal pavement surfaces. However, these noise reduction properties degrade over time, and the noise reduction would not be sufficient to reduce noise impacts in many areas of Stockton. The typical cost of rubberized asphalt -- more than twice that of conventional treatments – can also be expected to render this measure economically infeasible.

In many cases, aesthetic concerns, costs, physical constraints, or other issues would prevent the universal implementation of adequate noise-attenuating features. In addition to their expense, soundwalls often block views and are often regarded as unsightly, targets for graffiti, or presenting safety concerns. Moreover, the construction of soundwalls can result in reduced pedestrian and vehicle connectivity, which would contravene other goals of the proposed General Plan and have negative social, economic, and even environmental consequences.

Although improved building construction and insulation beyond that required by California Title 24 and the General Plan could further reduce indoor exposure to

excessive noise, substantial outdoor increases to ambient noise levels would remain. Therefore, this potential mitigation measure is regarded as infeasible.

Summary

In summary, for this traffic-generated noise impact, there is no feasible mitigation that would prevent substantial increases in ambient noise levels since all conceivable mitigations would be, in some circumstances, economically impractical, scientifically unachievable, outside the City's jurisdiction, and/or inconsistent with City planning goals and objectives, as demonstrated in the EIR. Thus, because no feasible mitigation measures are available to mitigate noise impacts to a less than significant level, traffic noise would remain a significant and unavoidable impact.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

a. Significant and Unavoidable Impact (no mitigation available)

Impact POP-1: The proposed General Plan and UMPS would induce substantial employment growth within the EIR Study Area.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact POP-1: In order to reduce the anticipated employment growth by 2040 to an "insubstantial" level that would not exceed SJCOG's projections, the City would have to limit employment development opportunities substantially. As noted in the Draft EIR, 43,750 new jobs are projected within approved and pending development projects alone, a number that itself exceeds SJCOG's employment growth forecast. Since the City cannot rescind existing development entitlements, it would be infeasible to reduce the employment development capacity in the city to SJCOG's projections. The proposed General Plan land use map represents a land use plan that the City believes is appropriate to accommodate growth projected for 2040 and beyond. It is not feasible to mitigate employment growth to a level that is less than "substantial;" therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

a. Significant and Unavoidable Impact after mitigation

Impact TRAF-1: Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with regional growth, would result in increased vehicle traffic, which would affect the operation of local roadways and freeway segments. As shown in Table 4-14.2 and discussed above, the proposed General Plan would result in significant level of service impacts to roadway and freeway segments.

Mitigation Measure TRAF-1a: The City shall implement the following to reduce the severity of potential LOS impacts on the following City roadway segments:

- **March Lane at UPRR.** The adopted 2035 General Plan identifies an eight-lane cross section for this roadway from North El Dorado Street to State Route 99. The proposed General Plan envisions a six-lane cross-section through 2040. With an eight-lane cross-section, the roadway would operate within the established LOS policy. Therefore, to mitigate the impact, the City shall reserve sufficient right-of-way to accommodate an eight-lane cross-section, plus associated turn pockets at intersections. Construction of an eight-lane cross-section would result in an acceptable level of service for vehicles, but could preclude the provision of facilities that would encourage higher levels of transit ridership, walking and bicycling along the corridor.

  Prior to the construction of additional roadway improvements along the March Lane corridor, the City shall conduct a focused complete streets study to analyze and evaluate peak hour and daily operations of March Lane between I-5 and State Route 99 to identify the cross-section required to accommodate existing and planned growth. The complete streets study shall consider the potential mode shift under scenarios that provide additional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities along the corridor. Should the complete streets study show that corridor operations would fall within the established level of service standard for the six-lane cross-section, an implementation program of the identified bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements shall be required. Alternatively, the mitigation measure is to provide an eight-lane cross-section for vehicles. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **March Lane between West Lane and Bianchi Road.** The adopted 2035 General Plan identifies an eight-lane cross section for this roadway from North El Dorado Street to State Route 99. The proposed General Plan envisions a six-lane cross-section through 2040. With an eight-lane cross-section, the roadway would operate within the established LOS policy. Therefore, to mitigate the impact, the City shall reserve sufficient right-of-way to accommodate an eight-lane cross-section, plus associated turn pockets at intersections.
  Prior to the construction of additional roadway improvements along the March Lane corridor, the City shall conduct a focused complete streets study to evaluate peak hour and daily operations of March Lane between I-5 and State Route 99 to identify the cross-section required to accommodate existing and planned growth. The analysis shall consider the potential mode shift under scenarios that provide additional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities along the corridor. Should corridor operations fall within the established level of service standard with a six-lane cross-section, the study shall identify bicycle, pedestrian, and transit enhancements that are necessary to serve the corridor. Otherwise, the mitigation measure is to provide an eight-lane cross-section for vehicles. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

- **Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard between I-5 and Airport Way.** This section of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard is built out to its ultimate capacity and no further improvements are planned. Provision of parallel capacity in the area would provide alternative travel choices within this area of South Stockton, but is not expected to result in LOS D operations in the Cumulative with Proposed Plan condition. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **8th Street between Pock Lane and D Street.** This roadway section currently provides one travel lane in each direction with on-street parking within a 60-foot curb-to-curb right-of-way. There is sufficient right-of-way to modify the roadway cross-section to maintain on-street parking (8 feet), provide bicycle lanes (6 feet), one travel lane in each direction (10 feet), and a center two-way left-turn lane (12-feet). With modifications within the existing right-of-way, vehicular capacity could increase, reducing the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, to mitigate the impact, the City shall conduct a detailed engineering study of 8th Street between El Dorado Street and Mariposa Road to identify roadway improvements that can be implemented within the existing right-of-way to improve travel for all modes, especially considering the potential for a grade-separated crossing of the railroad tracks, which would provide an additional east-west connection in South Stockton. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.
- **Arch Airport Road between SR 99 and Quantas Lane.** This section of Arch-Airport Road is built out to its ultimate capacity and no further improvements are planned. Provision of parallel capacity in the area would provide alternative travel choices within this area of South Stockton, but is not expected to result in LOS D operations in the Cumulative with Proposed Plan condition. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
- **California Street between Harding Way and Park Street.** Prior to the construction of roadway improvements along the California Street corridor, the City shall conduct a focused complete streets study to evaluate peak hour and daily operations of California Street from north of Harding Way to south of Park Street. The evaluation shall consider the effect of providing exclusive bicycle facilities on peak hour and daily operations along the corridor. The study shall also evaluate parallel roadway facilities that could potentially see an increase in vehicle traffic with a lane reduction on California Street.

  Should the study indicate vehicle operations would fall below the level of service standard for the facility, even considering potential traffic shifts to other roadways (and the secondary impact of those shifts), and the potential mode shift to non-auto travel modes, the mitigation measure is to retain the existing vehicle capacity and explore other alternatives for providing bicycle facilities through the corridor. Should the analysis indicate vehicle levels of service would remain within the City's standard for the roadway facility, the mitigation measure is to construct exclusive bicycle facilities within the

existing cross-section. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

- **B Street between Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and 4th Street.** The City shall reserve sufficient right-of-way to accommodate a four-lane cross-section, plus associated turn pockets at intersections.

  Prior to the construction of additional roadway improvements along the B Street corridor, the City shall conduct a focused complete streets study to evaluate peak hour and daily operations of B Street between Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Arch-Airport Road to identify the cross-section required to accommodate existing and planned growth. The analysis shall consider the potential mode shift under scenarios that provide additional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities along the corridor. Should corridor operations fall within the established level of service standard with a two-lane cross-section, the study shall identify bicycle, pedestrian, and transit enhancements that are necessary to serve the corridor. Otherwise, the mitigation measure is to provide a four-lane cross-section for vehicles. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure TRAF-1b: The City shall implement the following to reduce the severity of potential LOS impacts on the following freeway segment:

- **State Route 99 between Farmington Road and Fremont Street.** The Cumulative with Proposed Plan transportation analysis considers the widening of State Route 99 through Stockton to its ultimate planned width. No additional improvements have been identified. Implementation of the proposed General Plan and its associated policies are expected to provide alternative travel choices to Stockton residents and workers, shifting travel patterns and modes. However, deficient operations are expected to occur on State Route 99, and this impact would remain <u>significant and unavoidable</u>.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact TRAF-1: As indicated above, with implementation of Mitigation Measures TRAF-1a and TRAF-1b, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable due to three roadway segments (see underlining above).

Impact TRAF-2: Implementation of the proposed General Plan, in combination with regional growth, would result in increased vehicle traffic, which would affect the operation of regional roadways and freeway segments. As discussed above, the proposed General Plan would result in significant level of service impacts to roadway and freeway segments.

Mitigation Measure TRAF-2: The City of Stockton shall continue to participate in planning efforts for regional transportation facilities.

Facts in Support of Findings for Impact TRAF-2: With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRAF-2, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

IV. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA mandates that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or the project location that generally reduce or avoid potentially significant impacts of the project. CEQA requires that every EIR evaluate a "No Project" alternative. Alternatives provide a basis of comparison to the project in terms of beneficial, significant, and unavoidable impacts. This comparative analysis is used to consider reasonable, feasible options for minimizing environmental consequences of a project.

The proposed General Plan and UMPS Draft EIR analyzed three alternatives, including the No Project alternative, the Corridors Focus Alternative, and the Infill Focus Alternative. Table 5-1, *Comparison of Impacts from Project Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR provides a side-by-side comparison of the three alternatives and their impacts as they relate to the impacts of the proposed General Plan and UMPS.

1. No Project Alternative

As required by CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e), the proposed General Plan evaluates a No Project Alternative. The evaluation of the No Project Alternative allows decision makers to compare the impacts of the proposed project to the impacts of the No Project Alternative. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e)(2) requires the No Project Alternative analysis to discuss what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. Under the No Project Alternative the proposed General Plan and UMPS would not be adopted, future development in Stockton would continue to be subject to existing policies, regulations, and land use designations pursuant to the existing General Plan, and future infrastructure development would continue to be subject to the current Utility Master Plans, which were adopted to support development under the existing 2035 General Plan.

It is estimated that this alternative would likely result in the same horizon-year development levels as the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would include the same level of growth within the General Plan horizon as the proposed project, but under a different land use map, which is shown on Figure 5-3 of the Draft EIR. The main differences in the land use map compared to the proposed General Plan are that residential growth would be directed to villages at the edges of the city (including on approximately 9,000 acres of land designated for open space and agriculture under the proposed General Plan), and commercial and industrial development would be interspersed along key corridors.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative does not meet the City Council's objectives for the General Plan. By maintaining the Village designation in an extensive area outside the city limit,

maintaining a lower allowed residential density within the Downtown Core and Greater Downtown, and excluding the extensive policies and actions that promote infill development, the No Project Alternative would not support the objectives related to strengthening the city's core through revitalization of the Downtown and other existing neighborhoods, nor the sustainability objectives related to maintaining clear, discrete edges of the city surrounded by agricultural land. By excluding the focused policies and actions related to access to healthy food and physical activity, the No Project Alternative would not further the objective of providing opportunities for the entire Stockton community to maintain active and healthy lifestyles. Finally, by excluding the focused policies and actions related to crime prevention, the No Project Alternative would not support the objective to make all parts of Stockton safer.

Summary of Environmental Impacts

The No Project Alternative would result in several slightly greater impacts than the proposed General Plan and UMPS. These slightly greater impacts are associated with Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The No Project Alternative and the proposed General Plan and UMPS would have similar impacts to Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Population and Housing; and Public Services and Recreation.

Findings

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the No Project Alternative identified in the Final EIR as described below:

- The No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives of strengthening the city's core through revitalization of the Downtown and other existing neighborhoods.
- The No Project Alternative would not accomplish the sustainability objectives related to maintaining clear, discrete edges of the city surrounded by agricultural land.
- The No Project Alternative would not further the objective of providing opportunities for the entire Stockton community to maintain active and healthy lifestyles.
- The No Project Alternative would not support the objective to make all parts of Stockton safer.
- The No Project Alternative would have slightly greater impacts to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems.

2. Corridors Focus Alternative

Under the Corridors Focus Alternative, the policies and actions in the proposed General Plan would be adopted, but the land use map and the associated UMPS to plan for infrastructure to serve that land use pattern would be different, focusing residential development into village areas at the edge of the city and retail development along major corridors. The land use map for the Corridors Focus Alternative is shown on Figure 5-4 of the Draft EIR. It is estimated that this alternative would likely result in the same horizon-year development levels as the proposed project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Corridors Focus Alternative does not meet the City Council's objectives for the General Plan. By maintaining the Village designation in a large area outside the city limit, the No Project Alternative would not further the sustainability objectives related to maintaining clear, discrete edges of the city surrounded by agricultural land.

Summary of Environmental Impacts

The Corridors Focus Alternative would result in several slightly greater impacts than the proposed General Plan and UMPS. These slightly greater impacts are associated with Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Corridors Focus Alternative and the proposed General Plan and UMPS would have similar impacts to Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Land Use and Planning; Population and Housing; and Public Services and Recreation.

Findings

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the Corridors Focus Alternative identified in the Final EIR for the reasons below:

- The Corridors Focus Alternative would not accomplish the sustainability objectives related to maintaining clear, discrete edges of the city surrounded by agricultural land.
- The Corridors Focus Alternative would have slightly greater impacts to Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems.

3. Infill Focus Alternative

Under the Infill Focus Alternative, the policies and actions in the proposed General Plan would be adopted, but the land use map and the associated UMPS to plan for

infrastructure to serve that land use pattern would be slightly different. The most significant difference is that this alternative does not include the Economic and Education Enterprise designation in the area north of Eight Mile Road, and instead designates it primarily for Open Space and Agriculture. Within the core of the city, the Infill Focus Alternative would provide for more Professional Office uses along S Airport Way and more High Density Residential near Weston Ranch. The land use map for the Infill Focus Alternative is shown on Figure 5-5 of the Draft EIR. It is estimated that this alternative would likely result in the same horizon-year development levels as the proposed project.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives

The Infill Focus Alternative does not meet the City Council's objectives for the General Plan. By excluding the Economic and Education Enterprise designation, the Infill Focus Alternative would not further the economic development objectives related to providing job opportunities with competitive wages, attracting major employers and attracting a California State University (CSU) Stockton or similar facility.

Summary of Environmental Impacts

CEQA requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative in an EIR. The Infill Focus Alternative is identified in the Final EIR as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. By focusing development in the core of the city and designating the area north of Eight Mile Road for Open Space and Agriculture, this alternative would be an improvement over the proposed project with respect to potential negative impacts associated with Aesthetics, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems.

The impacts of the Infill Focus Alternative and the proposed General Plan and UMPS on Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Land Use and Planning; Population and Housing; and Public Services and Recreation would be similar.

Findings

Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the Infill Focus Alternative identified in the Final EIR for the reasons below:

- The Infill Focus Alternative does not further the City Council's objective of providing job opportunities with competitive wages.
- The Infill Focus Alternative does not further the City Council's objective of attracting major employers.
- The Infill Focus Alternative does not further the City Council's objective of attracting a CSU Stockton or similar educational facility.

V. OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED CONSIDERATIONS

Growth Inducement

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR discuss the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Typical growth inducements might be the extension of urban services or transportation infrastructure to a previously unserved or under-served area, or removal of major barriers to development. Not all growth inducement is necessarily negative. Negative impacts associated with growth inducement occur only where the projected growth would cause adverse environmental impacts.

Growth-inducing impacts fall into two general categories: direct or indirect. Direct growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with providing urban services to an undeveloped area. Providing urban services to a site, and the subsequent development, can serve to induce other landowners in the vicinity to convert their property to urban uses. Indirect, or secondary growth-inducing impacts consist of growth induced in the region by additional demands for housing, goods, and services associated with the population increase caused by, or attracted to, a new project.

Direct Impacts

The proposed project (which includes already approved or pending development both within the city limits and outside the City's jurisdiction) would directly induce population, employment, and economic growth by allowing development and associated infrastructure in areas that are currently undeveloped. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the following growth by 2040 based on the buildout methodology described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR:

- 40,900 new dwelling units, including:
    - 26,300 new single-family units
    - 14,600 new multi-family units
- 132,200 new residents[2]
- 13.8 million square feet of new commercial and office space
- 35.6 million square feet of new industrial space

The primary mechanism for this growth within the city and Sphere of Influence (SOI) is the proposed General Plan land use map, which allows for some development in areas that are not currently developed. The anticipated locations of this growth are shown in Figures 3-3 and 3-5 in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

[2] Based on an assumption of 3.23 persons per household, as reported in: State of California, Department of Finance, 2017. *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State* — January 1, 2011- 2017.

The proposed General Plan land use map allows some development in areas of the EIR Study Area presently used as agriculture and vacant land. However, through the Open Space and Agriculture designation in the proposed land use map, combined with policies and actions enacted under the General Plan, the proposed project would control the geographical extent of growth and encourage sustainable patterns of urban land uses. In addition, the proposed General Plan commits the City to controlled and orderly use of its natural resources through policies to conserve agricultural land and promote compact growth.

Specifically, Policy LU-5.3 and Action LU-5.3.B direct the City to define discrete and clear city edges that preserve agriculture, open space, and scenic views, including through the development of a greenbelt or community separator around the city. Goal LU-2 and its associated actions and policies support compact growth by promoting development in the Downtown. Meanwhile, Policy 6.2 and its associated actions direct the City to prioritize development and redevelopment of vacant, underutilized, and blighted infill areas. Actions LU-6.1.B, LU-6.1.E, and LU-6.1.F promote orderly growth by directing the City to monitor the rate of growth to ensure that it does not overburden the City's infrastructure and services, ensure that there is adequate infrastructure to serve new development, and evaluate and implement adjustments to the Public Facilities Fee structure to encourage development in areas where infrastructure is already present and ensure that non-infill development pays its fair share of anticipated citywide capital facilities and operational costs. In addition, Policy LU-5.2 and its associated actions protect natural resource areas, fish and wildlife habitat, scenic areas, open space areas, and agricultural lands.

As a result, while the proposed project would result in increased local growth, the Open Space and Agriculture designation in the proposed land use map, combined with policies and actions included in the proposed General Plan, would reduce the potential for negative impacts associated with direct growth inducement to a less-than-significant level.

Indirect Impacts

While the proposed General Plan does allow growth, it also includes the Open Space and Agriculture designation in the proposed land use map and policies and actions that would control the geographical extent of growth and encourage sustainable patterns of urban land uses, as described above. The proposed General Plan land use map provides a mixture of housing, shopping, public, and employment opportunities so that as the number of residents increase, they do not pressure adjacent communities to provide new commercial and employment opportunities. As stated above, the General Plan commits to only allow development where infrastructure is in place or is planned. As a result, the proposed General Plan and UMPS would result in a less-than-significant indirect growth-inducing impact.

Findings Regarding Growth Inducing Impacts

While the proposed General Plan would result in increased local growth, the Open Space and Agriculture designation in the proposed land use map, combined with policies and actions included in the proposed General Plan, would reduce the potential for negative impacts associated with direct growth inducement to a less-than-significant level.

While the proposed General Plan allows growth, the land use map and policies and actions included in the proposed General Plan would reduce the potential for negative impacts associated with indirect growth inducement to a less-than-significant level.

Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. More information on these impacts is found in Chapter 4, Environmental Evaluation, of the Draft EIR. Significant and unavoidable impacts are identified in Section III above.

Significant Irreversible Changes

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires discussion of the extent to which a proposed project will commit nonrenewable resources to uses that future generations will probably be unable to reverse.

A project would generally result in a significant irreversible impact if:

- Primary and secondary impacts would commit future generations to similar uses.
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.

Changes in Land Use that Commit Future Generations

Development allowed by the proposed General Plan would result in the conversion of some agricultural and vacant lands to residential, commercial, and industrial uses, and the intensification of underutilized areas. In addition, intensification of land uses and development of currently undeveloped lands would contribute to traffic congestion, as described in Section 4.14, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR. Development allowed under the proposed General Plan would constitute a long-term commitment to residential, commercial, industrial, parking, public, and other urban uses.

Irreversible Damage from Environmental Accidents

Irreversible changes to the physical environment could occur from accidental release of hazardous materials associated with development activities. However, compliance with State and federal hazardous materials regulations and local emergency plans, as

discussed in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR, would reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level. No other irreversible changes are expected to result from the adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan and UMPS.

Large Commitment of Nonrenewable Resources

Implementation of the proposed General Plan and UMPS would result in the commitment of limited, renewable resources such as lumber and water. In addition, development allowed by the proposed General Plan and UMPS would irretrievably commit nonrenewable resources for the construction and maintenance of buildings, infrastructure, and roadways. These non-renewable resources include mined materials such as sand, gravel, steel, lead, copper, and other metals. Development allowed under the proposed General Plan also represents a long-term commitment to the consumption of fossil fuels, natural gas, and gasoline. Increased energy demands would apply to construction, lighting, heating, and cooling of residences, and transportation of people within, to, and from the EIR Study Area. Proposed General Plan Policy LU-5.4 and Action LU-5.4.B promote energy conservation and efficiency, which could minimize or incrementally reduce the consumption of these resources.

Cumulative Impacts

Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines states that cumulative impacts shall be discussed when a project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. It further states that this discussion shall reflect the level and severity of the impact and the likelihood of occurrence, but not in as great detail as that necessary for the proposed project alone. section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts to be "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." Cumulative impacts represent the change caused by the incremental impact of the proposed project when added to effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects in the vicinity.

CEQA Guidelines section 15130 (b)(1) states that the information utilized in an analysis of cumulative impacts should come from one of two sources, either:

1. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or
2. A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document designed to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions.

The cumulative impacts analyses in the EIR use method No. 2. The proposed project consists of the Envision Stockton 2040 General Plan Update and UMPS. Consistent with Section 15130(b)(1)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of projected development that will occur under the proposed General Plan through its horizon year of 2040. As a result, this EIR addresses the cumulative impacts of development within the City of Stockton and the region surrounding it, as appropriate.

In most cases, the potential for cumulative impacts is contiguous with the SOI. Potential cumulative impacts that have the potential for impacts beyond the SOI (e.g., traffic, air quality, noise) have been addressed through cumulative growth in the SOI and region. Regional growth outside Stockton has accounted for traffic, air quality, and noise impacts that are identified through use of the regional traffic model, which uses regional growth projections to calculate future traffic volumes.

VI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In determining whether to adopt the General Plan and UMPS, CEQA requires a public agency to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks. (CEQA Guidelines, section 15093). In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines section 15093, the City Council has, in determining whether or not to adopt the General Plan and UMPS, balanced the economic, social, technological, academic, and other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental effects, and has found that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the City Council's review of the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record.

On the basis of the above findings and the substantial evidence in the record of this proceeding, the City specifically finds, and therefore makes this Statement of Overriding Considerations, that as a part of the process of obtaining project approvals, all significant effects on the environment with implementation of the proposed project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible. Furthermore, the City has determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the following overriding considerations:

1. The proposed General Plan and UMPS represent a vision that accommodates a balance between the City's economic development needs and the quality of life that the community seeks to achieve.

2. The proposed General Plan and UMPS represent a balance between the many interests of community members and agencies who have participated in the General Plan process.

3. The proposed General Plan and UMPS accommodate development that has already been entitled through permit approvals and development agreements, and which contribute substantially to the significant impact findings identified in the Final EIR.

4. The proposed General Plan contains land uses, policies, and actions that will promote a sustainable, infill-focused development pattern while maintaining the opportunity for a major economic development catalyst project to come to Stockton.

5. The General Plan contains land uses, policies, and actions that will provide opportunities and support both residential and employment growth within its existing neighborhoods, while still maintaining the opportunity for large job-generators and/or educational institutions that require large tracks of undeveloped lands to locate in Stockton.

6. The proposed General Plan contains land uses, policies, and actions that will support the revitalization of the Downtown and other existing neighborhoods in Stockton. In the Downtown, revitalization is supported by increasing the allowed residential density in the Downtown Core and Greater Downtown, along with actions that would increase flexibility and provide incentives for Downtown development and that would promote transit-oriented development (TOD) around the Downtown rail stations. Outside the Downtown, revitalization is supported by prioritizing maintenance activities in historically underserved areas and providing incentives for property maintenance, rehabilitation, and redevelopment.

7. The proposed General Plan contains land use and economic development policies and actions that support existing businesses while helping to attract new businesses, particularly uses that are identified in the City's Economic Development Strategic Plan.

8. The proposed General Plan incorporates a combination of non-vehicular and vehicular transportation improvements that meet the transportation challenges of the future so that people can travel safely and conveniently on foot or by car, air, bicycle, and transit. The proposed General Plan also includes or maintains policies that ensure compatibility between the City's land use plans and the surrounding airports.

9. The proposed General Plan includes actions that direct the City to amend its Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines to consider non-vehicular travel metrics and to establish CEQA thresholds based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than level of service (LOS), consistent with State law.

10. The proposed General Plan includes land uses, policies, and actions that facilitate and incentivize infill development and establish criteria for balanced growth, helping to fulfill the City's obligations under its 2008 Settlement Agreement to facilitate the development of 4,400 units within the Greater Downtown and an additional 14,000 units within the city limit as it existed in 2008, to provide incentives for infill development, and to establish criteria for balanced growth.

11. The proposed General Plan increases the allowed residential density in the Downtown Core and Greater Downtown, supporting revitalization of the Downtown and helping to fulfill the City's obligations under its 2008 Settlement Agreement to facilitate the development of 4,400 units within the Greater Downtown.

12. The proposed General Plan will strengthen the City's goals to provide housing for all needs in the community by supporting and expanding on the policies and goals in the Housing Element, increasing the allowed residential density in the Downtown Core and Greater Downtown, and providing land use designations that allow a variety of housing styles, types, and densities throughout the city.