

---

ORAL COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

---



### III. ORAL COMMENTATORS

The following section contains summarized oral comments regarding the Draft EIR as recorded during Planning Commission Study Session held November 10, 1993. As was the case in the previous section, this section identifies any resulting changes to the DEIR as *additions* and *deletions*.

These comments were transcribed from tape recordings and written notes received from the City of Merced. All comments were summarized. Apologies are made for any misspelling of names.

#### STUDY SESSION PUBLIC COMMENTS, NOVEMBER 10, 1993

1. Michael Boykin<sup>1</sup>
2. Ken Riggleman
3. Nancy Silva
4. Lydia Miller
5. Michael Belluomini<sup>1</sup>
6. Thomas Humphrey<sup>1</sup>
7. Suzanne Burrows<sup>1</sup>
8. Don Robinson
9. Planning Commissioner Kay Melansen
10. Planning Commissioner Barbara Sullivan

---

1

As a supplement to their comments, these individuals also submitted written comments reiterating their oral remarks. A response to each written comment is provided in the Written Comments and Responses section of this Final EIR.

**Oral Commentator 1: Mr. Michael Boykin, citizen**

Mr. Boykin submitted a written transcript of his oral comments to the Planning Commission, which are addressed within the Written Comments and Responses section of this document.

**Oral Commentator 2: Ken Riggleman, citizen**

The commentator voiced concerns regarding the following issues:

**ORAL COMMENT 2-1**

*The Project will experience drainage problems associated with flooding, and the 100-year floodplain is misrepresented in the DEIR.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 2-1**

The first component of this comment concerns the ability of the Bellevue Ranch Project to adequately protect urban development within flood prone areas. As discussed on pages 4.7-5 and 4.7-6 of the DEIR, the proposed Project will involve the installation of a complete master storm drainage system, preceded by passive storm drainage facilities. To ensure that the drainage and flood hazard impacts associated with the Project are reduced to a less-than-significant level, Mitigation Measures 4.7.1 through 4.7.3 are proposed on page 4.7-6 of the DEIR. In short, final maps for subdivisions within the project area are required to provide for flood control facilities which are consistent with the Bellevue Ranch Master Stormdrain Plan.

The second component of this comment involves the boundaries of the 100-year floodplain. As noted on page 4.7.5 of the Draft EIR, with the completion of the check structure and proposed channel improvements, both the 100-year regulatory floodway and the 100-year floodplain would be contained within the banks of Fahrens and Cottonwood Creeks.

See also Response to Comment PC-7.

**ORAL COMMENT 2-2**

*Commentator stated the need to provide adequate in-stream water flows to support fish and wildlife populations.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 2-2**

This comment concerns the provision of adequate water flows to support fish and wildlife. According to the biotic and wetlands resources report, there are no fish populations in Cottonwood Creek or Fahrens Creek. The creeks themselves are small and would not be expected to contain high water flows except during storm events. Near the project site, creeks of this size are usually dry in the summer and fall months unless they convey runoff from agricultural and urban activities.

The Draft EIR indicates that implementation of the project would result in the displacement of the immediate resident wildlife species observed on site, which includes the creek areas. However, the Draft EIR concludes on page 4.8-9 that this will result in a less-than-significant

impact to wildlife in the area, given the abundance of similar habitats in the region and the relatively low quality of the tree canopy in the vicinity of the creek areas.

**ORAL COMMENT 2-3**

*Commentator testified against the conversion of farmland to urban development.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 2-3**

As identified on pages 4.1-5 and 4.1-6 of the Draft EIR, the City of Merced has been involved in a prolonged planning effort to decide how best to direct the anticipated growth of the City through the year 2030. The *Merced 2030* planning effort has involved an analysis of environmental constraints, forces driving growth, deciding where best to channel growth, and selecting the land use pattern that should be encouraged. The key environmental factor in determining the growth patterns has been the high resource value of prime agricultural lands.

The City of Merced urban growth and conservation policies approved through the *General Plan*, the *Merced 2030 Plan*, and the conceptually approved *Merced Villages Concept Plan* direct future growth northward where there is a lower concentration of prime agricultural land. The project site is within this growth corridor, which has been planned in order to preserve higher value lands to the east and west for the long term.

**ORAL COMMENT 2-4**

*Commentator is concerned that the project will not provide and pay for its "fair share" of sewer facilities.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 2-4**

One of the more critical steps toward the implementation of Bellevue Ranch and other projects in North Merced is the establishment of a facilities financing program, which will establish appropriate funding mechanisms and guidelines for contribution. Such a program would address sewer facilities, as well as many other infrastructure and public facility needs. Without such a program in place, EIR mitigation has been proposed which will link project improvements to the appropriate mechanism, once established by the City.

As identified on page 4.9-7 of the Draft EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.9.5 requires the following:

MM 4.9.5 "Prior to the approval of a tentative map, the project applicant will submit to the City Public Works Department detailed wastewater service plans for review and approval. This will include the sizing and location of collection lines in conformance with the City's Master Plan, and provide for the appropriate financing mechanism for both on-and off-site improvements."

**ORAL COMMENT 2-5**

*Commentator suggests that urban growth be directed along the freeway in an easterly and westerly direction.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 2-5**

This comment concerns the geographical direction for new urban growth. As identified on page 4.1-5 and 4.1-6 of the Draft EIR, to protect agriculturally significant lands, growth is discouraged to the east and west.

For further discussion, please see Response to Oral Comment 2-3.

**Oral Commentator 3:** Nancy Silva, citizen

**ORAL COMMENT 3-1**

*Commentator advocates the establishment of an agricultural land use preservation program.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 3-1**

With respect to the suggestion that an agricultural land use preservation program be established, this comment is acknowledged. For reference purposes, Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR contains a detailed evaluation of the conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses.

At a project-specific level, impacts relative to agricultural land conversion are significant and unavoidable. The comment refers to potential mitigation on a regional level, which would address the cumulative impacts of development in North Merced. A conservation mechanism such as a land trust or preservation program would be a regional policy issue to be explored by both the City and the County.

See also Response to Oral Comment 2-3 and Response to Comment 15-3.



**Oral Commentator 4:** Lydia Miller, San Joaquin Raptor Wildlife Rescue Center

The commentator offered the following testimony relative to general planning issues, as well as issues specific to the Draft EIR:

**ORAL COMMENT 4-1**

*Commentator stated that the City's General Plan is outdated and needs to be updated, and that it is a key issue when discussing this type of long range planning.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-1**

The comment reflects an important planning issue for the City of Merced, but must be considered independently by the City as the issue is outside the range of issues addressed within the EIR.

**ORAL COMMENT 4-2**

*Commentator expressed concern that there may be no County or surrounding jurisdictional involvement in the Project.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-2**

As part of the scoping process for the Bellevue Ranch Project, the Appendix of the Draft EIR identifies the surrounding agencies and organizations provided the opportunity to comment and become involved in the environmental review process. Some agencies receiving copies of the Notice of Preparation and the Draft EIR include Merced County, the City of Atwater, and the Merced County Association of Governments.

The project includes the annexation of the site into the existing Merced city limits. In order to facilitate annexation, a series of requirements will need to be met consistent with the Cortese/Knox Act. The complete proposal will subsequently be brought before the Merced County LAFCO for annexation proceedings.

**ORAL COMMENT 4-3**

*Commentator has suggested that the Village Concept Plan and the 2030 Plan are too conceptual.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-3**

Comment noted.

#### ORAL COMMENT 4-4

*Commentator noted that there is little reference to cumulative impacts in terms of public services and facilities, particularly with other (residential and golf course) projects developing along R Street.*

#### RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-4

With respect to the specific reference to the Public Facilities and Services analysis within the Cumulative Impact Section of the Draft EIR, the following text modifications shall be made before the first paragraph on page 10.0-2, under the subtitle *Public Facilities and Services*.

##### Water System

*Development of the Bellevue Ranch Project is anticipated to incrementally add to the need for additional water supplies, treatment, and distribution within North Merced. The project's demand on water presents a significant cumulative impact, as water sources other than groundwater supplies will eventually be required. To reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts, Mitigation Measure 4.9.1 of the Draft EIR requires that each tentative map demonstrate adequate supply and delivery plans.*

##### Sewer System

*Development of the Project is anticipated to incrementally increase the demand for additional sewer treatment capacity and collection facilities within North Merced. In response to anticipated growth, the City completed a sewer master plan for the northerly portion of Merced known as the North Merced Wastewater Master Plan. The purpose of the plan is to identify the most timely and cost-efficient manner in which to provide sanitary sewer services. The Wastewater Master Plan, in association with Mitigation Measure 4.9.5 on page 4.9-7, will serve to reduce sewer system cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.*

##### Electrical and Natural Gas Service

*Regarding the cumulative energy supply impacts, Mitigation Measure 4.9.6 on page 4.9-9 of this Draft EIR conditions development on the adequacy and availability of energy supplies. The mitigation requires also the applicant to demonstrate to the City that they have coordinated with Pacific Gas and Electric regarding the location and phasing of natural gas and electrical facilities to serve the Project. As such, the project's contribution to electrical and natural gas service cumulative impacts are less-than-significant.*

##### Telecommunication Services

*Mitigation Measure 4.9.8 on page 4.9-10 of this Draft EIR requires the project applicant to coordinate with Pacific Bell regarding the extension, location, and phasing of*

*telecommunication facilities. As such, cumulative impacts associated with telecommunication services are reduced to a less-than-significant level.*

#### **Police Protection**

*According to Mitigation Measure 4.9.9 on page 4.9-12 of this Draft EIR, the project applicant shall pay all Cost Revenue Impact System fees or other applicable program fees as defined by the City to cover all Police Department costs. Therefore, cumulative impacts to Police Protection are reduced to a less-than-significant level.*

#### **Fire Protection**

*Development of the Bellevue Ranch Project will incrementally increase the demands placed on Fire Protection Services. But, the cumulative impacts generated by the Bellevue Ranch Project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the Fire Protection Services Mitigation Measures listed on page 4.9-15 of this Draft EIR.*

#### **ORAL COMMENT 4-5**

*There are many separate plans within the (North Merced) area that show circulation patterns. How do they connect to Highway 99?*

#### **RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-5**

Although this topic is an important planning and circulation issue for the City of Merced, this comment is outside the scope and content of the Draft EIR. However, background planning documents which illustrate the northerly growth pattern for the City anticipate a series of north-south arterials or expressways to link Highway 99 with new development.

#### **ORAL COMMENT 4-6**

*Commentator noted that existing city infrastructure (Old Merced) is being neglected at the expense of proposed future development. Commentator stated that the City should focus resources and encourage investment within existing urban areas, rather than apply resources toward large speculative outlying projects, such as the proposed University of California campus.*

#### **RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-6**

The preservation and revitalization of Merced's downtown area has been and will continue to be a focus of City planning efforts. Investment in the downtown area is highly encouraged. The long range planning of City growth, however, also needs to be recognized at this early stage in order to establish the basic parameters for urban growth that cannot be contained within the City's urban core.

## ORAL COMMENT 4-7

*Commentator stated that the biological studies are flawed. In order for the project to move forward, all applicable state and federal permits must be secured. In addition, natural areas and creek areas need to be enhanced and protected. The Raptor Center has received much wildlife from this area, such as burrowing owls and bald eagles. Fairy shrimp populations and the eucalyptus grove are contained in the area and represent examples of the area's biological assets.*

## RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-7

The general comment concerning the validity of the biological studies is noted. However, the Draft EIR does meet CEQA requirements pertaining to biological impacts. Regarding the securement of all necessary permits, on pages 4.8-10 through 4.8-12 of the Draft EIR, all of the required permits are listed in the following mitigation measures. MM 4.8.1 and MM 4.8.2 are concerned with compliance with the Corps of Engineers Wetland requirements. MM 4.8.3 is concerned with the protection of special plant status species, while MM 4.8.4 is concerned with the protection of special animal status species. In particular, the fairy shrimp is protected by the implementation of MM 4.8.4 on page 4.8-12 of the Draft EIR.

Concerning the need to enhance and protect "creeks and natural areas", the Draft EIR describes the details of the Merced County Streams Project (page 4.7-2). In addition, Figure 4.7-4 provides a visual display of the improvements along various segments of these two streams. Regarding "natural areas," the Biotic Resource section contains mitigation measures (starting on page 4.8-10) concerning vegetation, wildlife, wetlands, special status plants and animal species.

Concerning the occurrence of burrowing owls and bald eagles, the implementation of the Bellevue Ranch Project has been determined to have no significant impact on wildlife and other special-status animal species. The Draft EIR includes the following statement:

"Implementation of the project would result in the displacement of the immediate resident wildlife species observed on site. Conversion of the Bellevue Ranch site to urban uses would, however, result in a less-than-significant impact to wildlife in the area, given the existing agricultural impacts to the site and the abundance of similar habitat in the region (4.8-9)."

"Due to agricultural impacts to the project site and the abundance of similar habitat locally, the project would have no significant impact to other special-status animal species (4.8-10)."

Concerning the biological importance of protecting the eucalyptus grove, as determined on page 4.8-9 of the Draft EIR, these stands of trees hold more aesthetic than biological value.

#### **ORAL COMMENT 4-8**

*Commentator stated a need for closer coordination between the City of Merced and the surrounding communities for a plan such as this, along with a general plan update. There are several planning documents pertaining to the Merced area (The 2030 Plan, Village Plan, Water (Master) Plan, and Highway Plan). The relationship between each document should be established through a series of public workshops. To treat the plans separately is irresponsible.*

#### **RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-8**

Comments noted. The relationship between the Merced 2030 Plan, the Village Concept Plan and Design Guidelines, and the project itself are linked very closely, in that Bellevue Ranch is the first project to implement the long range planning goals of the City. The documents cited are not intended to be implemented independently, but rather rely upon each other to ensure continued consistency. The relationship between various area planning documents is described in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR.

#### **COMMENT 4-9**

*Commentator expressed concern about the conversion of agricultural and open space lands to urban development.*

#### **RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 4-9**

Please see Response to Oral Comment 2-3, as well as Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR.

**Oral Commentator 5: Michael Belluomini, Merced Union High School District**

Mr. Belluomini submitted two letters to the Planning Department summarizing his oral comments. Responses are contained in the Response to Written Comments section of this document.

**Oral Commentator 6: Thomas Humphrey, Merced County Association of Governments**

The commentator submitted a written letter summarizing his oral remarks, which are addressed in the Written Comments and Responses section of this document.

**Oral Commentator 7: Suzanne Burrows, Merced City School District**

The commentator submitted two letters which summarize her oral comments. Responses are contained within the Response to Written Comments section of this document.



**Oral Commentator 8: Don Robinson, citizen**

The commentator voiced his concerns and addressed the following issues associated with the Bellevue Ranch Draft EIR:

**ORAL COMMENT 8-1**

*Commentator believes it is important to protect agricultural lands from urban development by establishing conservation easements and purchasing development rights.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 8-1**

Comment noted. Please see Response to Oral Comments 3-1 and 2-3 regarding agricultural land conversion.

**ORAL COMMENT 8-2**

*Commentator testified in favor of developing a new community planning document to guide future growth and to protect Merced's agricultural lands.*

**RESPONSE TO ORAL COMMENT 8-2**

Comments noted. Please see Response to Oral Comments 3-1 and 2-3.

## PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS, NOVEMBER 10, 1993

### Planning Commissioner Kay Melansen

#### COMMENT PC-1

*Commissioner concurs with many speakers that agricultural land conversion is the most pressing issue associated with this project. The concept of sacrificing some agricultural land for preserving larger tracts should be explained within the EIR.*

#### RESPONSE TO COMMENT PC-1

Page 4.2-11 of the Draft EIR contains a discussion under Local Impacts which describes that the project area is located within the City and County SUDP, and that the project demonstrates conformance with both City and County General Plans by following a northerly growth pattern. As described on page 4.1-6 of the Draft EIR, this northerly growth pattern is the most sensitive to prime agricultural land, which is more heavily concentrated to the east, west, and south of the project area.

To reiterate, it is the intent of the City, through these related planning efforts, to "sacrifice" a minimal amount of prime agricultural land in the name of planned development. The alternative is piecemeal development which, in the long term, holds the potential to convert larger tracts of agricultural land over a wider area.

#### COMMENT PC-2

*Commissioner stated that the mitigation strategies for Bellevue Ranch should guarantee the preservation of agricultural lands to the east and west, through a land trust or other mechanism.*

#### RESPONSE TO COMMENT PC-2

Comment noted. At a project-specific level, impacts relative to agricultural land conversion are significant and unavoidable. The comment refers to potential mitigation on a regional level, which would address the cumulative impacts of development in North Merced. A conservation mechanism such as a land trust would be a regional policy issue to be explored by both the City and the County. See also Response to Oral Comment 2-3.

#### COMMENT PC-3

*Commissioner stated that the cumulative effects of water and energy expenditure, water conservation, and energy conservation have not been fully addressed in the EIR. In addition, "futuristic" mitigation measures need to be incorporated into the EIR to address the above issues.*

### RESPONSE TO COMMENT PC-3

Comments noted. Response to Oral Comment 4-4 expands the discussion of cumulative impacts regarding water supply. Regarding water conservation measures, Mitigation Measures 4.9.2 and 4.9.3 on page 4.9-4 of the Draft EIR require the use of low-flow fixtures and drought-tolerant landscape materials in order to reduce water demand.

Energy consumption has been identified in Section 9.0 of the Draft EIR as an irretrievable resource associated with the project. Although not identified within a separate section of the document, energy conservation is achieved by nature of project design. Implementation of the Village Concept Design Guidelines will reduce vehicle trips and use less fossil fuel than conventional development, generate less air pollution, and consolidate infrastructure requirements.

### COMMENT PC-4

*The parks discussion contained a discrepancy between the number of acres required by the project and the number of acres set aside for the project. The parks discussion needs to be reviewed and clarified.*

### RESPONSE TO COMMENT PC-4

Table 4.4-2, on page 4.4-7 of the Draft EIR illustrates the number of acres required by the project and the number of acres currently proposed by the project. Currently, the proposed project has a thirteen-acre deficiency in community parks and a forty-five-acre deficiency in neighborhood parks. As noted on page 4.4-8 of the Draft EIR, this represents a significant impact to local park supply. In concert with the identification of this significant impact, the Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 to reduce the project's impact to parks and recreation to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation measure 4.4.1 requires the applicant to provide at least thirteen additional acres of community park land and at least forty-five additional acres of neighborhood parks. The project applicant is also required to show that the park improvements are generally consistent with the Village Design Guidelines, the Merced Municipal Code, and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.

### COMMENT PC-5

*The Merced Streams project is an important element to the plan and should be clearly explained within the EIR. Acknowledging that the Army Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over the flood control project, the EIR should include a preferred outcome or range of outcomes for the channels.*

## **RESPONSE TO COMMENT PC-5**

Comment noted. Page 4.7-2 of the Draft EIR discusses the Merced County Streams Project, and the relationship of the project to these planned Corps of Engineers channel improvements. From the standpoint of the environmental document, the desired outcome regarding channel improvements is relative to flood control. All improvements, including project-specific improvements designed by the project applicant, must demonstrate the ability to control site drainage. Other channel improvement features, such as landscaping and right-of-way, will undergo review by the City and the Department of Fish and Game.

**Planning Commissioner Barbara Sullivan**

**COMMENT PC-6**

Cumulative effects are not being addressed at a county-wide level. We need to address cumulative effects in this context.

**RESPONSE TO COMMENT PC-6**

Cumulative impacts are discussed within Section 10.0 of the Draft EIR. For an expanded discussion of the cumulative impacts analysis, please see Response to Oral Comment 4-4.



---

CHANGES, CORRECTIONS, AND ADDITIONS

---





#### IV. CHANGES, CORRECTIONS, AND ADDITIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

Edits, additions and deletions to the Draft EIR are summarized below. Changes to the document by the lead agency have been made primarily in response to written and oral comments on the Draft EIR, but are also the result of general editorial comments made during further review of the document in order to clarify particular issues. This summary of changes, or errata, addresses each section of the Draft EIR sequentially. Changes are shown as *additions* and *deletions*.

The changes made herein do not result in additional environmental impacts, nor do they alter the conclusions of the previous environmental analysis in any way.

##### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

No changes.

##### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary has been updated in its entirety and is included as an appendix to this document.

##### 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Page 3.0-5, bottom of page, under Open Space, Parks and Transit Stations:

- Park Areas (~~51.3~~ 49.2 acres)

Page 3.0-6, top of page:

The sum of all open space and recreation areas equates to ~~188.2~~ 186.1 acres, or approximately...

Page 3.0-8, second paragraph. Text has been added to clarify the relationship between the project boundary and the SUDP:

##### 3.7 Related Project Actions

Bellevue Ranch is currently within the County and is identified by both the County General Plan and the City General Plan as a Specific Urban Development Plan (SUDP) Area. *Approximately eighty-five acres in the northwest corner of the Bellevue Ranch Project are outside the City and County SUDP. This property is to be developed during the final phases of the project, with an approximate 15-year planning horizon. This acreage will require the modification of the current SUDP boundaries, which will be a concurrent action associated with the property's annexation to the City of*

~~Merced.~~ Therefore, the City and the County agree that the project site is a logical choice for urban expansion.

#### 4.1 LAND USE

Page 4.1-2, last paragraph. Text has been added clarifying the project boundary relationship to the SUDP.

##### 1. City of Merced General Plan

The City of Merced General Plan identified the project area as an "urban expansion area", within the SUDP which limits the physical limits of urban development. *Approximately eighty-five acres in the northwest corner of the Bellevue Ranch Project are outside the City and County SUDP. This property is to be developed during the final phases of the project, with an approximate 15-year planning horizon. This acreage will require the modification of the current SUDP boundaries, which will be a concurrent action associated with the property's annexation to the City of Merced.* The urban expansion policies written into the General Plan provide...

Page 4.1-17, MM 4.1.1: This measure has been deleted in response to subsequent changes in project design.

Page 4.1-17, MM 4.1-4: This measure has been deleted as not applicable.

#### 4.2 AGRICULTURAL LAND CONVERSION

No changes.

#### 4.3 AESTHETICS

Page 4.3-8. The following changes have been made to MM 4.3.1:

MM 4.3.1 ~~Prior to approval of related *required* Conditional Use Permits, the project applicant will retain a qualified landscape architect and/or other professionals as detailed in the City's Planned Development Ordinance to prepare detailed landscape plans. Landscape plans must be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Department and shall generally adhere to the landscape concepts contained in the Merced Villages Design Guidelines.~~ *will prepare conceptual landscape plans for the subject project. Detailed landscape plans must be prepared for building permit review and shall generally adhere to the landscape concepts contained in the Merced Villages Design Guidelines and applicable adopted plans.*

Page 4.3-8: The following change has been made to MM 4.3.2:

MM 4.3.2 In conjunction with the approval of related *required* Conditional Use Permits *and Tentative Maps*, the project applicant shall provide preliminary building plans, elevations, and architectural treatment for City review and approval by the Planning Department. City review will ensure general project consistency with the Merced Villages Design Guidelines, *Planned Development Ordinance and applicable adopted plans*.

Page 4.8-3: The following change has been made to MM 4.3.3:

MM 4.3.3 ...project applicant shall provide detailed lighting, signage, and fencing/*decorative sound wall* plans consistent with the City's Planned Development Ordinance, and the Merced Villages Design Guidelines, and *applicable adopted plans*. ~~in conjunction with the landscape plans noted above. Covenants...~~

Page 4.3-8: The following qualifier has been added to MM 4.3.4, in response to Comment 5-5:

MM 4.3.4 ~~Prior to approval of the Msater Development Plan, The project applicant shall demonstrate that~~ The mature stands of existing eucalyptus trees found on site shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible and ~~have been~~ designed into the land uses of the *Bellevue Ranch* Master Development Plan, *unless the trees are confirmed by the City's arborist to present a significant safety hazard*. Preservation of these stands of trees is *shall be* consistent with policies contained within the City's General Plan.

#### 4.4 PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Page 4.4-8: MM 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 have been deleted and replaced with the following revised MM 4.4.1:

MM 4.4.1 *Based on the maximum total dwelling unit and population figures estimated in the Master Development Plan, adjustment (as buildout of the Bellevue Ranch Project occurs) to the presently proposed park acreage total may be necessary, involving up to approximately 12 additional acres of park land for the project area located north of Bellevue Road, in order to reflect the actual dwelling unit and population figures determined by the City of Merced during Final Map approvals consistent with the Merced Municipal Code and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.*

~~MM 4.4.1 Prior to project annexation, rezoning approval, and Master Development Plan Adoption, the applicant shall provide at least 13 additional acres of community park land and at least 45 additional acres of neighborhood parks. The project applicant shall demonstrate that the park improvements are generally consistent with the Villages Design Guidelines, to the City's~~

~~satisfaction. In addition, park improvements shall be consistent with the Merced Municipal Code and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.~~

~~MM 4.4.2 Prior to approval of the prezone application and Master Development Plan Adoption, the applicant shall demonstrate, by design, the provision of general village park locations within the village core areas. Village park acreage, distribution, and design within the village core areas shall generally follow the adopted Merced Villages Design Guidelines. In addition, park improvements shall be consistent with the Merced Municipal Code and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan. Precise village park locations and sizes shall be identified prior to approval of Master Development Plan and prezone.~~

#### 4.5 LANDFORM, TOPOGRAPHY, AND SOILS

Page 4.5-9: MM 4.5.1 and MM 4.5.4 have been edited as follows:

MM 4.5.1 Prior to the approval of ~~building permits~~ *final subdivision maps*, the City shall require a detailed geotechnical report...

MM 4.5.4 Prior to the ~~approval~~ *issuance* of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City that the project features have been designed to withstand *any maximum ground acceleration standard required of such development at the time of specific approval.* ~~UBC and applicable local codes.~~

#### 4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL SECTION

Page 4.6-8: MM 4.6.1 has been clarified as follows:

MM 4.6.1 State of California Historic Resource Inventory Form(s) and an Archeological Site Record Form (State of California DPR 422 A (Rev. 4/86) Form) of the Bellevue Ranch complex shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits for the *areas within the project which will impact the Bellevue Ranch complex.* Copies of the Form(s) shall be filed with the local historical society, the Mercer County Museum and Historical Society, the Office of Historic Preservation, and the Central Information Center as appropriate.

Page 4.6-9: MM 4.6-5 has been edited as follows:

- MM 4.6.5 An Archeological Site Record Form (State of California DPR 422 A (Rev. 4/86) Form) for the segment of the Yosemite Valley Railroad Grade *within the Bellevue Ranch project* shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits for the project *phase(s) affected by the Grade*. ~~that may impact the Yosemite Valley Railroad Bed.~~ Copies of the Form(s) shall be filed with the Central Information Center.

#### 4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY TECHNICAL SECTION

Page 4.7-2, third paragraph: The following text change has been made in response to Comment 5-24:

~~The Army Corps project does not involve any channel improvements or reconfiguration for the remainder of Fahren's Creek located with the proposed Bellevue project boundaries. The COE is currently updating the design for the Merced County Streams Group project. Fahrens Creek channel improvements may ultimately extend upstream through all proposed Bellevue Ranch project boundaries. Current designs, however, terminate at Bellevue Road.~~

Page 4.7-5, first full paragraph: In response to Comment 5-25, descriptive text has been amended as follows:

##### Flooding

*Initial phases of the Bellevue Ranch development will include the construction of a "passive flood control bypass system". Passive means that as streams within the development boundary begin to rise, they will overtop their banks at pre-determined locations and flow into adjacent flood bypass channels.* The proposed Bellevue Ranch project *at latter phases, however,* will involve installation of a complete master storm drainage system consisting of underground pipes ~~and open channels,~~ as well as alternation of Fahrens Creek, and Cottonwood Creek, ~~and Parkinson's Creek~~ to provide for storm drainage capacity. In general, storm water runoff will be diverted by curb and gutter, collected by drop inlets, and discharged into either Fahrens Creek, Cottonwood Creek, or the *newly-created* realigned "Parkinson Creek" drainage channel. The preliminary drainage plan details major pipe sizes ranging from 24 to 60 inches.

Page 4.7-6: MM 4.7.1 has been amended as follows:

- MM 4.7.1 Prior to approval of the final tract map for a development within the Bellevue Ranch project area, the City will review the development proposal to ensure adequate provisions for flood control facilities

consistent with the *Army Corp of Engineers (COE), Merced Streams Group Project, Design Memorandum No. 11, September 1983 (including any subsequent modifications)*. *Facilities must also be consistent with the Bellevue Ranch master drainage plan and City of Merced engineering standards. COE endorsement shall be required.*

Page 4.7-6: MM 4.7.2 has been modified to read as follows:

MM 4.7.2 Prior to approval of Tentative Subdivision Maps (*including Fahrens Creek*), the *project* applicant shall ~~obtain~~ *secure* City of Merced and *Army Corp of Engineers (COE)* endorsement of the proposed creek channel design *consistent with MM 4.7.1*. Prior to Final Map recordation, *the project applicant shall also secure COE endorsement of the proposed channel improvements*. ~~in FEMA designated floodplains, the project applicant shall obtain any necessary FEMA endorsements of the revised floodplain boundaries.~~

Page 4.7-6: MM 4.7.3 has been edited as follows:

MM 4.7.3 Development will not be permitted within the southwestern portion of the project site (*south of Lehigh Drive, extended*) within the regulatory floodway of Fahrens Creek...

Page 4.7-7: MM 4.7.12 has been deleted as not applicable.

#### 4.8 BIOTIC RESOURCES TECHNICAL SECTION

Page 4.8-1, second paragraph. The following text has been clarified to reflect the survey periods for Bellevue Ranch:

Biotic and wetland surveys were conducted on the Bellevue Ranch site during September/October 1992, *February 1993, and May 1993*. For the biotic field surveys,...

Page 4.8-6, bottom of page. The following text has been clarified to reflect that late spring surveys were conducted:

*Initial f*Field surveys were conducted in September/October 1992, *followed by fairy shrimp, tadpole shrimp, and orcutt grass surveys in February and May 1993 (Ken Whitney, Sugnet and Associates, personal communication)*. Biologists walked the site...

Page 4.8-9, Special Status Plant Species, San Joaquin Orcutt Grass. The following text has been prepared to reflect the May 1993 survey for this species for clarification purposes.

San Joaquin Orcutt Grass - The project ~~may~~ **will not** result in a significant impact to San Joaquin Orcutt Grass, ~~although~~ **given that** the vernal pools on-site do not appear to contain this species based upon field observations **and follow-up confirmation field review in May 1993.**

**Dwarf Downingia - The project may result in a significant impact to the Dwarf Downingia, although the vernal pools on-site do not appear to contain this species based upon field observations.**

Page 4.8-10. MM 4.8.1 has been clarified as follows:

MM 4.8.1 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall produce a wetlands delineation consistent with the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual **or succeeding standards** and obtain verification...

Page 4.8-11, top of page. MM 4.8.2 has been clarified as follows:

MM 4.8.2 Prior to issuance of grading permits in *affected* wetland areas, the project applicant shall secure a permit to fill wetlands consistent with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, **and the corresponding 1603 Streambed Alteration permit required by the State of California.** Such a permitting shall include a wetlands mitigation plan consistent with the policy of "no net loss in wetlands acreage or value". The applicant shall consult with the **City, the California Department of Fish and Game,** and the COE during the preparation of this plan to develop a consolidated mitigation program, within the guidelines of the COE.

Due to the proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers levee and channel improvement plan, the project applicant has two options regarding modifications to Fahrens and Cottonwood Creeks. The applicant shall:

1) Postpone modifications to creek channels until U.S. Army Corps of Engineers begins the Merced-area project (estimated to be late 1996; Lauren Renning, personal communication). Mitigation for wetland impacts associated with this project would then be the responsibility of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

or,

2) Make modifications to creek channels ~~consistent with the Merced County streams project,~~ subject to approval by **the City of Merced and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.** Mitigation for wetland impacts associated with creek modifications shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. The mitigation plan for impacts to Fahrens and

Cottonwood Creeks shall include a detailed native vegetation *and restoration* planting plan consistent with the Merced Streams Project (Merced Streams Project-Design Memorandum No. 11, 1983). *Vegetation and riparian restoration plans will be subject to review and approval by the City of Merced. All plans must be deemed adequate by City standards as a condition of approval for flood control improvements.*

The mitigation plan for impacts to isolated wetlands shall include on-site preservation/compensation areas, off-site compensation areas, or a combination of the two with the intent of providing for a consolidated mitigation area. Compensation wetlands must be located in Merced County and meet the following success criteria:

- 1) Compensation wetlands will remain inundated or saturated for sufficient duration to support hydrophytic vegetation.
- 2) Compensation wetlands will exhibit plant and invertebrate species richness comparable to existing wetlands on site.
- 3) Compensation wetlands will be monitored each year for five years, and a report of monitoring results will be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for review.

Page 4.8-12, top of page, MM 4.8.3 has been clarified as follows to reflect the May 1993 survey:

MM 4.8.3     ~~Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to~~ *shall* conduct late spring surveys of vernal pools for ~~San Joaquin Orcutt grass and Dwarf Downingia. If these species are~~ *species is* confirmed on the project site, mitigation measures consistent with the most current listing status of the species shall be prepared and submitted to the City for inclusion in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project.

This mitigation measure has been modified to note that Orcutt Grass has not been found on-site based upon the May 1993 survey. However, the project biologist has indicated that Dwarf Downingia, although not confirmed to occur on-site, will be surveyed for in spring 1994 to correspond with the appropriate survey time for this species.

Page 4.8-12, MM 4.8.4. Measure has been edited as follows:

MM 4.8.4     ~~A decision on whether to list fairy shrimp and tadpole shrimp as endangered species will probably occur sometime between May and November 1993. Once a decision regarding listing...~~



#### 4.9 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Pages 4.9-4 through 4.9-9: Mitigation Measures 4.9.1 through 4.9.6 have been modified for consistency purposes as follows:

- MM 4.9.1 Prior to the approval of a tentative map, the project applicant shall submit to the City of Merced ~~Public Works~~ *Engineering* Department detailed water supply and delivery plans for review and approval. This shall include...
- MM 4.9.2 The following water conservation measures shall be implemented as required by state law:
- All buildings shall include low-flow fixtures to conserve water.
  - Insulation of hot water lines in water recirculating systems.
  - *Installation of water meters on all new services.*
- MM 4.9.3 Prior to the approval of a tentative ~~map~~ *conditional use permit*, the project applicant will submit to the City Planning Department for review and approval general landscape plans...
- MM 4.9.4 The project applicant, as approved by the City ~~Public Works~~ *Engineering* Department and Fire Department,...
- MM 4.9.5 Prior to the approval of a tentative *final subdivision* map, the project applicant will submit to the City Public Works Department detailed wastewater service plans...
- MM 4.9.6 Prior to approval of a *final subdivision* tentative map, the project applicant will demonstrate...

Pages 4.9-10 through 4.9-15: Editorial changes have been made to MM 4.9-8 through 4.9.14 as follows:

- MM 4.9.8 Prior to approval of a *final subdivision* tentative map, the project applicant will demonstrate...
- MM 4.9.9 The project applicant shall pay all CRIS (Cost Revenue Impact System) fees, or other applicable program fees as defined by the City, *including any fees intended to cover* ~~which are intended to cover~~ all Police Department costs for purchase of new or replacement vehicles, substation space, personnel costs and general overhead.

MM 4.9.11: This measure has been deleted in its entirety as not applicable.

- MM 4.9.12 Payment of CRIS impact fees or other applicable fees as determined by the City of Merced, which will, *among other things, help* finance necessary new substations, new fire apparatus, vehicle maintenance, station maintenance and personnel costs to adequately serve the proposed project.
- MM 4.9.13 Construction of exterior and interior water lines as outlined in Section 4.9-A (Water) along with fire hydrants (with the design and spacing of hydrants to be approved by the Merced Fire Department) with sufficient water pressure as *required to meet State and local standards.* ~~determined by the Merced Fire Department.~~
- MM 4.9.14 Prior to submittal of individual *tentative* subdivision maps within the project, each applicant shall meet with representatives from the Merced Fire Department to mutually outline necessary fire prevention requirements.

Page 4.9-16, third paragraph. The following text changes have resulted from more current information, in response to Comment 8-2:

~~Both districts charge the maximum school impact fee presently permitted under state law. The Elementary District levies a \$2.10 fee per square foot of development fee and the High School district levies fees in the amount of \$1.55 per square foot of development. This amount (\$3.65) is actually \$1.00 higher than the total permitted by State law. Recognizing that state law governing school finance is changing, both Districts have been depositing \$1.00 per square foot into an escrow account until more definitive school financing methods are put into place. The most current information now available indicates that the \$1.00 per square foot shall be refunded.~~

*Both districts charge the maximum school impact fee presently permitted under state law. Combined, the districts impose a maximum fee of \$1.65 per square foot of residential development, with \$1.10 routed to the Merced Elementary School District, and \$.55 going to the high school district.*

Page 4.9-18 and 4.9-19, student generation charts. Charts have been replaced to remove generation rate for patio homes:

**TABLE 4.9-4  
STUDENT GENERATION RATES**

	Single-Family Detached	Single-Family Attached	Multi-Family
Elementary (K-8)	.558	.558	.380
High School (9-12)	.219	.219	.079

Source: Michael Paoli and Associates

**TABLE 4.9-5  
GENERATION OF K-8 STUDENTS**

Unit Type	No. of Dwellings	Generation Rate	No. of Students
Single-Family Detached	2,384-2,981	.558	1,330-1,663
Patio Homes (detached)	1,790-2,116	.558	999-1181
Multi-family	1,797	.220	395
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,971-6,894</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>2,724-3,239</b>

**TABLE 4.9-6  
GENERATION OF STUDENTS GRADE 9-12**

Unit Type	No. of Dwellings	Generation Rate	No. of Students
Single Family Detached	2,384-2,981	.219	1,330-1,663
Patio Homes (detached)	1,790-2,116	.219	392-463
Multi-family	1,797	.079	142
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,971-6,894</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>1,056-1,258</b>

Page 4.9-19, Mitigation Measure 4.9.15 has been clarified as follows:

MM 4.9.15 The developer of each subdivision within the Bellevue Ranch *project* shall pay ~~the maximum impacts fee to the respective districts as permitted by State law.~~ *all City and school district fees in effect on the date of this approval, as permitted by State law, and any increases in those fees, and any new fees which are in effect at the time the building permits are issued.*

Page 4.9-19. Mitigation Measure 4.9.16 amended in response to Comment 8-11 and as a result of further analysis. The measure now reads as follows:

MM 4.9.16 The developer of the Bellevue Ranch project shall reserve one ~~40-acre~~ *minimum high school site of at least 40 acres (net of right of ways), as consistent with state standards, for acquisition by the Merced Union High School District.*, ~~and~~ *The developer* shall also reserve ~~two to three~~ *between two and four 10 acre (net) minimum elementary school sites for acquisition to by the Merced City Elementary School District. The actual number of elementary school sites will depend upon school enrollment and the District's ability to adjust attendance boundaries of existing schools. In each instance, sites to be reserved shall be mutually agreed to by the developer, and the respective school district, and the City of Merced.*

#### 4.10 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Page 4.10-64, top of page, numerical correction:

MM 4.110-5

Page 4.10-64, MM 4.10.7 and Figure 4.10-8. Measure and figure have been revised to incorporate a second through lane at the northbound and southbound approaches of the intersection of R Street/Yosemite Avenue to be consistent with the recommended 4-lane widening of R Street in the year 2000. A revised Figure 4.10-8 is attached on the following page.

MM 4.10.7 Build the new intersections of Yosemite/R and Yosemite/SR 59, with the *four-lane configurations for Yosemite/R shown in the figure (Figure 4.10-8)*. Install a traffic signal at Yosemite/R and a stop sign at the westbound approach to SR 59.

Page 4.10-67, MM 4.10.29. This measure has been modified to clarify the recommended widening of G Street to six lanes between Yosemite Avenue to 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. The traffic analysis found that while the mid-block segments of G Street can operate under capacity in 2010 as a 4 lane arterial, the intersections cannot. The six lane recommendation

provides additional through capacity at the intersections, but G Street does not need to be six lanes along the entire segment. Providing six through lanes at the intersections for 1/4 mile before and after the intersections is sufficient to provide the necessary additional capacity. The 5th and 6th lanes can be lane additions and lane drops at the 1/4 mile intersections, as illustrated in Figure 2 on the following page.

**MM 4.10.29** Widen G Street to a six lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. *The entire segment of G Street is not required to be six lanes. Six lanes are required, however, 1/4 mile before and after each intersection along this roadway segment, allowing for lane additions and lane drops.*

Page 4.10-67, MM 4.10.31. Measure has been modified in response to Comment 5-29:

~~MM 4.10.31~~ ~~Extend Old Lake Road from G Street to SR 59 (possibly) incorporating existing Nevada Street. Construct Old Lake Road as a 4 lane divided arterial (ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet) between G and R Streets, and as a 2 lane undivided road between R Street and SR 59.~~

**MM 4.10.31** *Extend Old Lake Road from G Street to SR 59 as a 2-lane undivided road, (possibly) incorporating existing Nevada Street.*

Page 4.10-69. The R Street improvement #2 contains a typographical error. The sentence should read:

~~Extend R Street (2 lanes) from 1/2 mile north of Yosemite Avenue to 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road.~~

*Extend R Street (2 lanes) from present terminus at Yosemite Avenue to Cardella Road.*

The text of R Street improvement #5 incorrectly states that R Street should be widened to 4 lanes from 1/2 mile north of Yosemite Avenue to 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road, and that R Street should extend to 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road. At 17% buildout of Phase III, R Street does not require extension north of Bellevue Road. The text should state:

~~Widen R Street to 4 lanes for 1/2 mile north of Yosemite Avenue to 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. Extend R Street (2 lanes) from Bellevue Road to 1/2 mile south of Old Lake Road.~~

*Widen R Street to 4 lanes from present terminus at Yosemite Avenue to Cardella Road.*

From a capacity standpoint, R Street is not required to be 4 lanes north of Bellevue Road with only development of Bellevue Ranch. The text of R Street improvement #6 should read:

~~Widen R Street to 4 lanes from 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road to 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road. Extend R Street (2 lanes) from 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road.~~

*Widen R Street to 4 lanes from Cardella Road to Bellevue Road. Extend R Street (2 lanes) from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road.*

Page 4.10-74, following discussion of Mitigated Levels of Service. The following discussion is added in order to describe the potential ultimate improvements at the intersection of West Olive Avenue and State Route 59, in relation to the other significant unavoidably impacted intersections along West Olive Avenue:

*Potential Ultimate Improvements to West Olive Avenue/State Route 59*

*The intersection of West Olive Avenue/State Route 59/Sante Fe Drive experiences unacceptable service levels within the timeframe of the EIR (2000 to 2010). While the intersection can physically accommodate additional through lanes, it will not operate acceptably in the future without substantial improvements such as grade-separation. Therefore, under the timeframe of the EIR analysis, the intersection does experience significant unavoidable adverse impacts.*

*The intersection, however, differs from the other unavoidably impacted intersections on West Olive Avenue for the following reasons:*

- 1) State Route 59 may potentially be improved to a freeway with grade-separated interchanges as the City builds out further to the north. However, the ultimate configuration and alignment of this freeway is unknown at this time. This concept has been discussed with the City and Caltrans, but is probably well beyond the year 2010 timeframe.*
- 2) The intersection is not located in a dense and established part of the City or County and, therefore, it is more feasible to acquire the necessary right-of-way for a grade separated urban interchange.*

*While this intersection experiences significant unavoidable impacts during the timeframe of the EIR, it has a greater potential for long range improvements than the other impacted intersections along West Olive Avenue, which will likely never be substantially improved beyond their present configurations.*

#### **4.11 AIR QUALITY**

Page 4.11-13: In response to Comment 3-3 and at the direction of the City, the following modifications have been made to Mitigation Measure 4.11.1:

MM 4.11.1 To ensure that construction mitigation is utilized, final *improvement plan* approval ~~should~~ *shall* not be given to any development until the developer/contractor submits a satisfactory construction mitigation plan *to the City of Merced*. This plan ~~should~~ *shall* specify the methods of control that will be utilized, ~~demonstrate the availability of needed equipment and personnel,~~ and identify a reasonable individual who, ~~if needed,~~ can authorize ~~generation~~ the implementation of additional measures, if needed.

The Construction Mitigation plan ~~should, at a minimum, include the following;~~ *may include, but not be limited to the following measures, as deemed appropriate by the City (or as required by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District at the time of improvement plan approval:*

- Suspend earthmoving or other dust-producing activities during period of high *winds greater than 20 mph.* ~~when dust control measures are unable to avoid visible dust plumes.~~
- Provide equipment and ~~staffing~~ for watering of all *construction areas at least exposed or disturbed soil surfaces* at least twice daily. ~~including weekends and holidays. An appropriate dust palliative or suppressant, added to water before application, should be utilized.~~
- ~~Water or cover~~ Stockpiles of debris, soil, ~~sand or other~~ *fine materials being left for periods in excess that can be blown by the wind.* ~~of one day during site construction shall be watered, covered or track walked after stockpiling is complete.~~
- ~~Sweep construction area and adjacent streets of all mud and debris, since this material can be pulverized and later resuspended by vehicle traffic.~~ *Paved areas at controlled access points shall be swept or washed once a day, or more frequently if necessary, within 100 yards of the point of entry.*
- ~~Limit the speed of all construction vehicles to 15 miles per hour while on site.~~ *All unpaved construction areas shall be sprayed with water at least twice per day within areas being graded, excavated or used as construction haul roads.*
- ~~All materials transported by truck will be covered or wetted down.~~ *Haul trucks used for moving materials on/or off-site shall not be overfilled, or shall be covered if overfilled.*

- ~~All inactive portions of the site will be watered with an appropriate dust suppressant, covered~~ ***Exposed dirt surfaces shall be paved, landscaped, track walked or hydroseeded as quickly as possible following completion of work.***

***To ensure a land use design which promotes regional air quality standards, the following measures may be implemented:***

- ***Utilize land uses and densities to orient the development towards pedestrian/bicycle travel for local trips.***
- ***Establish a system of pedestrian/bicycle/electric vehicle paths connecting residences to shopping, employment and recreational uses to encourage non-auto travel for short trips.***
- ***Reserve land for transit centers and other transit amenities in conjunction with the M Street Transitway.***
- ***Reserve land for neighborhood parks and schools in close proximity to residential uses.***

Page 4.11-14: In response to Comment 3-5, Mitigation Measure 4.11.2 has been modified to read as follows:

MM 4.11.2 ...Such improvements may include ***such items as*** public transportation dedications, bikeway/paths, transit improvements/amenities, and pedestrian access facilities.

Page 4.11-15: The following modification was made to MM 4.11.5:

MM 4.11.5 Project design shall be reviewed by the City Planning Department prior to approval of the ~~Master Development Plan~~ ***Tentative Map*** to encourage the provision of park-and-ride amenities within the project.

Page 4.11-15: In response to Comment 3-6, the following revisions were made to the following mitigation measure:

MM 4.11.6 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy, individual homes will require the installation of low NOx space and water heaters, ***and the provision of electric lawn mowers and blowers with the sale of residential units, and include in residential units a perimeter electrical outlets to allow the use of electrical mowers and blowers. and a natural gas line to the backyard of each residence to provide an alternative to charcoal barbecues.***



Page 4.11-15. In response to Comment 3-7, Mitigation Measure 4.11.7 has been replaced to read as follows:

**MM 4.11.7** *In conjunction with the processing of building permits, the applicant will provide a maximum of one EPA-certified pellet stove, wood stove or fireplace inserts per residence.*

Page 4.11-15: In response to Comment 3-2, the following mitigation measure has been added:

**MM 4.11.9** *In conjunction with applications for discretionary approvals the project applicant may be required to incorporate current practices to promote the use of alternative fuels within the proposed development. Implementation of this measure may include the use of alternative fuel facilities (compressed natural gas filling stations and charging stations) for automobiles. Electrical service standards may also be incorporated for commercial, residential and industrial sites that would provide adequate capacity to allow installation of recharging facilities as needed in the future as determined by the City of Merced.*

#### **4.12 NOISE**

Page 4.12-9, MM 4.12.2. This measure has been clarified as follows:

**MM 4.12.2** Most future residences within Bellevue Ranch that are located within 125 feet of Bellevue Road, Cardella Road and M Street (*south of Cardella*) roadway centerlines would require sound-rated windows to be consistent...

#### **4.13 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**

No changes.

#### **4.14 HUMAN HEALTH**

Page 4.14-6: The following additions have been made to the first lines of the two tables near the bottom of the page, in response to Comment 1-7:

Typical 115 kV double circuit design (639 amps *based upon* maximum current)

Typical 230 kV double circuit design (823 amps *based upon* maximum current)

Page 4.14.13. MM 4.14.2 has been clarified as follows:

MM 4.14.2 Abandoned automobiles, ranch equipment, tires and other miscellaneous farm refuse shall be removed to an appropriate disposal facility prior to issuance of project grading permits *for the appropriate phase.*

Page 4.14.13, 4.14.14. MMs 4.14.3 and 4.14.4 have been clarified as follows:

MM 4.14.3 A Phase II site reconnaissance and sampling investigation of those portions of the project site where areas of potential environmental contamination have been identified shall be conducted *at applicant expense, by professionals acceptable to the City* and submitted for City review prior to *consideration of any conditional use permits, if required, or tentative subdivision maps within the affected areas.* ~~final map reoordation.~~ The Phase II investigation shall be conducted following removal of all on-site refuse material. Paint storage and cleaning areas...

MM 4.14.4 ...The project sponsor shall comply with, or bond for, all mitigations specified in the resulting report prior to issuance of any project construction related permits *within the affected area.* Mitigations specified within the report...

Pages 4.14-14 and 4.14-15: The text for Mitigation Measures 4.14.6 and 4.14.7 has been deleted and replaced with the following in response to Comment 1-1, and as a result of further review of available information:

**MM 4.14.6** *Prior to approval of final maps, the project applicant shall submit all plans for review to PG&E, Yosemite Division Capital Investment Department, to ensure that site development does not conflict with existing PG&E facilities and accommodates new utility requirements. The project applicant shall seek, to the City's satisfaction, a Consent Agreement from PG&E prior to the issuance of any permits for development within PG&E transmission easements.*

**MM 4.14.7** *Land uses which will limit the exposure of humans to electric and magnetic fields, such as parks, open space, trails, and other non-residential uses, will be encouraged in and around transmission line easements. Ultimate land use determination will be dependent upon City design review (outside of easements) and PG&E consultation (within easements) during tentative map review and approval. Tentative maps will also comply with California Department of Education regulations for the setback of school property lines from power line easements.*

## 5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

No changes.

## 6.0 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

No changes.

## 7.0 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED

Page 7.0-1. The following text has been added to this section to correlate with the significant unavoidable impacts identified in Section 4.10, Traffic and Circulation:

### Traffic and Circulation

*The intersections of West Olive Avenue at R, M, and G Streets will experience unacceptable service levels in the p.m. peak hour from the year 2005 on. The intersections of West Olive Avenue at R and G Streets will experience unacceptable conditions from the year 2000 on. These intersections cannot feasibly be mitigated without constructing additional through lanes. Because the intersections are located in a dense, established part of the City it is cost prohibitive to acquire the necessary right-of-way to add through lanes, not only at the intersections but for several hundred feet along the intersecting streets. Therefore, these intersections experience unmitigatable significant impacts and will require a Statement of Overriding Considerations upon project approval.*

*The intersection of West Olive Avenue/State Route 59/Sante Fe Drive experiences unacceptable service levels within the timeframe of the EIR (2000 to 2010). While the intersection can physically accommodate additional through lanes, it will not operate acceptably in the future without substantial improvements such as grade-separation. Therefore, under the timeframe of the EIR analysis, the intersection does experience significant unavoidable adverse impacts.*

*The intersection, however, differs from the other unavoidably impacts intersections on West Olive Avenue for the following reasons:*

- 1) *State Route 59 may potentially be improved to a freeway with grade-separated interchanges as the City builds out further to the north. However, the ultimate configuration and alignment of this freeway is unknown at this time. This concept has been discussed with the City and Caltrans, but is probably well beyond the year 2010 timeframe.*

- 2) *The intersection is not located in a dense and established part of the City or County and, therefore, it is more feasible to acquire the necessary right-of-way for a grade separated urban interchange.*

*While this intersection experiences significant unavoidable impacts during the timeframe of the EIR, it has a greater potential for long range improvements than the other impacted intersections along West Olive Avenue, which will likely never be substantially improved beyond their present configurations.*

#### **8.0 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT TERM USE AND LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY**

No changes.

#### **9.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES**

No changes.

#### **10.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

The following text has been added to page 10.0-2, under the subtitle Public Facilities and Services:

##### Water System

*Development of the Bellevue Ranch Project is anticipated to incrementally add to the need for additional water supplies, treatment, and distribution within North Merced. To reduce the water system cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level, Mitigation Measure 4.9.1 of the Draft EIR requires that each tentative map demonstrate adequate supply and delivery plans.*

##### Sewer System

*Development of the Project is anticipated to incrementally increase the demand for additional sewer treatment capacity and collection facilities within North Merced. In response to anticipated growth, the City completed a sewer master plan for the northerly portion of Merced known as the North Merced Wastewater Master Plan. The purpose of the plan is to identify the most timely and cost-efficient manner in which to provide sanitary sewer services. The Wastewater Master Plan, in association with Mitigation Measure 4.9.5 on page 4.9-7, will serve to reduce sewer system cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.*

**Electrical and Natural Gas Service**

*Regarding cumulative energy supply impacts, Mitigation Measure 4.9.6 on page 4.9-9 of this Draft EIR conditions development on the adequacy and availability of energy supplies. The mitigation requires also the applicant to demonstrate to the City that they have coordinated with Pacific Gas and Electric regarding the location and phasing of natural gas and electrical facilities to serve the Project. As such, the project's contribution to electrical and natural gas service cumulative impacts are less-than-significant.*

**Telecommunication Services**

*Mitigation Measure 4.9.8 on page 4.9-10 of this Draft EIR requires the project applicant to coordinate with Pacific Bell regarding the extension, location, and phasing of telecommunication facilities. As such, cumulative impacts associated with telecommunication services are reduced to a less-than-significant level.*

**Police Protection**

*According to Mitigation Measure 4.9.9 on page 4.9-12 of this Draft EIR, the project applicant shall pay all Cost Revenue Impact System fees or other applicable program fees as defined by the City to cover all Police Department costs. Therefore, cumulative impacts to Police Protection are reduced to a less-than-significant level.*

**Fire Protection**

*Development of the Bellevue Ranch Project will incrementally increase the demands placed on Fire Protection Services. But, the cumulative impacts generated by the Bellevue Ranch Project will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the Fire Protection Services Mitigation Measures listed on page 4.9-15 of this Draft EIR.*

**11.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**

No Changes.

**12.0 PREPARERS OF THIS REPORT**

No Changes.

**13.0 INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS CONSULTED**

No Changes.



---

# MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

---





**V. MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

**1. Legislative Mandate**

Public Resources Code (PRC) §21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt mitigation monitoring or reporting programs for all projects for which an environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration has been prepared. This 1989 law is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

The statute does not convey any new powers to public agencies. The conditions and changes imposed on projects through CEQA have always been enforced through the previously existing police powers of the agency. This is the same with the implementation of Chapter 1232 of Statutes of 1989.

No regulations or guidelines concerning the implementation of PRC §21081.6 have been issued by the State, and numerous interpretations of its requirements are possible. The program defined in this document is intended to satisfy the spirit of the new law and is based on research of ongoing monitoring programs throughout the state.

**2. Monitoring Matrix**

On the following pages, a matrix has been provided which identifies the mitigation measures proposed for the project. The matrix's columns are used to show the link between the EIR and the Bellevue Ranch Master Development Plan. The columns have the following meanings:

**Mitigation Measure** The number in this column refers to the Mitigation Measure identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

**Proposed Mitigation Measure Language** The text in this column is the language proposed for adoption as the appropriate mitigation for impacts attributable to the project.

**Responsibility:**

**Mon** **Mon** identifies the party responsible for monitoring that the project complies with the mitigation measure.

**Impl** **Impl** identifies the party responsible for carrying out the implementation measure.

**Timing**

The timing column identifies at what point in time or phase of the project the measure is to be completed. The exception is the identification of "DA", Development Agreement, which means that the timing of when the measure is to be completed is called out in the Development Agreement. It does not mean that the mitigation measure has to be implemented prior to the adoption of the Development Agreement.

**Verification**

The verification columns are shown as a convenience in the form to be completed when the mitigation measure has been reported and verified as completed by the appropriate party.

**3. Summary of Abbreviations***Responsible Agency/Department/Party*

<b>PD</b>	Planning Department
<b>ES</b>	Engineering Services
<b>B</b>	Building and Safety Department
<b>CC</b>	Merced City Council
<b>CDFG</b>	California Department of Fish and Game
<b>ACE</b>	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
<b>FD</b>	Merced County Fire Department/California Department of Forestry
<b>LE</b>	Merced County Sheriff's Department/City of Merced Police Department
<b>PBTC</b>	Pacific Bell Telephone Company
<b>PGE</b>	Pacific Gas & Electric
<b>DEV</b>	Developer
<b>POA</b>	Property Owner Association

**MCWD** Merced County Water District  
**MSD** Merced School Districts

*Timing of Monitoring*

**BP** Prior to the issuance of Building Permits  
**GP** Prior to the issuance of Grading Permits  
**FM** Prior to approval of the applicable phase's Final Map  
**C** During Construction  
**PC** Post Construction  
**IP** Improvement Plan Review and Approval  
**DA** Development Agreement (refer to development agreement for timing of monitoring)  
**MP** Master Plan Approval  
**CUP** Conditional Use Permit  
**TM** Tentative Map

# Mitigation Monitoring Program

Endnotes are located at the end of the table

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl <sup>b</sup>		Initials	Date
<b>LAND USE, PLANS, AND POLICIES</b>						
4.1.2	The Bellevue Ranch project and other future projects within the SUDP will continue to be reviewed and monitored to ensure that the City-wide goal of density distribution and land use mix is achieved pursuant to the general goals of the Villages Concept Plan and the Merced General Plan.	PD	PD	CUP/TM/ BP		
4.1.3	Prior to approval of a tentative map for areas adjacent to existing development in the City of Merced, the project applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval detailed landscape and building placement plans to ensure adequate buffering and transition between land uses.	PD	DEV	CUP		
<b>AGRICULTURAL LAND USE</b>						
4.2.1	The project applicant, in cooperation with adjacent land owners, shall provide interim buffers between future urbanized areas and existing agricultural uses that use pesticides, herbicides, or create substantial dust and/or odors. The buffer shall be maintained until the project applicant has demonstrated that adjacent agriculture uses have ceased.	PD	DEV	TM		
<b>AESTHETICS</b>						
4.3.1	Prior to approval of required Conditional Use Permits, the project applicant will prepare conceptual landscape plans for the subject project. Detailed landscape plans must be prepared for building permit review and shall generally adhere to the landscape concepts contained in the Merced Villages Design Guidelines and applicable adopted plans.	CUP/TM		CUP/TM		
4.3.2	In conjunction with the approval of required Conditional Use Permits and Tentative Subdivision Maps, the project applicant shall provide preliminary building plans, elevations, and architectural treatment for City review. City review will ensure general project consistency with the Merced Villages Design Guidelines, Planned Development Ordinance and applicable adopted plans.	PD	DEV	CUP/TM		

\* Depending on type of CUP or Tentative Map processing, consistent with City Policies and Procedures.

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl†		Initials	Date
4.3.3	Prior to approval of conditional use permits, the project applicant shall provide detailed lighting, signage, and fencing/decorative soundwall plans consistent with the City's Planned Development Ordinance, Merced Villages Design Guidelines and applicable adopted plans. Covenants, Conditions, and restrictions shall limit the exterior lighting on residential dwelling units to mercury vapor, low pressure sodium, incandescent and fluorescent lamps. All lighting have cut-off lenses.	PD	DEV	CUP/TM		
4.3.4	Mature stands of existing eucalyptus trees found on site shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible and designed into the land use of the Master Development Plan, unless the trees are confirmed by the City's arborist to present a significant safety hazard. Preservation of these stands of trees shall be consistent with the policies contained within the City's General Plan.	PD/CC	DEV	MP		
4.3.5	Prior to approval of each Conditional Use Permit, the project applicant will demonstrate to the City Planning Department consistency of overall design features with the general principles of the Merced Village Design Guidelines.	PD	DEV	TM/CUP		
<b>PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE</b>						
4.4.1	Based on the maximum total dwelling unit and population figures estimated in the Master Development Plan, adjustment (as buildout of the Bellevue Ranch Project occurs) to the presently proposed park acreage total may be necessary, involving up to approximately 12 additional acres of park land for the project area located north of Bellevue Road, in order to reflect the actual dwelling unit and population figures determined by the City of Merced during Final Map approvals consistent with the Merced Municipal Code and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.	PD, CC	DEV	MP		
<b>LANDFORM, TOPOGRAPHY, AND SOILS</b>						
4.5.1	Prior to the approval of final subdivision maps, the City shall require a detailed geotechnical report to be prepared by a California registered geotechnical engineer for each project.	ES	DEV	FM		
4.5.2	The City shall require the recommendations contained in the geotechnical report be incorporated into the design prior to approval of the tentative map.	ES	DEV	TM		
4.5.3	During construction, the geotechnical engineer shall provide inspection to ensure that recommendations and plans are properly implemented.	ES	DEV	C	DD	3/4/94

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl <sup>b</sup>		Initials	Date
4.5.4	Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City that the project features have been designed to withstand any maximum ground acceleration standard required of such development at the time of specific approval.	B	DEV	BP		
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
4.6.1	State of California Historic Resource Inventory Form(s) and an Archeological Site Record Form (State of California DRP 422 A (Rev. 4/86) Form) of the Bellevue Ranch complex shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of grading, demolition, or building permits for the areas within the project which will impact the Bellevue Ranch complex. Copies of the Form(s) shall be filed with the local historical society, the Merced County Museum and Historical Society, the Office of Historic Preservation, and the Central Information Center as appropriate.	B, ES	DEV	GP		
4.6.2	Archaeological monitoring of any demolition and subsurface construction in the vicinity of the Bellevue Ranch buildings shall be conducted by a qualified archaeological monitor and funded by the project applicant. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to modify the intensity of the monitoring effort.	B	DEV	C		
4.6.3	If any significant cultural materials are exposed during demolition, excavation, grading or other construction activities in the vicinity of the Bellevue Ranch buildings or anywhere else on the project site, operations shall be ceased within ten feet of the find, the City shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist contacted for further recommendations.	B	DEV	C		
4.6.4	A Historic American Building Survey report of all standing Bellevue Ranch structures shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits for the project.	B	DEV	GP/BP		
4.6.5	An Archeological Site Record Form (State of California DPR 422 A (Rev. 4/86) Form) for the segment of the Yosemite Valley Railroad Grade within the Bellevue Ranch project shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits for the project phase(s) affected by the Grade. Copies of the Form(s) shall be filed with the Central Information Center.	B	DEV	GP/BP		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl <sup>b</sup>		Initials	Date
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>						
4.7.1	Prior to approval of the final tract map for development within the Bellevue Ranch project area, the City will review the development proposal to ensure adequate provisions for flood control facilities consistent with the Army Corp of Engineers (COE), Merced Streams Group Project, Design Memorandum No. 11, September 1983 (including any subsequent modifications). Facilities must also be consistent with the Bellevue Ranch master drainage plan and City of Merced engineering standards. COE endorsement shall be required.	ES, B	DEV	FM		
4.7.2	Prior to approval of Tentative Subdivision Maps (including Fahrens Creek), the project applicant shall secure City of Merced and Army Corp of Engineers (COE) endorsement of the proposed creek channel design consistent with MM 4.7.1. Prior to Final Map recordation, the project applicant shall also secure COE endorsement of the proposed channel improvements.	ACE, ES, PD	DEV	TSM/FM		
4.7.3	Development will not be permitted within the southwestern portion of the project site (south of Lehigh Drive, extended) within the regulatory floodway of Fahrens Creek unless the Main Channel check structure is completed and building pad elevations are constructed above the 100-year flood elevation.	B, ES, ACE	DEV	BP		
4.7.4	A comprehensive plan to prevent erosion, siltation, and contamination of storm water during construction will be required for any development proposal within the Bellevue Ranch project area prior to approval.	ES, ACE	DEV	TM/FM		
4.7.5	Grading operations should be targeted for the dry months of the year as directed by the City.	B, ES	DEV	C		
4.7.6	If construction occurs during storm events, sediment traps, barriers, covers or other methods approved by the City shall be used to reduce erosion.	B, ES, ACE	DEV	C		
4.7.7	Cut and fill slopes shall not be steeper than recommended by the project geotechnical engineer and approved by the City.	ES, ACE	DEV	C		
4.7.8	Temporary mulching, seeding, or other suitable erosion stabilization measures approved by the City shall be used to protect exposed areas during construction activities.	ES, B	DEV	C		
4.7.9	Excavated materials shall not be deposited or stored where the material could be washed away by storm-water runoff.	ES, B	DEV	C		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl*		Initials	Date
4.7.10	Final grades shall be revegetated as soon as practical after completion of grading.	B, PD	DEV	C		
4.7.11	Final grades shall be graded so that runoff of surface water is minimized.	ACE, PD	DEV	C		
<b>BIOTIC RESOURCES</b>						
4.8.1	Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall produce a wetlands delineation consistent with the 1987 Corp of Engineers (COE) Wetlands Delineation Manual or succeeding standards and obtain verification of the wetlands delineation by the COE. The applicant shall consult with the City Planning Department and demonstrate compliance with the COE requirements.	ACE, PD	DEV	GP	DD	3/4/94



Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Imp†		Initials	Date
4.8.2	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits in affected wetland areas, the project applicant shall secure a permit to fill wetlands consistent with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the corresponding 1603 Streambed Alteration permit required by the State of California. Such permitting shall include a wetland mitigation plan consistent with the policy of "no net loss in wetlands acreage or value". The applicant shall consult with the City, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the COE during the preparation of this plan to develop a consolidated mitigation program, within the guidelines of the COE.</p> <p>Due to the proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers levee and channel improvement plan, the project applicant has two options regarding modifications to Fahrens and Cottonwood Creeks. The applicant shall:</p> <p>1) Postpone modifications to creek channels until U.S. Army Corps of Engineers begins the Merced-area project (estimated to be late 1996; Lauren Renning, personal communication). Mitigation for wetland impacts associated with this project would then be the responsibility of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>or,</p> <p>2) Make modifications to creek channels subject to approval by the City of Merced and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Mitigation for wetland impacts associated with creek modification shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. The mitigation plan for impacts to Fahrens and Cottonwood Creeks shall include a detailed native vegetation and restoration planting plan consistent with the Merced Streams Project (Merced Streams Project-Design Memorandum No. 11, 1983). Vegetation and riparian restoration plans will be subject to review and approval by the City of Merced. All plans must be deemed adequate by City standards as a condition of approval for flood control improvements.</p> <p>The mitigation plan for impact to isolated wetlands shall include on-site preservation/compensation areas, off-site compensation areas, or a combination of the two with the intent of providing for a consolidated mitigation area. Compensation wetlands must be located in Merced County and meet the following success criteria outlined in the DEIR.</p>	ACE, PD	DEV	GP	DD	3/4/94

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Imp <sup>o</sup>		Initials	Date
4.8.3	Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project biologist shall conduct late spring surveys of vernal pools for Dwarf Downingia. If species is confirmed on the project site, mitigation measures consistent with the most current listing status of the species shall be prepared and submitted to the City for inclusion in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project.	PD	DEV	GP	DD	3/4/94
4.8.4	Once a decision regarding listing is reached and prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall comply with the appropriate mitigation measure. If the fairy and tadpole shrimp are listed as threatened or endangered, the project sponsor shall initiate a Section 7 consultation with the USFWS as part of compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Comparatively, if the shrimps are not listed, a wetlands mitigation plan shall be submitted as part of compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.	PD	DEV	GP	DD	3/4/94

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl*		Initials	Date
<b>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>						
4.9.1	Prior to the approval of a tentative map, the project applicant shall submit to the City of Merced Engineering Department detailed water supply and delivery plans for review and approval.	ES	DEV	TM		
4.9.2	The following water conservation measures shall be implemented as required by state law: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All buildings shall include low-flow fixtures to conserve water.</li> <li>• Insulation of hot water lines in water recirculation systems.</li> <li>• Installation of water meters on all new services.</li> </ul>	B	DEV	BP		
4.9.3	Prior to the approval of conditional use permits, the project applicant will submit to the City Planning Department for review and approval detailed landscaping plans.	PD	DEV	CUP		
4.9.4	The project applicant, as approved by the City Engineering Department and Fire Department, will demonstrate that the water system proposed for the project is designed to meet the projected water capacity and fire flow requirements as well as all City specifications, prior to the approval of the first final map.	ES, FD	DEV	FM		
4.9.5	Prior to the approval of a final subdivision map, the project applicant will submit to the City Engineering Department detailed wastewater service plans for review and approval.	ES	DEV	FM		
4.9.6	Prior to the approval of a final subdivision map, the project applicant will demonstrate to the City that they have coordinated with Pacific Gas and Electric regarding the location and phasing of natural gas and electrical facilities to serve the area.	ES, PGE	DEV	FM		
4.9.7	Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City that their architect(s) have consulted with Pacific Gas and Electric regarding the incorporation of energy conservation techniques into building and landscape design.	ES, PGE, B	DEV	BP		
4.9.8	Prior to the approval of a final subdivision map, the project applicant will demonstrate to the City that they have coordinated with Pacific Bell regarding the extension, location, and phasing of telecommunication facilities to serve the project.	ES, PBTC	DEV	FM		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl†		Initials	Date
4.9.9	The project applicant shall pay all Cost Revenue Impact System fees, or other applicable program fees as defined by the City, including any fees intended to cover all Police Department costs for purchase of new or replacement vehicles, substitution space, personnel costs, and general overhead.	LE, B	DEV	BP		
4.9.10	Developers associated with Bellevue Ranch shall meet with the Merced Police Department prior to issuance of building permits. Specific security mitigation, as agreed between the Department and the developer, shall be incorporated into the construction plans.	LE, PD	DEV	BP	DD	3/4/94
4.9.12	Payment of Cost Revenue Impact System fees or other applicable fees as determined by the City of Merced, which will, among other things, help finance necessary new substations, new fire apparatus, vehicle maintenance, station maintenance, and personnel costs to adequately serve the proposed project.	B	DEV	BP		
4.9.13	Construction of exterior and interior water lines as outlined in Section 4.9-A (Water) along with fire hydrants (with the design and spacing of hydrants to be approved by the Merced Fire Department) with sufficient water pressure as required to meet State and local standards.	MCWD, FD	DEV	BP	DD	3/4/94
4.9.14	Prior to submittal of tentative subdivision maps within the project, each applicant shall meet with representatives from the Merced Fire Department to outline necessary fire prevention requirements.	FD, PD	DEV	TM		
4.9.15	The developer of each subdivision within the Bellevue Ranch project shall pay all City and school district fees in effect on the date of this approval, as permitted by State law, and any increases in those fees, and any new fees which are in effect at the time the building permits are issued.	B	DEV	B		
4.9.16	The developer of the Bellevue Ranch project shall reserve one high school site of at least 40 acres (net of right of ways), as consistent with state standards, for acquisition by the Merced Union High School District. The developer shall also reserve between two and four 10 acre (net) minimum elementary school sites for acquisition by the Merced City Elementary School District. The actual number of elementary school sites will depend upon school enrollment and the District's ability to adjust attendance boundaries of existing schools. In each instance, sites to be reserved shall be mutually agreed to by the developer, the respective school district, and the City of Merced.	MSD, PD, ES	DEV	FM		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon <sup>a</sup>	Impl <sup>b</sup>		Initials	Date
<b>TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION</b>						
4.10.1	Extend R Street to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. Construct a 2 lane divided arterial between present terminus and Cardella Road. Construct a 2 lane divided arterial north of Cardella Road. Build R Street with ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet to allow widening inside without reconstructing curb, gutter, sidewalks, etc.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.2	Extend Cardella Road from G Street to present terminus east of Kansas Street. Construct a 4 lane divided arterial (ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet) between G and R Streets and a 2 lane divided arterial west of R Street. Build 2 lane section with an ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.3	Extend Yosemite Avenue to SR 59 (planned improvement). Construct a 4 lane divided arterial from present terminus to R Street and as a 2 lane divided street from R Street to SR 59. If possible, build 4 lane and 2 lane sections with an ultimate curb to curb width of 98 feet in anticipation of widening to 6 lanes. Maintain expressway level access restrictions on the extension.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.4	Extend M Street from present terminus to Cardella Road. Construct a 2 lane divided arterial (maintaining existing tree-lined median).	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.5	Widen SR 59 to a 4 lane divided expressway from West Olive Avenue to Yosemite Avenue. Maintain expressway level access restrictions.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.6	Build new intersections of Cardella/R, Cardella/M, and western side of Cardella/G with the lane configurations shown in Figure 4.10-9.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.7	Build the new intersections of Yosemite/R and Yosemite/SR 59, with the four-lane configurations for Yosemite/R shown in the figure (Figure 4.10-8). Install a traffic signal at Yosemite/R and a stop sign at the westbound approach to SR 59.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.8	Yosemite/G - mitigate service level with a change in signal phasing to include protected left turns on the Yosemite Avenue approaches. Maintain existing lane configurations.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl†		Initials	Date
4.10.9	<p>West Olive/SR 59 - concurrent with widening SR 59 construct a free right turn lane southbound SR 59 to westbound Santa Fe Drive. Add a right turn lane to the northbound SR 59 approach at West Olive Avenue.</p> <p>West Olive/SR 59 cannot easily be mitigated to LOS D or better because of right-of-way constraints. To mitigate to LOS D the following improvements in addition to those described above would be needed: dual left turn lanes southbound on SR 59, dual left turn lanes eastbound on West Olive, exclusive right turn lane westbound on West Olive, two through lanes on SR 59 north and south of West Olive, three through lanes eastbound on Santa Fe Drive.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.10	<p>West Olive/G - apply improvements recommended in the 1992 Smith's Food and Drug Store traffic impact study. These improvements are dual left turn lanes on all approaches and exclusive right turn lanes on the northbound and southbound G Street, and eastbound Olive Avenue approaches. These improvements, however, do not improve the service level to LOS D or better.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.11	<p>West Olive/R and West Olive/M - no mitigations are recommended for these intersections because of right-of-way constraints. Dual left turns on all approaches of both intersections would result in a LOS F at West Olive/R and a LOS D/E at West Olive/M. Additional through lanes on R and M Streets are needed to fully mitigate these intersections. Rather than incur high right-of-way costs to improve these intersections, it is recommended that funds be used for additional capacity to divert traffic away from West Olive Avenue. If redevelopment projects occur adjacent to these intersections, the City should evaluate potential improvements as part of the project.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.12	<p>Extend R Street from north of Cardella Road to Bellevue Road. Maintain this section of R Street as a 2 lane divided arterial with ultimate curb-to curb width of 84 feet.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.13	<p>Widen Bellevue Road to its ultimate curb to curb width (84 feet) from G Street to R Street.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.14	<p>Widen Yosemite Avenue to a 4 lane divided arterial from R Street to SR 59.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.15	<p>Widen Cardella Road to a 4 lane divided arterial from R Street to SR 59.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.16	<p>Widen G Street to a 4 lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road.</p>	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon <sup>1</sup>	Imp <sup>2</sup>		Initials	Date
4.10.17	Widen SR 59 to a 4 lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road. Maintain expressway level access restrictions.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.18	Widen M Street to 4 lanes from present terminus to Cardella Road.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.19	Build new intersections of Bellevue/R and Bellevue/M with the lane configurations shown in the Figure. Install traffic signals at both intersections.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.20	Bellevue/G - improve with the addition of a left turn pocket and a shared through right lane on the northbound and eastbound approaches. Signalize the intersection.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.21	Cardella/R - improve with an additional through lane in each direction of Cardella Road concurrent with widening road east of R Street. Signalize the intersection.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.22	Cardella/G - improve concurrent with the G Street widening and development east of G Street. Add additional through lanes on G Street and in both directions of Cardella Road. Add an exclusive right turn lane on the eastbound Cardella approach. Signalize the intersection.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.23	Cardella/SR 59 - improve concurrent with the Cardella Road widening and development west of SR 59. Add additional through lanes on the SR 59 approaches and construct a free right turn lane northbound with a lane addition on eastbound Cardella. Signalize the intersection.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.24	Yosemite/R - improve concurrent with the widening of the west approach of Yosemite. Add through lanes to the approaches of Yosemite and R Street.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.25	Yosemite/M - convert the existing westbound and eastbound shared through-left turn lanes to exclusive through lanes. Add an exclusive right turn lane eastbound, and an exclusive through lane westbound. Provide dual left turn lanes northbound. Modify signal phasing to provide protected left turns on all approaches.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.26	Yosemite/G - improve concurrent with the G Street widening (G Street lane configurations remain the same). Stripe an additional through lane in each direction of Yosemite Avenue.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.27	West Olive/SR 59 - no improvements beyond those described for the year 2000 are recommended.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.28	Widen SR 59 to a 6 lane divided expressway from Yosemite Avenue to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Imp#		Initials	Date
4.10.29	Widen G Street to a six lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. The entire segment of G Street is not required to be six lanes. Six lanes are required, however, 1/4 mile before and after each intersection along this roadway segment, allowing for lane additions and lane drops.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.30	Extend R Street from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road. Widen R Street to a 4 lane divided arterial from 1/2 mile north of Yosemite Avenue to 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road. Construct R Street as a 2 lane divided arterial from 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road with ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.31	Extend Old Lake Road from G Street to SR 59 as a 2-lane undivided road, (possibly) incorporating existing Nevada Street.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.32	Extend R Street from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road as a 4 lane divided arterial, with ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.33	Widen G Street to a 4 lane divided arterial from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.34	Widen Yosemite Avenue to a 6 lane divided expressway from San Jose Avenue to SR 59. Extend Yosemite Avenue as a 6 lane expressway ("Yosemite Bypass") from SR 59, intersecting Santa Fe Drive, and continuing south potentially along the Cooper Avenue alignment to connect with SR 99. Construct a new	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.35	Cardella/SR 59 - add a through lane in each direction of SR 59 concurrent to widening the state route to 6 lanes. Add dual left turns on the westbound Cardella approach. Maintain the free right turn northbound with a lane addition eastbound on Cardella Road.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.36	Yosemite/R - improve concurrent with Yosemite Avenue widening. Provide two through lanes on the westbound approach of Yosemite Avenue. Construct a free right turn lane southbound on R Street with a lane addition westbound on Yosemite Avenue. The third through lane eastbound on Yosemite Avenue will drop at or before San Jose Avenue.	ES, PD	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.37	Yosemite/M - improve with the addition of a second left turn lane on the westbound approach of Yosemite Avenue.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		
4.10.38	Yosemite/G - improve concurrent with the G Street widening. Flare northbound approach to provide three through lanes. Third southbound through lane on G Street is dropped as an exclusive left or right turn lane.	PD, ES	DEV	GP/BP		



Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Imp <sup>b</sup>		Initials	Date
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>						
4.11.1	<p>To ensure that construction mitigation is utilized, final improvement plan approval shall not be given to any development until the developer/contractor submits a satisfactory construction mitigation plan to the City of Merced. This plan shall specify the methods of control that will be utilized and identify a reasonable individual who can authorize the implementation of additional measures, if needed.</p> <p>The Construction Mitigation plan may include, but not be limited to the following measures, as deemed appropriate by the City (or as required by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District) at the time of improvement plan approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspend earth moving or other dust-producing activities during period of winds greater than 20 mph.</li> <li>• Provide equipment for watering of all construction areas at least twice daily.</li> <li>• Stockpiles of soil or other fine material being left for periods in excess of one day during site construction shall be watered, covered, or track walked after stockpiling is complete.</li> <li>• Paved areas at controlled access points shall be swept or washed once a day, or more frequently if necessary within 100 yards of the point of entry.</li> <li>• All unpaved construction areas shall be spayed with water at least twice per day within areas being graded, excavated, or used as construction haul roads.</li> <li>• Haul trucks used for moving materials on/off-site shall not be overfilled, or shall be covered if overfilled.</li> <li>• Exposed dirt surfaces shall be paved, landscaped, track walked, or hydroseeded as quickly as possible following completion of work.</li> </ul>	PD, B	DEV	GP, BP		
4.11.2	<p>As a condition of project approval, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City to implement a Transportation Demand Program. Such improvements may include such items as public transportation dedications, bikeway/paths, transit improvements/amenities, and pedestrian access facilities.</p>	PD	DEV	BP		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl <sup>b</sup>		Initials	Date
4.11.3	Employers within the Master Plan area shall coordinate with the City to implement a strong Transportation Demand Management program for all employment generating use.	PD	POA	CUP		
4.11.4	Project design shall be reviewed by the City Planning Department prior to tentative map approvals to encourage tele-commuting.	PD	DEV	TM		
4.11.5	Project design shall be reviewed by the City Planning Department prior to approval of the Tentative Map to encourage the provision of park-and-ride amenities within the project.	PD	DEV	TM		
4.11.6	Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, individual homes will require the installation of low NOx space and water heaters and include in residential units electrical outlets to allow the use of electrical mowers and blowers.	B	DEV	BP		
4.11.7	In conjunction with the processing of building permits, the applicant will provide a maximum of one EPA-certified pellet stove, wood stove, or fireplace inserts per residence.	PD, B	DEV	BP		
4.11.8	In conjunction with the processing of tentative maps, building orientation should be designed to reduce heating and cooling requirements.	PD, B	DEV	TM		
4.11.9	In conjunction with applications for discretionary approvals the project applicant may be required to incorporate current practices to promote the use of alternative fuels within the proposed development. Implementation of this measure may include the use of alternative fuel facilities (compressed natural gas filling stations and charging stations) for automobiles. Electrical service standards may also be incorporated for commercial, residential, and industrial sites that would provide adequate capacity to allow installation of recharging facilities as needed in the future.	PD	DEV	FM		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl†		Initials	Date
<b>NOISE</b>						
4.12.1	For the year 2010 with the project scenario noise environment, sound walls, earth berm, or other acoustical shielding would need to be constructed to meet the City's recommended outdoor noise goal of DNL 65 dB. A detailed noise study should be performed along impacted roadway segments to corroborate the actual noise environment and the required acoustical shielding.	PD	DEV	PC		
4.12.2	Most future residence within Bellevue Ranch that are located within 125 feet of Bellevue Road, Cardella Road, and M Street (south of Cardella) roadway centerlines would require sound-rated windows. New residences within 175 feet of R and G streets will require sound rated windows and new residences located within 50 feet of R and G streets will also require sound-rated exterior wall assemblies.	PD, B	DEV	BP		
4.12.3	Trucks used for the development of Bellevue Ranch will be required to use the City's designated truck routes.	B	DEV	C		
4.12.4	All construction activity shall be conducted in accordance with City of Merced Standards for times of operations.	B	DEV	C		
<b>POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT</b>						
4.13.1	The project applicant shall insure that the project contributes proportionally to the City's affordable housing goals and demonstrate compliance with this requirement prior to approval of tentative maps. Compliance with this mitigation measure can be satisfied by setting aside the appropriate share of project housing for very low, low and moderate income households, rehabilitation of such households, or a combination thereof.	PD	DEV	TM		
<b>HUMAN HEALTH</b>						
4.14.1	Exploration trenches or other adequate excavation methods shall be conducted prior to the issuance of any project building permits to identify the location of the banded-filled burial trenches. Following delineation of the burial trenches, they shall be excavated, back-filled, and compacted to appropriate construction standards.	PD, B	DEV	GP, BP		
4.14.2	Abandoned automobiles, ranch equipment, tires, and other miscellaneous farm refuse shall be removed to an appropriate disposal facility prior to issuance of project grading permits for the appropriate phase.	PD, B	DEV	GP		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Imp†		Initials	Date
4.14.3	A Phase II site reconnaissance and sampling investigation of those portions of the project site where areas of potential environmental contamination have been identified shall be conducted at applicant expense, by professionals acceptable to the City and submitted for City review prior to consideration of any conditional use permits, if required, or tentative subdivision maps within the affected areas. Should the report(s) identify the need for substantial changes in the project, if it reveals significant new information about potential project impacts, if any required remediation will result in additional project impacts, or if impacts are identified which will remain significant after mitigation, the EIR for the proposed project shall be recirculated or a supplemental or subsequent EIR shall be prepared.	PD	DEV	GP, BP		
4.14.4	Soil samples shall be collected during the demolition of the vehicle maintenance building from beneath the floor slab and the concrete-lined work pit to assess if subsurface soils have been impacted. Should the results required the need for substantial changes in the project, if it reveals significant new information about potential project impacts, if remediation will result in additional project impacts, of if impacts which will remain significant after mitigation are identified, the EIR for the proposed project shall be recirculated or a subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be prepared. The project sponsor shall comply with, or bond for, all mitigations specified in the resulting report prior to issuance of any project construction related permits within the affected areas.	PD, B	DEV	BP		
4.14.5	Appropriate precautions and personal protection equipment shall be utilized during demolition of structures if building materials contain asbestos of lead based paint, keeping with OSHA and other applicable regulations.	PD, B	DEV	BP		
4.14.6	Prior to approval of final maps, the project applicant shall submit all plans for review to PG&E, Yosemite Division Capital Investment Department, to ensure that site development does not conflict with existing PG&E facilities and accommodates new utility requirements. The project applicant shall seek, to the City's satisfaction, a Consent Agreement from PG&E prior to the issuance of any permits for development within PG&E transmission easements.	PD	DEV	FM		

Mitigation Measure	Summary of Measure	Responsibility		Timing	Verification	
		Mon*	Impl*		Initials	Date
4.14.7	Land uses which will limit the exposure if humans to electric and magnetic fields, such as parks, open space, trails, and other non-residential uses, will be encouraged in and around transmission line easements. Ultimate land use determination will be dependent upon City design review (outside of easements) and PG&E consultation (within easements) during tentative map review and approval. Tentative maps will also comply with California Department of Education regulations for the setback of school property lines from power line easements.	PD	DEV	BP		



---

## APPENDIX 1

---





REFERENCES

Individuals and Organizations Consulted

General Information

City of Merced Planning Department

Public Facilities and Services

Larry Ebo, Merced Engineering Department

John Frank, Merced Engineering Department

Suzanne Burrows, Special Assistant to Superintendent, Merced Elementary School District

Galen Chastain, Assistant Superintendent, Merced Union High School District

Michael Belloumini, Director of Facilities Planning, Merced Union High School District

J.A. Caldwell, Public Works Coordinator, Pacific Bell

Charles Crandall, Pacific Gas and Electric

Commander David Knutsen, Merced Police Department

Undersheriff Jerry Brockman, Merced County Sheriff's Department

Chief Leonard Franco, Merced Fire Department

Human Health

Dr. Obette Odoemelman, California Energy Commission

Jim Farley, University of California, Davis CO-OP extension

Mike Van Remoortere, PG&E

Ceciley Wilder, California Department of Health Services

California State Department of Education

---

## REFERENCES: INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PUBLICATIONS CONSULTED

---

### Publications

- City of Merced, City of Merced General Plan (Revised 1987)
- City of Merced, Merced 2030: How Should We Grow?, 1990
- City of Merced, Merced General Plan Public Safety Element, 1992
- City of Merced, Revised Draft City of Merced Housing Element, 1992-1993
- City of Merced, Parks and Open Space Master Plan, 1984
- Calthorpe Associates, Merced Village Concept Planning Preferred Alternative Report, 1991
- Calthorpe Associates, Opportunities and Constraints Analysis and Village Programming Recommendations, 1991
- Calthorpe Associates, Merced Villages Design Guidelines, 1991
- Merced County, Merced County Year 2000 General Plan, 1990
- Army Corps of Engineers, Design Memorandum No. 11: Merced County Streams Levee and Channel Improvements, 1983
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Merced Area Soil Survey, 1991
- The Spink Corporation, Preliminary Hydrology Study for the Fahrens Creek Watershed, 1992
- The Spink Corporation, Hydrologic/Hydraulic Study for Bellevue Ranch, 1993
- The Spink Corporation, Bellevue Ranch Master Development Plan, 1993
- U.S. Department of Health Services, Electromagnetic Fields Possible Health Effects, 1992
- EIP Associates, Bellevue Ranch (South Parcel) Wetland Delineation, 1991
- Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG), Congestion Management Program, 1992
- MCAG, Merced Area Growth Assumptions, 1991
-

REFERENCES: INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PUBLICATIONS CONSULTED

---

California Employment Development Department, Merced County Annual Planning Information, 1991

U.S. Air Force, Castle Air Force Base AICUZ Amendment, 1980  
New Yorker Magazine, Hazards of Electromagnetic Fields, 1992

Time Magazine, Danger Overhead, by Christine Gorman, 1992

---



---

## APPENDIX 2

---



**4.1 LAND USE, PLANS, AND POLICIES**

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Adjacent Land Use:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future development for the areas north, east, and west are expected to be accomplished through the guidance of the Merced Villages Conceptual Planning, to form a pedestrian-oriented Villages program for development. In this regard, the proposed project will have the beneficial impact of enabling the City to realize the Villages Concept for anticipated development.</li> <li>With respect to adjacent lands to the south, the project will have a less-than-significant impact on existing lands given that these uses will be buffered by the alignment of Cottonwood Creek and the landscape program Master Plan.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> </ol> <p>MM 4.1.3 Prior to approval of a tentative map for areas adjacent to existing development in the City of Merced, the project applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval detailed landscape and building placement plans to ensure adequate buffering and transition between land uses.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beneficial.</li> <li>Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>
<p><u>General Plan Consistency:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project, which includes an amendment to the General Plan, will have a beneficial impact to the City by proactively planning for development within the Specific Urban Development Plan.</li> <li>By implementing and furthering the goals and policies of the General Plan, the proposed project will have a beneficial impact.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beneficial.</li> <li>Beneficial.</li> </ol>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Merced County Streams Group Project:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project will provide for a 290 foot right-of-way to accommodate both the designated and future alignment of the flood control improvements to Fahrens Creek. This provision will ensure that the COE facilities will be implemented to provide adequate flood protection. This is considered to be a <b>beneficial</b> impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. <b>Beneficial.</b></p>
<p><u>Merced County LAFCO:</u></p> <p>1. Most of the impacts associated with the LAFCO annexation and approval process are <b>beneficial or less-than-significant</b>. The only impact listed as <b>significant</b>, public services and infrastructure, is discussed in another section of this report.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation required.</p>	<p>1. <b>Beneficial or less-than-significant</b></p>
<p><u>Merced Villages Concept Plan/Design Guidelines Consistency:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project is conceptually consistent with the intentions of the Merced 2030 Plan and the Village Concepts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a <b>beneficial</b> impact.</p> <p>2. The distribution of land uses in the project, however, is in some cases inconsistent with the land use allocations provided in the 8,000 acre Merced Village Concept Plan. Deviation from these patterns constitute a <b>significant</b> impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>MM 4.1.2 The Bellevue Ranch will continue to be reviewed and monitored to ensure that the City-wide goal of density distribution and land use mix is achieved pursuant to the general goals of the Villages Concept Plan and the Merced General Plan.</p>	<p>1. <b>Beneficial.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Less-than-significant.</b></p>



#### 4.2 AGRICULTURAL LAND USE

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Local Impacts:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will involve conversion of existing agricultural uses at the project site to various urban uses. This conversion is a significant and unavoidable impact. However, these lands are designated by both the County and City as an area for future urban expansion (SUDP) and therefore, conversion of these lands are anticipated.</li> <li>The proposed project is in conformance with the City General Plan in terms of directing growth away from agriculturally significant lands concentrated primarily east and west of the City and promoting growth north and south of the City. Therefore, there are <b>no significant impacts</b> associated with conflicts with the local general plans, community plans or zoning.</li> <li>The encroachment of residential development to existing farming operation boundaries will result in significant impacts. However, since the majority of adjacent lands are within the SUDP and the Merced Villages Concept Plan area, their continued viability is temporary.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is available.</li> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> </ol> <p>MM 4.2.1 The project applicant shall provide interim buffers between future urbanized areas and existing agricultural uses.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant and unavoidable.</li> <li>No significance.</li> <li>Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>
<p><u>Regional Impacts:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will result in conversion of Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance available in Merced County. With respect to the regional availability of Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, this project will result in a less-than-significant impact to agriculture.</li> <li>Cumulatively, the loss of agricultural lands for other uses in the City and County is a regionally significant and unavoidable impact.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> <li>No mitigation is available.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less-than-significant.</li> <li>Significant and unavoidable.</li> </ol>

### 4.3 AESTHETICS

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>View Impairment:</u></p> <p>1. While the introduction of urban uses to the project site will encroach upon the views from adjoining properties across the site, none of these views are of significant or unique scenic value. Therefore, the project is expected to have a less-than significant impact on scenic views and vistas.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Creation of Objectional Views:</u></p> <p>1. Adherence to the Merced Villages Design Guidelines will ensure that no aesthetically offensive views will be created from adjoining roadways or properties. This impact will be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Alteration/Destruction of Visual Features:</u></p> <p>1. The project site is relatively flat, with existing vegetative cover consisting primarily of grasses and row crops. Several creeks and man-made irrigation ditches traverse the site, but they are not highly prominent visual features. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact to the alteration and destruction of these existing visual features.</p> <p>2. The only prominent visual features are three strands of mature eucalyptus trees near the center of the site. Stands of such trees, are identified by the City's Parks and Open Space Master Plan and General Plan as significant open space features. Therefore, removal of such trees to implement the project is considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>MM 4.3.4 The mature stands of existing eucalyptus trees found on site shall be preserved to the greatest extent possible into the land use of the Master Development Plan, unless the trees are confirmed by the City's arborist to present a significant safety hazard.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p> <p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Production of Light and Glare:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site. Given the currently undeveloped nature of the site, this represents a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.3.3 Prior to approval of conditional use permits, the project applicant shall provide detailed lighting, signage, and fencing/decorative soundwall plans consistent with the City's Planned Development Ordinance and the Merced Villages Design Guidelines. Covenants, Conditions, and restrictions shall also regulate exterior lighting.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Consistency With Adopted Plans:</u></p> <p>1. The Bellevue Ranch project is consistent with the Merced Villages Concept Plan, Design Guidelines, and both the City and County General Plans. The Master Plan has illustrated general consistency with these documents in terms of design and aesthetic appeal, and thus has a less-than-significant impact in terms of document consistency.</p>	<p>MM 4.3.1 Prior to approval of required Conditional Use permits, the project applicant will prepare conceptual landscape plans for the subject property. Detailed plans must be prepared for building permit review and shall generally adhere to the landscape concepts contained within the City's applicable plans.</p> <p>MM 4.3.2 In conjunction with the approval of required Conditional Use Permits and Tentative Maps, the project applicant shall provide preliminary building plans, elevations, and architectural treatment for City review.</p> <p>See above mitigation measure (MM 4.3.3).</p> <p>MM 4.3.5 Prior to approval of each Conditional Use Permit, the project applicant will demonstrate to the City Planning Department consistency of overall design features with the general principles of the Merced Village Design Guidelines.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

#### 4.4 PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Parks, Recreation, And Open Space:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. According to the Merced Villages Design Guidelines, General Plan, and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan, the Bellevue Ranch development does not include enough neighborhood and community parks. This characteristic of the project represents a significant impact.</li> <li>2. As the land use plan is currently drafted, there are no provisions for Village Parks, or similar amenities which are crucial to the implementation of the villages concept. This is a significant impact.</li> <li>3. The development of the proposed project will reduce the total amount of agricultural land in the area, which is considered an important open space resource by the City. Loss of agricultural land in terms of open space is considered a less-than-significant impact.</li> </ol>	<p>MM 4.4.1 Based on the maximum total dwelling unit and population figures estimated in the Master Development Plan, adjustment (as buildout of the Bellevue Ranch Project occurs) to the presently proposed park acreage total may be necessary, involving up to approximately 12 additional acres of park land for the project area located north of Bellevue Road, in order to reflect the actual dwelling unit and population figures determined by the City of Merced during Final Map approvals consistent with the Merced Municipal Code and the Parks and Open Space Master Plan.</p> <p>See MM 4.4.1</p> <p>3. No mitigation is required.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less-than-significant.</li> <li>2. Less-than-significant.</li> <li>3. Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>

#### 4.5 LANDFORM, TOPOGRAPHY, AND SOILS

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Alquist-Priolo Zone:</u></p> <p>1. The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study zone. Therefore, there is no significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. No significance.</p>
<p><u>Ground Rupture:</u></p> <p>1. No known faults traverse the site. Therefore, there is no significant impact..</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. No significance.</p>
<p><u>Ground-shaking:</u></p> <p>1. The project site may experience moderate severity of ground-shaking during a large seismic event. This is considered to be a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.5.4 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City that the project features have been designed to withstand any maximum ground acceleration standard required of such development at the time of specific approval.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Liquefaction:</u></p> <p>1. Due to the lack of shallow groundwater and the fine grained texture of the site soils, liquefaction is improbable. This is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Seismic Compaction:</u></p> <p>1. Although the site may be exposed to ground-shaking, the site soils are not loose nor granular. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Landslides or Unstable Slopes:</u></p> <p>1. The project site and adjacent land is relatively level with no unstable slopes. This is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Flooding Due to Dam Failure:</u></p> <p>1. The site may be inundated if the Lake Yosemite dam were to fail. The California Division of Safety of Dams inspects the dam regularly and has judged the dam to be safe. This is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Mineral Resources:</u></p> <p>1. No significant mineral resources are known to exist within the site boundaries. Therefore, development of the site will not result in a loss of known mineral resources. This is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Expansive Soils:</u></p> <p>1. A portion of the site is underlain by soils with a moderate to high expansion potential. Development could be impacted because of the possibility for structural distress induced by sub-grade swelling and shrinkage. Due to these concerns, this is considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.5.1 Prior to the approval of final subdivision maps, the City shall require a detailed geotechnical report to be prepared by a California registered geotechnical engineer for each project.</p> <p>MM 4.5.2 The City shall require the recommendations contained in the geotechnical report be incorporated into the design prior to approval of the tentative map.</p> <p>MM 4.5.3 During construction, the geotechnical engineer shall provide inspection to ensure that recommendations and plans are properly implemented.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

#### 4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Archaeological Resources:</u></p> <p>1. According to Basin Research Associates, the prepares of the Cultural Resource Study, prehistoric cultural resources are not expected in the project area. Therefore, there is <b>no significant impact</b>.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. No significance.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Architectural/Historic Resources:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project would result in the demolition of the Bellevue Ranch complex. It is the opinion of Basin Research Associates that the ranch is of historical and potential architectural interest and may also yield archaeological material associated with specific buildings or activities. The demolition of the complex is considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.6.1 State of California Historic Resource Inventory Form(s) and an Archeological Site Record Form (State of California DRP 422 A (Rev 4/86) Form) of the Bellevue Ranch complex shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of grading, demolition, or building permits for the areas within the project which will impact the Bellevue Ranch complex.</p> <p>MM 4.6.2 Archaeological monitoring of any demolition and subsurface construction in the vicinity of the Bellevue Ranch buildings shall be conducted by a qualified archaeological monitor and funded by the project applicant. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to modify the intensity of the monitoring.</p> <p>MM 4.6.3 If any significant cultural materials are exposed during demolition, excavation, grading or other construction activities in the vicinity of the Bellevue Ranch buildings or anywhere else on the project site, operations shall be ceased within ten feet of the find, the City shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist contacted for further recommendations.</p> <p>MM 4.6.4 A Historic American Building Survey report of all standing Bellevue Ranch structures shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits for the project.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p>2. The proposed project would result in the loss of an example of a ranch complex containing architectural dating from the 1870's to 1940. The project's contribution to the cumulative loss of examples of early twentieth century ranch complexes constitutes a significant cumulative impact.</p>	<p>2. See above mitigation measures (MM 4.6.1; MM 4.6.2; MM 4.6.3; MM 4.6.4).</p>	<p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>



IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Cultural Resources:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project would have an impact on the segment of the abandoned Yosemite Valley Railroad bed which is situated along the far northwestern edge of the project area. This is considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.6.5 An Archeological Site Record Form (State of California DPR 422 A (Rev. 4/86) Form) for the segment of the Yosemite Valley Railroad Grade within the Bellevue Ranch project shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian prior to the issuance of any grading, demolition, or building permits for the project phase(s) affected by the Grade.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-Significant.</p>

#### 4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Flooding:</u></p> <p>1. The implementation of the proposed storm water drainage plan will decrease the potential for substantial flooding to occur, but 100 year flood protection for the southwestern portion of the site will not be provided by reconfiguration of the channel unless the Main Canal check structure is built. Since the structure is not yet completed, the potential for people and property to be exposed to flooding within the southwestern portion of the project is considered to be a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.7.1 Prior to approval of the final tract map for development within the Bellevue Ranch project area, the City will review the development proposal to ensure adequate provisions for flood control facilities consistent with the Army Corp of Engineers (COE), Merced Streams Group Project, Design Memorandum No. 11, September 1983 (including any subsequent modifications). Facilities must also be consistent with the Bellevue Ranch master drainage plan and City of Merced engineering standards. COE endorsement shall be required.</p> <p>MM 4.7.2 Prior to approval of Tentative Subdivision Maps (including Fahrens Creek), the project applicant shall secure City of Merced and Army Corps of Engineers (COE) endorsement of the proposed creek channel design consistent with MM 4.7. Prior to Final Map recordation, the project applicant shall also secure COE endorsement of the proposed channel improvements.</p> <p>MM 4.7.3 Development will not be permitted within the southwestern portion of the project site (south of Lehigh Drive, extended) within the regulatory floodway of Fahrens Creek unless the Main Channel check structure is completed and building pad elevations are constructed above the 100-year flood elevation.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-Significant</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Water Quality:</u></p> <p>1. Increased siltation and sedimentation could result from erosion and storm runoff during the construction phases of the project. This is considered to be a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.7.4 A comprehensive plan to prevent erosion, siltation, and contamination of storm water during construction will be required for any development proposal within the Bellevue Ranch project area prior to approval.</p> <p>MM 4.7.5 Grading operations should be targeted for the dry months of the year as directed by the City.</p> <p>MM 4.7.6 If construction occurs during storm events, sediment traps, barriers, covers or other methods approved by the City shall be used to reduce erosion.</p> <p>MM 4.7.7 Cut and fill slopes shall not be steeper than recommended by the project geotechnical engineer and approved by the City.</p> <p>MM 4.7.8 Temporary mulching, seeding, or other suitable erosion stabilization measures approved by the City shall be used to protect exposed areas during construction activities.</p> <p>MM 4.7.9 Excavated materials shall not be deposited or stored where the material could be wasted away by storm-water runoff.</p> <p>MM 4.7.10 Final grades shall be revegetated as soon as practical after completion of grading.</p> <p>MM 4.7.11 Final grades shall be graded so that runoff of surface water is minimized.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p>2. Due to the urban land use proposed by the project, there will be a corresponding increase in roadway contaminants. This is considered a significant impact as degradation of the surface water quality of the watershed may occur.</p> <p><b>4.8 BIOTIC RESOURCES</b></p>		<p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<u>Vegetation:</u> 1. The site is predominately in agricultural production, irrigated pasture, or non-native grassland. Impacts to vegetation resources are less-than-significant.	1. No mitigation is required.	1. Less-than-significant.
<u>Wildlife:</u> 1. Implementation of the project would result in the displacement of the immediate resident wildlife species observed on site. Conversion of the site would result in a less-than-significant impact to wildlife, given the existing agricultural impacts and the abundance of similar habitats in the region.	1. No mitigation is required.	1. Less-than-significant.

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Wetlands and Waters of the United States:</u></p> <p>1. The current site plan for Bellevue Ranch indicates that both Fahrens and Cottonwood Creeks will be realigned. Any levee or channel improvements or other project impacts to these creeks constitutes a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.8.2 Prior to issuance of grading permits in affected wetland areas, the project applicant shall secure a permit to fill wetlands consistent with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the corresponding 1603 Streambed Alteration permit required by the State of California. The applicant shall consult with the City, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the COE during the preparation of the plan to develop a consolidated mitigation program, within the guidelines of the COE.</p> <p>Due to the COE levee and channel improvement plan, the project applicant has two options regarding modifications to Fahrens and Cottonwood Creeks, postpone modification until the COE begins the Merced-area project or proceed with modifications to creek channels subject to approval by the City of Merced and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant</p>
<p>2. The current project plan indicates that all isolated wetlands will be filled. Any fill of vernal pools and seasonal wetlands represents a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.8.1 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall produce a wetlands delineation consistent with the 1987 Corp of Engineers (COE) Wetlands Delineation Manual or succeeding standards and obtain verification of the wetlands delineation by the COE. The applicant shall consult with the City Planning Department and demonstrate compliance with the COE requirements.</p> <p>See above mitigation measure (4.8.2).</p>	<p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p>3. Loss of artificial wetlands and irrigation canals are considered less-than-significant impacts.</p>	<p>3. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>3. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Special-Status Plant Species:</u></p> <p>1. San Joaquin Orcutt Grass - The project will not result in a significant impact to San Joaquin Orcutt Grass, given that the vernal pools on-site do not appear to contain this species based upon field observations and follow-up confirmation field review in May 1993.</p> <p>Dwarf Downingia - The project may result in a significant impact to the Dwarf Downingia, although the vernal pools on-site do not appear to contain this species based upon field observations.</p> <p>2. It is unlikely that other special-status plants occur on site. Therefore, potential impacts to other special status plant species are judged to be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>MM 4.8.3 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project biologist shall conduct late spring surveys of vernal pools for Dwarf Downingia. If species is confirmed on the project site, mitigation measures consistent with the most current listing status of the species shall be prepared and submitted to the City for inclusion in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project.</p> <p>See above mitigation measure (MM 4.8.3).</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p> <p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Special-Status Animal Species:</u></p> <p>1. Two species of shrimp are known to occur on the Bellevue Ranch site. Since these two species have been proposed for listing, loss of their habitat is considered a significant impact.</p> <p>2. Due to agricultural impacts to the project site and the abundance of similar habitat locally, the project would have a less-than-significant impact to other animal species.</p>	<p>MM 4.8.4 Once a decision regarding listing is reached and prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall comply with the appropriate mitigation measure. If the fairy and tadpole shrimp are listed as threatened or endangered, the project sponsor shall initiate a Section 7 consultation with the USFWS as part of compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Comparatively, if the shrimps are not listed, a wetlands mitigation plan shall be submitted as part of compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>See above mitigation measure (MM 4.8.4)</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant</p> <p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>General Plan Goals and Policies:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project is inconsistent with City General Plan Goals and Policies to protect existing natural resources in and around the City. Variations from the General Plan goals and policies represent a significant impact.</p>	<p>1. See above mitigation measures (MM 4.8.1; MM 4.8.2; MM 4.8.3; MM 4.8.4)</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

**4.9 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Water Facilities:</u></p> <p>1. Based on the sufficient long-term water resources existing to serve the proposed project, no significant impacts related to the availability of water services are anticipated.</p> <p>2. With respect to the implementation and phasing of improvements, the project will require the extension of water facilities and services. Although the City anticipates extending facilities to the site, the provision of new water facilities constitutes a significant impact given that no master plan for water improvements has been approved for the area.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required</p> <p>MM 4.9.1 Prior to the approval of a tentative map, the project applicant shall submit to the City of Merced Engineering Department detailed water supply and delivery plans for review and approval.</p> <p>MM 4.9.2 The following water conservation measures shall be implemented as required by state law: all buildings shall include low-flow fixtures, insulation of hot water lines in water recirculation systems, and installation of water meters on all new services.</p> <p>MM 4.9.3 Prior to the approval of a conditional use permits, the project applicant will submit to the City Planning Department for review and approval detailed landscaping plans.</p> <p>MM 4.9.4 The project applicant, as approved by the Engineering Department and Fire Department, will demonstrate that the water system proposed for the project is designed to meet the projected water capacity and fire flow requirements as well as all City specifications, prior to the approval of the first final map.</p>	<p>1. No significance.</p> <p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Sewage Facilities:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project will have a significant impact on the City's wastewater delivery and treatment capacities.</p>	<p>MM 4.9.5 Prior to the approval of a final subdivision map, the project applicant will submit to the City Engineering Department detailed wastewater service plans for review and approval.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>



IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Electrical and Natural Gas:</u></p> <p>1. Existing electrical and natural gas facilities are inadequate to serve the land uses proposed within the Bellevue Ranch Master Plan. This constitutes a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.9.6 Prior to the approval of a final subdivision map, the project applicant will demonstrate to the City that they have coordinated with Pacific Gas and Electric regarding the location and phasing of natural gas and electrical facilities to serve the area.</p> <p>MM 4.9.7 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the City that their architect(s) have consulted with Pacific Gas and Electric regarding the incorporation of energy conservation techniques into building and landscape design.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Telecommunication Facilities:</u></p> <p>1. The extension of telecommunication services will be required to serve the project site. This is considered to be a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.9.8 Prior to the approval of a final subdivision map, the project applicant will demonstrate to the City that they have coordinated with Pacific Bell regarding the extension, location, and phasing of telecommunication facilities to serve the project.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Police Services:</u></p> <p>1. Based upon an increased project population of approximately 22,371, there will be an increased demand for up to 17 additional sworn officers. There will also be a need for additional equipment. This constitutes a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.9.9 The project applicant shall pay all Cost Revenue Impact System fees, or other applicable program fees as defined by the City, including any fees intended to cover all Police Department costs.</p> <p>MM 4.9.10 Developers associated with Bellevue Ranch shall meet with the Merced Police Department prior to issuance of building permits. Specific security mitigation, as agreed between the Department and the developer, shall be incorporated into the construction plans.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Fire Services:</u></p> <p>1. Based on the projected increase in emergency service calls, the increased distance between new development and existing fire stations, and projected increases in the number of fire inspections, there will be a significant impact to fire protection services.</p>	<p>MM 4.9.12 Payment of Cost Revenue Impact System fees or other applicable fees as determined by the City of Merced, which will, among other things, help finance necessary new substations, new fire apparatus, vehicle maintenance, station maintenance, and personnel costs to adequately serve the proposed project.</p> <p>MM 4.9.13 Construction of exterior and interior water lines outlined in Section 4.9-A (Water) along with fire hydrants (with the design and spacing of hydrants to be approved by the Merced Fire Department) with sufficient water pressure as required to meet State and local standards.</p> <p>MM 4.9.14 Prior to submittal of tentative subdivision maps within the project, each applicant shall meet with representatives from the Merced Fire Department to outline necessary fire prevention requirements.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p>2. A future fire station outside the project site is anticipated to serve portions of the Bellevue Ranch project. City staff as indicated that this station is speculative and not guaranteed. In this regard, the project does not provide for adequate fire facilities for future residents south of Bellevue Road. This is considered a significant impact.</p>		<p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>School Facilities:</u></p> <p>1. Based on the District standards, the proposed project will generate the need for between two and three schools. This represents a significant impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.9.15 The developer of each subdivision within the Bellevue Ranch project shall pay all City and school district fees in effect on the date of this approval, as permitted by State law, and any increases in those fees, and any new fees which are in effect at the time the building permits are issued.</p> <p>MM 4.9.16 The developer of the Bellevue Ranch project shall reserve one high school site of at least 40 acres (net of right of ways), as consistent with state standards, for acquisition by the Merced Union High School District. The developer shall also reserve between two and four 10 acre (net) minimum elementary school sites for acquisition by the Merced City Elementary School District. The actual number of elementary school sites will depend upon school enrollment and the District's ability to adjust attendance boundaries of existing schools. In each instance, sites to be reserved shall be mutually agreed to by the developer, the respective school district, and the City of Merced.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

#### 4.10 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2000 Roadway Impacts:</u></p> <p>In the year 2000, significant roadway impacts will occur on the following segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R Street (South of West Olive)</li> <li>• G Street (North and South of West Olive)</li> <li>• SR 59 (North of West Olive)</li> </ul>	<p><b>MM 4.10.1</b> Extend R Street to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. Construct a 2 lane divided arterial between present terminus and Cardella Road. Construct a 2 lane divided arterial north of Cardella Road. Build R Street with ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet to allow widening inside without reconstructing curb, gutter, sidewalks, etc.</p> <p><b>MM 4.10.2</b> Extend Cardella Road from G Street to present terminus east of Kansas Street. Construct a 4 lane divided arterial (ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet) between G and R Streets and a 2 lane divided arterial west of R Street. Build 2 lane section with an ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet.</p> <p><b>MM 4.10.3</b> Extend Yosemite Avenue to SR 59 (planned improvement). Construct a 4 lane divided arterial from present terminus to R Street and as a 2 lane divided street from R Street to SR 59. If possible, build 4 lane and 2 lane sections with an ultimate curb to curb width of 98 feet in anticipation of widening to 6 lanes. Maintain expressway level access restrictions on the extension.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>2000 Roadway Impacts (Continued):</u></p> <p><u>Year 2000 Intersection Impacts:</u></p> <p>1. In the Year 2000, the Bellevue Ranch will cause a significant impact to the Cardella Road/G Street intersection which can be fully mitigated.</p> <p>2. In the year 2000, the West Olive/SR 59 intersection will experience an unacceptable LOS.</p>	<p>MM 4.10.4 Extend M Street from present terminus to Cardella Road. Construct a 2 lane divided arterial (maintaining existing tree-lined median).</p> <p>MM 4.10.5 Widen SR 59 to a 4 lane divided expressway from West Olive Avenue to Yosemite Avenue. Maintain expressway level access restrictions.</p> <p>MM 4.10.6 Build new intersections of Cardella/R, Cardella/M, and western side of Cardella/G with the lane configurations shown in Figure 4.10-9.</p> <p>MM 4.10.7 Build the new intersections of Yosemite/R and Yosemite/SR 59, with the four-lane configurations for Yosemite/R shown in the figure (Figure 4.10-8). Install a traffic signal at Yosemite/R and a stop sign at the westbound approach to SR 59.</p> <p>MM 4.10.8 Yosemite/G- mitigate service level with a change in signal phasing to include protected left turns on the Yosemite Avenue approaches. Maintain existing lane configurations.</p> <p>MM 4.10.9 West Olive/SR 59- concurrent with widening SR 59 construct a free right turn lane southbound SR 59 to westbound Santa Fe Drive. Add a right turn lane to the northbound SR 59 approach at West Olive Avenue.</p> <p>West Olive/SR 59 cannot easily be mitigated to LOS D or better because of right-of-way constraints.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p> <p>2. Significant and unavoidable.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>2000 Scenario (Continued):</u></p> <p>3. The West Olive/R Street and West Olive/G Street intersections will experience an unacceptable LOS in the year 2000, which cannot be fully mitigated.</p>	<p>MM 4.10.10 West Olive/G- apply improvements recommended in the 1992 Smith's Food and Drug Store traffic impact study. These improvements are dual left turn lanes on all approaches and exclusive right turn lanes on the northbound and southbound G Street, and eastbound Olive Avenue approaches. These improvements, however, do not improve the service level to LOS D or better.</p> <p>MM 4.10.11 West Olive/R and West Olive/M- no mitigations are recommended for these intersections because of right-of-way constraints. Dual left turns on all approaches of both intersections would result in a LOS F at West Olive/R and a LOS D/E at West Olive/M. Additional through lanes on R and M Streets are needed to fully mitigate these intersections. Rather than incur high right-of-way costs to improve these intersections, it is recommended that funds be used for additional capacity to divert traffic away from West Olive Avenue. If redevelopment projects occur adjacent to these intersections, the City should evaluate potential improvements as part of the project.</p>	<p>1. Significant and unavoidable.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2005 Roadway Impacts:</u></p> <p>1. In the year 2005, Bellevue Ranch will create a significant impact to the following segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R Street</li> <li>• G Street</li> <li>• SR 59</li> <li>• SR 99</li> </ul>	<p>MM 4.10.12 Extend R Street from north of Cardella Road to Bellevue Road. Maintain this section of R Street as a 2 lane divided arterial with ultimate curb-to curb width of 84 feet.</p> <p>MM 4.10.13 Widen Bellevue Road to its ultimate curb to curb width (84 feet) from G Street to R Street.</p> <p>MM 4.10.14 Widen Yosemite Avenue to a 4 lane divided arterial from R Street to SR 59.</p> <p>MM 4.10.15 Widen Cardella Road to a 4 lane divided arterial from R Street to SR 59.</p> <p>MM 4.10.16 Widen G Street to a 4 lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road.</p> <p>MM 4.10.17 Widen SR 59 to a 4 lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road. Maintain expressway level access restrictions.</p> <p>MM 4.10.18 Widen M Street to 4 lanes from present terminus to Cardella Road.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2005 Intersection Impacts (continued):</u></p> <p>1. In the Year 2005, the proposed project will create a significant impact to five intersections, which can be fully mitigated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yosemite/M Street</li> <li>• Yosemite/G Street</li> <li>• Cardella/SR 59</li> <li>• Cardella/R Street</li> <li>• Cardella/G Street</li> </ul>	<p>MM 4.10.19 Build new intersections of Bellevue/R and Bellevue/M with the lane configurations shown in the Figure. Install traffic signals at both intersections.</p> <p>MM 4.10.20 Bellevue/G- improve with the addition of a left turn pocket and a shared through-right lane on the northbound and eastbound approaches. Signalize the intersection.</p> <p>MM 4.10.21 Cardella/R- improve with an additional through lane in each directions of Cardella Road concurrent with widening road east of R Street. Signalize the intersection.</p> <p>MM 4.10.22 Cardella/G- improve concurrent with the G Street widening and development east of G Street. Add additional through lanes on G Street and in both directions of Cardella Road. Add an exclusive right turn lane on the eastbound Cardella approach. Signalize the intersection.</p> <p>MM 4.10.23 Cardella/SR 59- improve concurrent with the Cardella Road widening and development west of SR 59. Add additional through lanes on the SR 59 approaches and construct a free right turn lane northbound with a lane addition on eastbound Cardella. Signalize the intersection.</p> <p>MM 4.10.24 Yosemite/R- improve concurrent with the widening of the west approach of Yosemite. Add through lanes to the approaches of Yosemite and R Street.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>



IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2005 Intersection Impacts (continued):</u></p> <p>2. The intersection of West Olive/M Street, West Olive/R Street and West Oliver/G Street and West Oliver/SR59 will experience unacceptable conditions from the Year 2005 on. As with the intersections identified in the Year 2000, this impact cannot be fully mitigated.</p>	<p>MM 4.10.25 Yosemite/M- convert the existing westbound and eastbound shared through-left turn lanes to exclusive through lanes. Add an exclusive right turn lane eastbound, and an exclusive through lane westbound. Provide dual left turn lanes northbound. Modify signal phasing to provide protected left turns on all approaches.</p> <p>MM 4.10.26 Yosemite/G- improve concurrent with the G Street widening (G Street lane configurations remain the same). Stripe an additional through lane in each direction of Yosemite Avenue.</p> <p>MM 4.10.27 West Olive/SR 59- no improvements beyond those described for the year 2000 are recommended.</p>	<p>2. Significant and unavoidable.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2010 Roadway Impacts:</u></p> <p>1. In the year 2010 Bellevue Ranch will create a significant impact to the following roadway segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R Street</li> <li>• G Street</li> <li>• SR 59</li> <li>• SR 99</li> <li>• M Street</li> <li>• West Olive Avenue</li> </ul>	<p>MM 4.10.28 Widen SR 59 to a 6 lane divided expressway from Yosemite Avenue to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road.</p> <p>MM 4.10.29 Widen G Street to 6 lane divided arterial from Yosemite Avenue to approximately 1/2 mile north of Cardella Road. The entire segment of G Street is not required to be six lanes. Six lanes are required, however, 1/4 mile before and after each intersection along this roadway segment, allowing for lane additions and lane drops.</p> <p>MM 4.10.30 Extend R Street from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road. Widen R Street to a 4 lane divided arterial from 1/2 mile north of Yosemite Avenue to 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road. Construct R Street as a 2 lane divided arterial from 1/2 mile north of Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road with ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet.</p> <p>MM 4.10.31 Extend Old Lake Road from G Street to SR 59 as a 2-lane undivided road, (possibly) incorporating existing Nevada Street.</p> <p>MM 4.10.32 Extend R Street from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road as a 4 lane divided arterial, with ultimate curb to curb width of 84 feet.</p> <p>MM 4.10.33 Widen G Street to a 4 lane divided arterial from Bellevue Road to Old Lake Road.</p> <p>MM 4.10.34 Widen Yosemite Avenue to a 6 lane divided expressway from San Jose Avenue to SR 59. Extend Yosemite Avenue as a 6 lane expressway ("Yosemite Bypass") from SR 59, intersecting Santa Fe</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2010 Intersection Impacts:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic from Bellevue Ranch in 2010 will significantly impact the intersections of Yosemite/M street, Cardella/R street, and Bellevue/R street because it will change the service level from an acceptable to unacceptable level in either the morning or afternoon peak hour.</li> <li>2. Traffic from Bellevue Ranch will significantly impact all of the other study intersection except Cardella/M street, Bellevue/M street, and Cardella/SR 59 because it will contribute more than five percent to intersections already operating at unacceptable levels of service.</li> <li>3. The intersections of West Olive/M Street, West Olive/R Street, West Olive/G Street and West Olive/SR59 will experience unacceptable conditions in 2010 which cannot be fully mitigated.</li> </ol>	<p><b>MM 4.10.35</b> Cardella/SR 59- add a through lane in each direction of SR 59 concurrent to widening the state route to 6 lanes. Add dual left turns on the westbound Cardella approach. Maintain the free right turn northbound with a lane addition eastbound on Cardella Road.</p> <p><b>MM 4.10.36</b> Yosemite/R- improve concurrent with Yosemite Avenue widening. Provide two through lanes on the westbound approach of Yosemite Avenue. Construct a free right turn lane southbound on R Street with a lane addition westbound on Yosemite Avenue. The third through lane eastbound on Yosemite Avenue will drop at or before San Jose Avenue.</p> <p><b>MM 4.10.37</b> Yosemite/M- improve with the addition of a second left turn lane on the westbound approach of Yosemite Avenue.</p> <p><b>MM 4.10.38</b> Yosemite/G- improve concurrent with the G Street widening. Flare northbound approach to provide three through lanes. Third southbound through lane on G Street is dropped as an exclusive left or right turn lane.</p>	<p><b>3. Significant and unavoidable.</b></p>

**4.11 AIR QUALITY**

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Construction-Related:</u></p> <p>1. Construction activities such as clearing, excavation, grading operations, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate particulate matter. The construction-related impacts of the proposed project are considered to be significant.</p>	<p>MM 4.1.1.1 To ensure that construction mitigation is utilized, final improvement plan approval shall not be given to any development until the developer/contractor submits a satisfactory construction mitigation plan to the City of Merced. This plan shall specify the methods of control that will be utilized, and identify a reasonable individual who can authorize the implementation of additional measure, if needed.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>
<p><u>Auto-Related:</u></p> <p>1. The project would generate new traffic and result in construction of new roadways. No violation of either the 1-hour or 8-hour standards are predicted. The project impacts on local air quality are considered to be less-than-significant.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Regional Air Quality:</u></p> <p>1. The growth accommodate by the proposed project and other development in the area would result in substantial new regional emissions. These new emissions could cause a deterioration in regional air quality and delay eventual attainment of the air quality standards for ozone and PM-10 in the San Joaquin Valley air basin. Project impacts on regional air quality are considered to be <b>significant and unavoidable.</b></p>	<p>MM 4.11.2 As a condition of project approval, the project applicant shall coordinate with the City to implement a Transportation Demand Program. Such improvements may include such items as public transportation dedications, bikeway/paths, transit improvements/amenities, and pedestrian access facilities.</p> <p>MM 4.11.3 Employers within the Master Plan area shall coordinate with the City to implement a strong Transportation Demand Management program for all employment generating use.</p> <p>MM 4.11.4 Project design shall be reviewed by the City Planning Department prior to tentative map approvals to encourage tele-commuting.</p> <p>MM 4.11.5 Project design shall be reviewed by the City Planning Department prior to approval of the Tentative Map to encourage the provision of park-and-ride amenities within the project.</p>	<p>1. Significant and Unavoidable.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Regional Air Quality (continued):</u></p>	<p>MM 4.11.6 Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, individual homes will require the installation of low NOx space and water heaters and include in residential units perimeter electrical outlets to allow the use of electrical mowers and blowers.</p> <p>MM 4.11.7 In conjunction with the processing of building permits, the applicant will provide a maximum of one EPA-certified pellet stove, wood stove or fireplace inserts per residence.</p> <p>MM 4.11.8 In conjunction with the processing of tentative maps, building orientation should be designed to reduce heating and cooling requirements.</p> <p>MM 4.11.9 In conjunction with applications for discretionary approvals the project applicant may be required to incorporate current practices to promote the use of alternative fuels within the proposed development. Implementation of this measure may include the use of alternative fuel facilities (compressed natural gas filling stations and charging stations) for automobiles. Electrical service standards may also be incorporated for commercial, residential, and industrial sites that would provide adequate capacity to allow installation of recharging facilities as needed in the future.</p>	

4.12 NOISE

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Year 2010 With Project Traffic Noise Levels Affecting Proposed Bellevue Ranch Land Use:</u></p> <p>1. For the segments of R, M, and G Street, Bellevue Road and Cardella Road located within the Bellevue Ranch project, the year 2010 DNLs at distance of fifty feet from the roadway centerlines would range from seventy to seventy-six dB. Therefore, all new residential dwellings, schools, and parks located along these roadway segments would be exposed to a "normally unacceptable" to "clearly unacceptable" noise environment according to the City's noise compatibility guidelines. The outdoor use areas of the new residences along these roadway segments would also be exposed to a DNL which is up to six dB higher than the maximum DNL recommended by the City's Noise Element. This is considered a <b>significant</b> impact.</p>	<p>MM 4.12.1 For the year 2010 with the project scenario noise environment, sound walls, earth berm, or other acoustical shielding would need to be constructed to meet the City's recommended outdoor noise goal of DNL 65 dB. A detailed noise study should be performed along impacted roadway segments to corroborate the actual noise environment and the required acoustical shielding.</p> <p>MM 4.12.2 Most future residence within Bellevue Ranch that are located within 125 feet of Bellevue Road, Cardella Road, and M street (south of Cardella) roadway centerlines would require sound-rated windows. New residences within 175 feet of R and G streets will require sound rated windows and new residences located within 50 feet of R and G streets will also require sound-rated exterior wall assemblies.</p>	<p>1. <b>Less-than-significant.</b></p>
<p><u>Year 2010 With Project Traffic Noise Levels Affecting Existing Off-Site Land Uses:</u></p> <p>1. The existing residences located along Bellevue Road, east of G street, would be exposed to a DNL of sixty-seven dB which is considered "conditionally acceptable" for residential land uses. The existing residences located along the other roadway segments, would be exposed to DNLs that are considered "normally unacceptable" to "clearly unacceptable." Additionally, the year 2010 increase in noise above the existing (year 1992) resultant DNLs exceed sixty-five dB and the increase in noise levels exceed three dB. These increases result in a <b>significant</b> impact.</p>	<p>1. See above mitigation measure (MM 4.12.1).</p> <p>MM 4.12.3 Trucks used for the development of Bellevue Ranch will be required to use the City's designated truck routes.</p> <p>MM 4.12.4 All construction activity shall be conducted in accordance with City of Merced Standards for times of operations.</p>	<p>1. <b>Less-than-significant.</b></p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Castle AFB Reuse Affecting Bellevue Ranch:</u></p> <p>1. The future noise exposure from any reasonable reuse of Castle AFB would dramatically reduce existing noise contour size. Future operation of Castle AFB, in terms of the established criteria, will result in noise impact to future residents which are less-than-significant.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. Less-than-significant.</p>



**4.13 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT**

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Merced 2030:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project is conceptually consistent with the intentions of the Merced 2030 plan and the villages concept. The proposed project would thus have a <b>beneficial</b> impact on the City's implementation of its desired land use pattern.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. <b>Beneficial.</b></p>
<p><u>Population:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project would result in the construction of between 4,181 and 6,894 new dwelling units. This would accommodate between 12,335 and 21,371 new residents. This represents accommodation of between 16.25% and 28.15% of the population increase anticipated to occur in the Planning Area between 1990 and 2010. This would be a <b>beneficial</b> impact of the proposed project.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. <b>Beneficial.</b></p>
<p><u>Employment:</u></p> <p>1. The proposed project would result in the development of approximately seventeen percent of the area north of the city scheduled for development, while providing somewhere between seven to twelve percent of anticipated job growth. While the anticipated number of jobs appear deficient, it should be acknowledged that this portion of the 8,000 acre Villages Concept will focus upon residential uses. The future base land use plan provides for a concentration of commercial, office, and light industrial uses along Highway 59, which will offset concentrations of residential uses in other portions of the Plan area. Impacts associated with employment generation rates for the Project are therefore <b>less-than-significant.</b></p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. <b>Less-than-significant.</b></p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Housing:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project would accommodate between sixteen to twenty-eight percent of the population increase anticipated to occur in the Planning area between 1990 and 2010. This would be a beneficial impact of the proposed project.</li> <li>The proposed project description does not include any affordable housing targets. This is considered a significant impact.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> </ol> <p>MM 4.13.1 The project applicant shall insure that the project contributes proportionally to the City's affordable housing goals and demonstrate compliance with this requirement prior to approval of tentative maps.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beneficial.</li> <li>Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>
<p><u>Jobs/Housing Balance:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The job/housing ratio for the proposed project would be approximately 0.40, indicating an extremely housing rich area. While the ratio for this project appears directed toward housing, the Village Concept provides for light industrial and office uses within other portions of the Plan area. In addition, the employment opportunities from the potential reuse of Castle Air Base and the potential University of California campus at Lake Yosemite would result in the project's impact to be less-than-significant.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>
<p><u>General Plan Goals And Policies:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project is conceptually consistent with the Village Concept and thus with the General Plan. The impact is therefore less-than-significant.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation is required.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>

#### 4.14 HUMAN HEALTH

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Adjacent Use:</u></p> <p>1. With the exception of the County Landfill, no recorded source of soil of groundwater contamination has been reported which would impact residents of the proposed project. Site identified through the government records search are located down gradient from the project site. Therefore no significant impact is anticipated to result from the introduction of residential and commercial uses on the proposed site.</p> <p>2. Landfill activities will not pose a threat to the proposed project, therefore there will be no significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>2. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>1. No significance.</p> <p>2. No significance.</p>
<p><u>On-Site Concerns:</u></p> <p>1. There is no significant impact associated with the introduction of residential and commercial uses in proximity to buried cattle.</p> <p>2. Even though these burial trenches are not a human health concern, these bone-filled burial trenches may not be geotechnically suitable for construction. Thus, construction of structures on burial trenches may result in a significant impact.</p>	<p>1. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>MM 4.14.1 Exploration trenches or other adequate excavation methods shall be conducted prior to the issuance of any project building permits to identify the location of the bone-filled burial trenches. Following delineation of the burial trenches, they shall be excavated, back-filled, and compacted to appropriate construction standards.</p>	<p>1. No significance.</p> <p>2. Less-than-significant.</p>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Hazardous Materials:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on the identified chemicals that have been used at the site, there is a significant impact associated with the possible exposure of project inhabitants to contaminants.</li> <li>2. Based on the significant amount of open dumping and soil staining observed throughout the ranch headquarters complex, there is a significant impact of exposure of project occupants to contaminants.</li> <li>3. Due to the improper handling practices of waste oil products observed in the vicinity of the ranch complex, there is a significant impact of exposure of project occupants to contaminants.</li> <li>4. Significant impacts from the presence of asbestos containing building materials and lead based paint in site buildings would include the short term exposure to workers during the demolition of structures and transport of demolition debris.</li> </ol>	<p>MM 4.14.3 A Phase II site reconnaissance and sampling investigation of those portions of the project site where areas of potential environmental contamination have been identified shall be conducted at applicant expense, by professionals acceptable to the City and submitted for City review prior to consideration of any conditional use permits, if required, or tentative subdivision maps within the affected areas. Should the report(s) identify the need for substantial changes in the project, the EIR for the proposed project shall be recirculated or a supplemental or subsequent EIR shall be prepared.</p> <p>MM 4.14.2 Abandoned automobiles, ranch equipment, tires, and other miscellaneous farm refuse shall be removed to an appropriate disposal facility prior to issuance of project grading permits for the appropriate phase.</p> <p>MM 4.14.4 Soil samples shall be collected during the demolition of the vehicle maintenance building from beneath the floor slab and the concrete-lined work pit to assess if subsurface soils have been impacted. Should the results required the need for substantial changes in the project, the EIR for the proposed project shall be recirculated or a subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be prepared. The project sponsor shall comply with, or bond for, all mitigations specified in the resulting report within the affected area.</p> <p>MM 4.14.5 Appropriate precautions and personal protection equipment shall be utilized during demolition of structures if building materials contain asbestos of lead based paint, keeping with OSHA and other applicable regulations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less-than-significant.</li> <li>2. Less-than-significant.</li> <li>3. Less-than-significant.</li> <li>4. Less-than-significant.</li> </ol>

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p><u>Hazardous Materials (Continued):</u></p> <p>5. Long-term health effects from on-site disposal of septic system sludge would most likely be negligible due to the long period of time since this disposal method has been conducted at the site. Therefore, no significant impact is anticipated.</p> <p>6. Based on the results of the California State Wide Radon Gas Survey, no significant impact is anticipated.</p> <p>7. Site reconnaissance revealed no soil staining associated with the observed electrical transformers. But, there is a potential significant impact of exposure to contaminants associated with the proposed project if PCPs are present in the transformers.</p> <p>8. A seventy-five foot wide easement for a 230 kV transmission line crosses diagonally through the Bellevue Ranch Site from the northwest corner, south to the southeast corner at Black Rascal Creek. The proposed project will result in placement of homes, parks, and open space corridors in immediate proximity to overhead transmission lines which emit electric and magnetic fields. For the purpose of this analysis, this will result in a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>9. A seventy-five foot wide easement for a 115 kV transmission line crosses through the study area to the southwest along Cottonwood Creek. The proposed project will result in placement of homes, parks, and open space corridors in immediate proximity to overhead transmission lines which emit electric and magnetic fields, this will result in a potential significant impact.</p>	<p>5. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>6. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>7. See above mitigation measure (MM 4.14.3).</p> <p>MM 4.14.6 Prior to approval of final maps, the project applicant shall submit all plans for review to PG&amp;E, Yosemite Division Capital Investment Department, to ensure that site development does not conflict with existing PG&amp;E facilities and accommodates new utility requirements. The project applicant shall seek, to the City's satisfaction, a Consent Agreement from PG&amp;E prior to the issuance of any permits for development within PG&amp;E transmission easements.</p> <p>MM 4.14.7 Land uses which will limit the exposure of humans to electric and magnetic fields, such as parks, open spaces, trails, and other non-residential uses, will be encouraged in and around transmission line easements. Ultimate land use determination will be dependent upon City design review (outside of easements) and PG&amp;E consultation (within easements) during tentative map review and approval. Tentative maps will also comply with CA Dept. of Education regulations for the setback of school property lines from power line easements.</p>	<p>5. No significance.</p> <p>6. No significance.</p> <p>7. Less-than-significance.</p> <p>8. Potentially significant.</p> <p>9. Potentially significant.</p>