

**CITY OF MERCED  
Planning Commission**

**Resolution #4118**

**WHEREAS**, the Merced City Planning Commission at its regular meeting of July 5, 2023, held a public hearing and considered **General Plan Amendment #23-02 and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #12**, initiated by Merced Security Storage, LLC, on behalf of REM Land Group, LLC, property owner. The General Plan Amendment would change the General Plan land use designation from Commercial Office (CO) to Business Park (BP). The Site Utilization Plan Revision would change the land use designation within P-D #12 from Commercial Office to Self-Storage. The applicant is requesting these changes to allow the development of a self-storage facility (approximately 440 storage units) with long-term boat and recreational vehicle parking spaces (approximately 171 parking spaces). The approximate 6-acre subject site is generally located on the north side of Olive Avenue, approximately 725 feet east of Highway 59. The subject site is more particularly described as “Parcel E” as shown on the map entitled “Parcel Map No. 3 for C.H.M. Company” recorded in Book 19, Page 46, in Merced County Records; also known as a portion of Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 058-030-005; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Merced City Planning Commission concurs with Findings/Considerations A through I of Staff Report #23-534 (Exhibit B of Planning Commission Resolution #4118); and,

**NOW THEREFORE**, after reviewing the City’s Initial Study and Draft Environmental Determination, and fully discussing all the issues, the Merced City Planning Commission does resolve to hereby recommend to City Council adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program regarding Environmental Review #23-08, and recommend approval of General Plan Amendment #23-02, and Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #12 subject to the Conditions set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Upon motion by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioner(s)

NOES: Commissioner(s)

ABSENT: Commissioner(s)

ABSTAIN: Commissioner(s)

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION #4118

Page 2

July 5, 2023

Adopted this 5<sup>th</sup> day of July 2023

---

Chairperson, Planning Commission of  
the City of Merced, California

ATTEST:

---

Secretary

Exhibits:

Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval

Exhibit B – Findings/Considerations

Exhibit C – Mitigation Monitoring Program

**Conditions of Approval**  
**Planning Commission Resolution # 4118**  
**General Plan Amendment #23-02, Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned**  
**Development (P-D) #12**

1. The proposed General Plan Amendment, and Site Utilization Plan Revision shall be as shown on the Proposed Land Use Map at Attachment D of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534.
2. Any project constructed on this site shall comply with all Design/Development Standards (Attachment I of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534) adopted by Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #12, unless otherwise modified.
3. In compliance with Merced Municipal Code Section 20.20.020 Q, all projects shall require a Site Plan Review Permit or Minor Use Permit at the discretion of the Director of Development Services to address conformance to the Design Standards approved with this Site Utilization Plan Revision. This does not replace the requirement for any other approval for a specific use required by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. Approval of the General Plan Amendment, and Site Utilization Plan Revision is subject to the applicant(s) entering into a written Legislative Action Agreement that they agree to all the conditions and shall pay all City and school district fees, taxes, and/or assessments, in effect on the date of any subsequent subdivision and/or permit approval, any increase in those fees, taxes, or assessments, and any new fees, taxes, or assessments, which are in effect at the time the building permits are issued, which may include public facilities impact fees, a regional traffic impact fee, Mello-Roos taxes—whether for infrastructure, services, or any other activity or project authorized by the Mello-Roos law, etc. Payment shall be made for each phase at the time of building permit issuance for such phase unless an Ordinance or other requirement of the City requires payment of such fees, taxes, and/or assessments at an earlier or subsequent time. Said agreement to be approved by the City Council prior to the adoption of the ordinance, resolution, or minute action.
5. The proposed project shall comply with all standard Municipal Code and Subdivision Map Act requirements as required by the City Engineering Department.

6. The Project shall comply with all applicable conditions set forth in the resolutions for Annexation No. 86 (Fahrens Creek Annexation) previously approved for this site.
7. All other applicable codes, ordinances, policies, etc., adopted by the City of Merced shall apply.
8. The developer/owner is required to finance the annual operating costs for police and fire services as well as storm drainage, public landscaping, street trees, streetlights, parks and open space, which may include a financing mechanism such as a Community Facilities District (CFD) or, assessment district. Procedures for financing these services and on-going maintenance shall be initiated before final map approval or issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building, whichever comes first. Developer/Owner shall submit a request agreeing to such a procedure, waiving right to protest and post deposit as determined by the City Engineer to be sufficient to cover procedure costs and maintenance costs expected prior to first assessments being received.
9. The developer/applicant shall indemnify, protect, defend (with counsel selected by the City), and hold harmless the City, and any agency or instrumentality thereof, and any officers, officials, employees, or agents thereof, from any and all claims, actions, suits, proceedings, or judgments against the City, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, and any officers, officials, employees, or agents thereof to attack, set aside, void, or annul, an approval of the City, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body, including actions approved by the voters of the City, concerning the project and the approvals granted herein. Furthermore, developer/applicant shall indemnify, protect, defend, and hold harmless the City, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, against any and all claims, actions, suits, proceedings, or judgments against any governmental entity in which developer/applicant's project is subject to that other governmental entity's approval and a condition of such approval is that the City indemnify and defend (with counsel selected by the City) such governmental entity. City shall promptly notify the developer/applicant of any claim, action, suits, or proceeding. Developer/applicant shall be responsible to immediately prefund the litigation cost of the City including, but not limited to, City's attorney's fees and costs. If any claim, action, suits, or proceeding is filed challenging this approval, the developer/applicant shall be required to execute a separate and formal defense, indemnification, and deposit agreement that meets the approval of the City Attorney and to provide

all required deposits to fully fund the City's defense immediately but in no event later than five (5) days from that date of a demand to do so from City. In addition, the developer/applicant shall be required to satisfy any monetary obligations imposed on City by any order or judgment.

10. The developer/applicant shall construct and operate the project in strict compliance with the approvals granted herein, City standards, laws, and ordinances, and in compliance with all State and Federal laws, regulations, and standards. In the event of a conflict between City laws and standards and a State or Federal law, regulation, or standard, the stricter or higher standard shall control.
11. A licensed hydrologist shall review the site and proposal to determine and development restrictions for the portion of the subject site located within the regulatory floodway.
12. The subject site shall comply with Merced Municipal Code Chapter 20.34 – Creek Buffers.

**Findings and Considerations**  
**Planning Commission Resolution #4118**  
**General Plan Amendment #23-02, Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to**  
**Planned Development (P-D) #12**

**FINDINGS/CONSIDERATIONS:**

**General Plan Compliance and Policies Related to This Application**

- A) If the General Plan Amendment is approved, the proposed project would comply with the General Plan land use designation of Business Park (BP) which allows parking facilities as a principally permitted use and self-storage facilities with a site plan review permit. The project would also comply with the Zoning classification of Planned Development (P-D) #12 if the Site Utilization Plan Revision is approved changing the Site Utilization Plan land use designation from Commercial Office to Self-Storage.

The proposed project, with conditions of approval, will help achieve the following General Plan land use policies:

Policy L-3.2: *Encourage Infill Development and a Compact Urban Form*

The proposed project would develop an approximate 6-acre site that has been vacant for decades. Developing this site addresses some maintenance issues associated with undeveloped parcels such as overgrown weeds (fire hazard), vandalism, and loitering which could impact neighboring parcels. In addition, infill development is an efficient use of development that utilizes existing infrastructure within City limits as opposed to annexing land that requires expanding City infrastructure and services.

**General Plan Amendment- Findings**

- B) Chapter 20.82 (General Plan Amendments) outlines procedures for considering General Plan Amendments, but does not require any specific findings to be made for approval. However, Planning practice would be to provide objective reasons for approval or denial. These findings can take whatever form deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission and City Council. Based on State law and case law, the following findings are recommended:

1. *The proposed amendment is deemed to be in the public interest.*

The proposed amendment is deemed to be in the public interest because it will provide employment, and storage options so that

residential properties are not overcrowded with personal items resulting in blight from items stored outside.

2. *The proposed amendment is consistent and compatible with the rest of the General Plan and any implementation programs that may be affected.*

As shown under Finding A, the proposal meets some of the General Plan Goals and Policies regarding promoting infill developments. The proposed project would comply with the General Plan designation of Business Park (BP) if the General Plan Amendment is approved.

3. *The potential impacts of the proposed amendment have been assessed and have been determined not to be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare.*

The proposed project does not include any uses that would be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare of the City. Implementation of the conditions of approval and adherence to all applicable Building Codes, Fire Codes, and City Standards would prevent the project from having any detrimental effect on the health, safety, and welfare of the City as a whole. However, the residential uses to the east could be impacted by the development, therefore, conditions are included to minimize any possible impacts.

4. *The proposed amendment has been processed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Government Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).*

The proposed General Plan Amendment has been processed in accordance with all applicable California Government Code sections. In addition, Planning staff has conducted an environmental review (#23-08) of the project in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (see Attachment I of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534) has been recommended.

### **Zoning Code Compliance for the Site Utilization Plan Revision**

- C) Per Merced Municipal Code Section 20.20.20 (J) Planned Development (P-D) Zoning Districts, approval of an application for Planned Development

Establishment or Revision with accompanying Preliminary Site Utilization Plan only if the following findings can be made:

1. *The proposed development is consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the General Plan and any applicable specific plan and community plan.*

The proposed Site Utilization Plan (SUP) Revision to change the land use designation for the approximately 6-acre site from Commercial Office to Self-Storage would be consistent with the General Plan if General Plan Amendment #23-02 is approved. As described in Finding A above, the project would help achieve Land Use Policy L-3.2 by encourage in-fill development.

There are no other applicable specific or community plans for this site.

2. *The site for the proposed development is adequate in size and shape to accommodate proposed land uses.*

The project site is approximately 6 acres, and would be used for 440 storage units and 171 long-term parking spaces for boats and recreational vehicles. The storage facility is similar in size to other existing storage facilities in the community (Simply Space Self Storage, Central Self Storage, Cal Storage, etc.) so it is considered adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed land uses. Due to the floodway on the northern portion of the site (refer to Finding H for additional information on the floodway), buildings are restricted to a small portion of the site. Due to this restriction, reduced setbacks are being proposed in the Design Standards to allow a zero-lot line development (refer to Finding D for the Proposed Design Standards). With this reduction, the site is of adequate size for the development.

3. *The site for the proposed development has adequate access considering the limitations of existing and planned streets and highways.*

The proposal would have adequate access to existing and planned streets and highways. The proposed development would have access to Olive Avenue through an existing driveway that is shared with the property to the west. No additional driveways are proposed. The proposed project does not require the construction of additional streets. However, because the vehicles coming to the site could cause a stacking problem on Olive Avenue, a condition requiring sufficient stacking space for vehicles to prevent stacking onto Olive Avenue is recommended along with possibly



widening a the driveway along Olive Avenue (refer to Conditions #14 and #35 of Planning Commission Resolution #4119 for the Conditional Use Permit #1274 and Site Plan Review Permit #516 at Attachment B of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534).

4. *Adequate public services exist or will be provided to serve the proposed development.*

City utilities such was water and sewer main lines as well as storm drain lines are directly available to the south at Olive Avenue. These lines are adequate to serve the project.

5. *The proposed development will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding property, will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area, and will enhance the desirability of the area and have a beneficial effect.*

There may be some temporary impacts such as vibration, noise, and dust during construction, but as described under Finding F – Neighborhood Impact, the proposed development would not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding property, will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area, and will enhance the desirability of the area and have a beneficial effect.

6. *The proposed development carries out the intent of the Planned Development zoning district by providing a more efficient use of the land and an excellence of site design greater than that which could be achieved through the application of established zoning standards.*

The proposed development provides efficient use of land optimizing the property by proposing a zero-lot line development with no setbacks along certain portions of the eastern and western property lines. This is attainable through specific development standards proposed as part of Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 for Planned Development #12. These standards are provided at Attachment I of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534.

7. *Each individual unit of the proposed development, in each phase as well as the total development, can exist as an independent unit capable of creating a good environment in the locality and being in any stage as desirable and stable as the total development.*

The proposed development consists of a self-storage facility along the southern portion of the property and long-term parking for boat and recreational vehicles on the northern portion of the parcel. This self-storage

facility and long-term parking lot could remain independent capable of creating a good environment in the locality and being in any stage as desirable and stable as the total development.

8. *Any deviation from the standard ordinance requirements is warranted by the design and additional amenities incorporated in the development plan, which offer certain unusual redeeming features to compensate for any deviations that may be permitted.*

As shown on Attachment G of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534 the proposal includes decorative block building walls along the southern and eastern property lines that include a mixture of materials, and color finishes that go beyond a standard concrete masonry unit wall.

9. *The principles incorporated in the proposed development plan indicate certain unique or unusual features, which could not otherwise be achieved under the other zoning district.*

The proposed use would allow development of the entire parcel, and not just the southern portion. As described in Finding H, development of the site is severely limited by the floodway. By allowing a deviation in the setback requirements the proposed development is able to provide long-term vehicle parking in the floodway area and uses an attractive design and color palette for the buildings on the southern portion of the site. Without the deviation in the setback requirement, the development would not be able to provide sufficient storage spaces to make the development feasible. This would lead to the site remaining empty and susceptible to blight.

Because the site is already established as a Planned Development, changing the zoning to another zoning district would not be the best way to promote development. By amending the Site Utilization Plan within the existing Planned Development, to allow this project with variations from the standard zoning requirements, allows the project to move forward in a more streamlined approach and without creating a “spot zone” for another zoning district in the area. Planned Developments were specifically designed to allow such unique designs.

### **Planned Development Standards**

- D) As shown on Attachment I of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534, the applicant is requesting specific standards for this proposal that deviate from typical development standards for the Business Park designation. Those standards include a zero-lot line development (no setbacks), requiring a

minimum of 5 parking stalls for the proposed uses, and providing a gravel surface for boat and recreational vehicle parking.

### **Traffic/Circulation**

- E) The proposed development includes a self-storage facility with approximately 440 storage units, and a long-term boat and recreational vehicle parking facility with approximately 171 spaces on an approximately 6-acre vacant parcel located in northwest Merced at 1965 W. Olive Avenue. The project site fronts an arterial road (Olive Avenue). Vehicle access is available from an existing driveway along Olive Avenue that is shared with the parcel to the west. The nearest north-south roads are Highway 59 (expressway) and Loughborough Drive (collector road) both designed to accommodate large volumes of traffic going through a large portion of the community. Highway 59 provides access to Highway 99 that connects Merced with other regional communities throughout the State.

### **Vehicle Miles Traveled**

The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) advisory suggests that the Vehicle-Miles Traveled (VMT) contribution of small projects need not be considered significant. OPR suggests that agencies can find projects generating fewer than 110 vehicles trips a day to be less than significant. The Olive Avenue Mini-Storage project is comprised of land uses estimated to generate 74 vehicle trips per day. As this trip generation estimate falls below the 110 daily trip threshold identified by OPR the proposed project qualifies as a “small project” that can be assumed to have a less than significant impact on regional VMT.

### **Improvements**

The development does not require the construction of any streets. Staff is of the opinion that the existing streets can adequately serve the development, but traffic light timing optimization at the intersection of Olive Avenue/Santa Fe Drive and Highway 59 may be required per Resolution #4119 for the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review Permit for this project (Attachment B of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534). Given the loading/unloading of storage facilities and the long-term boat and recreational vehicle parking spaces, staff anticipates that large trucks and vehicles will be entering and existing the site. To prevent these large vehicles from stacking onto Olive Avenue and creating traffic congestion, staff is requiring that the developer work with a traffic engineer to determine the sufficient distance for

vehicle stacking space to enter the site Condition #14 of Planning Commission Resolution #4119 – Attachment B of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534). This may require making minor modifications to the site plan that would need to be reviewed and approved by the Director of Development Services.

### **Neighborhood Impact**

- F) The land uses in the area include Light Industrial (IL) to the east of the subject site and Low Density Residential (LD) to the west of the subject site. The subject site was designated for Commercial Office (CO) to be a buffer between the industrial and residential uses. The CO designation offered reduced impacts to the adjacent residential properties as professional and medical offices tend to have limited hours of operation during the evening and weekends with less traffic and noise compared to light industrial uses. The requested land use change to Business Park would allow the site to still act as a buffer between the industrial and residential designations as Business Park is somewhat of a hybrid between light industrial and office commercial, described in the Zoning Ordinance as a district that allows back offices, and research and development businesses.

As shown in the Traffic Impact Study within the Initial Study at Attachment J of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534 the proposed development is expected to generate 74 vehicle trips per day which is considered a “small project” due to having under 110 daily trips (with 5 trips in a.m. peak hour and 8 trips in the p.m. peak hour). Although not many people are expected to come to the site throughout the day, noise and lighting from the proposed development would be reduced by the 12-foot-tall block building wall along the eastern property line between the self-storage portion of the project and residential properties to the east. In addition, conditions are included in Planning Commission Resolution #4119 for Conditional Use Permit #1274 and Site Plan Review Permit #516 (Attachment B of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534) requiring parking lot lights and building lights be shielded so that lighting does not “spill-over” to adjacent parcels, require controlled hours of operation (only allowed between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m.), and prohibit dwelling within storage facilities or within any recreational vehicle or boats parked onsite .

The proposed self-storage buildings would be on the property line adjacent to the single-family residential uses to the east. The buildings would have a sloped roof that slopes towards the east with a high point of 11 feet and a low point of 10-feet. Condition #33 of Planning Commission Resolution #4119

for Conditional Use Permit #1274 and Site Plan Review #516 requires that run-off from the buildings be maintained on-site and not allowed to drain onto adjacent properties. The buildings would be taller than most fences allowed as the Zoning Ordinance allows a 10-foot-tall fence in commercial zones to be approved either by a Minor Use Permit or along with another discretionary review. The proposed 12-foot building wall exceeds the height limit for fencing, but is below the maximum 35 feet height allowed for homes in the residential zone to the east.

Public hearing notices were sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the project site. At the time that this report was prepared, the City had not received any comments regarding this project.

### **Affordability Requirements**

- G) In April 2022, the City Council approved Resolution 2022-15 regarding the requirement for 12.5% affordable housing for new single-family residential subdivisions and multifamily residential projects. This requirement is triggered by two qualifiers that need to be met: entitlement type and number of units created. For single-family residential developments, the affordability requirement is triggered by a legislative action agreement (through annexations, general plan amendments, site utilization plan revisions, or zone changes) for projects with over 60 homes and for multi-family for projects over 30 units. The proposed singular (1) live/work unit for the manager of the self-storage facility is exempt from having to provide affordable units, as even though the proposal does require a legislative action agreement it contains less than the number of units needed to trigger the affordability requirement.

### **Black Rascal Creek/Floodway**

- H) The northern portion of the project is located within a floodway due to its close proximity to Black Rascal Creek (100 feet north). This portion of the project would not have any buildings and would be used for boat and recreational vehicle parking purposes only. Within this floodway, the applicant would like to install a wrought iron fence along the northern, western, and eastern (portion for boat and recreational vehicle parking only) property lines. However, doing so would require a No Rise Certificate prepared by a licensed Hydrologist confirming the fence would not increase the flood heights in the area or alter the flow of water. If the proposal does not qualify for a No Rise Certificate, the applicant would not be able to install any fencing within this area (Condition #11).

In addition, the proposal would have to comply with Merced Municipal Code Chapter 20.34 – Creek Buffers, which is intended to reduce the risks to property owners and the public from erosion and flooding, protect and enhance chemical, physical, and biological integrity of water resources in the City, minimize pollutants entering water bodies from urban stormwater runoff, and preserve riparian vegetation and protect vegetation, and protect wildlife habitats and wildlife corridors along natural drainage ways (Condition #12).

### **Environmental Clearance**

- I) Infill projects over 5 acres or projects that don't comply with Zoning/General Plan designations require an Initial Study, per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In this case, the project site is not consistent with Zoning or the General Plan and is over 5 acres (at 6 acres) – thus an Initial Study was required. An Initial Study includes a wide range of analysis required by the State covering an array of subjects including, but not limited to, impacts on vehicle miles traveled, air quality, biological resource, public services, cultural resources, and City utilities. Planning staff has conducted an environmental review of the project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, and concluded that Environmental Review #23-08 results in a Mitigated Negative Declaration as the proposal would have an effect on the environment, but could be mitigated with certain measures (Attachments J and K of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534) and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. A copy of the Initial Study with a Mitigated Negative Declaration can be found at Attachment I of Planning Commission Staff Report #23-534.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW #23-08**  
**Revised**  
**Mitigation Monitoring Program**

**MITIGATION MONITORING CONTENTS**

This mitigation monitoring program includes a brief discussion of the legal basis and purpose of the mitigation monitoring program, a key to understanding the monitoring matrix, a discussion of noncompliance complaints, and the mitigation monitoring matrix itself.

**LEGAL BASIS AND PURPOSE OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

Public Resource Code (PRC) 21081.6 requires public agencies to adopt mitigation monitoring or reporting programs whenever certifying an environmental impact report or mitigated negative declaration. This requirement facilitates implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process.

The City of Merced has adopted its own “Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program” (MMC 19.28). The City’s program was developed in accordance with the advisory publication, *Tracking CEQA Mitigation Measures*, from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.

As required by MMC 19.28.050, the following findings are made:

- 1) The requirements of the adopted mitigation monitoring program for the General Plan Amendment #23-02, Site Utilization Plan (SUP) Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #12, Conditional Use Permit #1274, and Site Plan Review #516 shall run with the real property. Successive owners, heirs, and assigns of this real property are bound to comply with all of the requirements of the adopted program.
- 2) Prior to any lease, sale, transfer, or conveyance of any portion of the subject real property, the applicant shall provide a copy of the adopted program to the prospective lessee, buyer, transferee, or one to whom the conveyance is made.

**MITIGATION MONITORING PROCEDURES**

In most cases, mitigation measures can be monitored through the City’s construction plan approval/plan check process. When the approved project plans and specifications, with mitigation measures, are submitted to the City Development Services Department, a copy of the monitoring checklist will be attached to the submittal. The Mitigation Monitoring Checklist will be filled out upon project approval with mitigation measures required. As project plans and specifications are checked, compliance with each mitigation measure can be reviewed.

In instances where mitigation requires on-going monitoring, the Mitigation Monitoring Checklist will be used until monitoring is no longer necessary. The Development Services Department will be required to file periodic reports on how the implementation of various mitigation measures is progressing or is being maintained. Department staff may be required to conduct periodic inspections to assure compliance. In some instances, outside agencies and/or consultants may be required to conduct necessary periodic inspections as part of the mitigation monitoring program. Fees may be imposed per MMC 19.28.070 for the cost of implementing the monitoring program.

## **GENERAL PLAN MITIGATION MEASURES**

As a second-tier environmental document, Initial Study #23-08 incorporates some mitigation measures adopted as part of the *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report* (SCH# 2008071069), as mitigation for potential impacts of the Project.

## **NONCOMPLIANCE COMPLAINTS**

Any person or agency may file a complaint asserting noncompliance with the mitigation measures associated with the project. The complaint shall be directed to the Director of Development Services in written form providing specific information on the asserted violation. The Director of Development Services shall cause an investigation and determine the validity of the complaint. If noncompliance with a mitigation measure has occurred, the Director of Development Services shall cause appropriate actions to remedy any violation. The complainant shall receive written confirmation indicating the results of the investigation or the final action corresponding to the particular noncompliance issue. Merced Municipal Code (MMC) Sections 19.28.080 and 19.28.090 outline the criminal penalties and civil and administrative remedies which may be incurred in the event of noncompliance. MMC 19.28.100 spells out the appeals procedures.

## **MONITORING MATRIX**

**The following pages provide a series of tables identifying the mitigation measures proposed specifically for General Plan Amendment #23-02, Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D) #12, Conditional Use Permit #1274, and Site Plan Review #516. The columns within the tables are defined as follows:**

<b>Mitigation Measure:</b>	Describes the Mitigation Measure (referenced by number).
<b>Timing:</b>	Identifies at what point in time or phase of the project that the mitigation measure will be completed.
<b>Agency/Department Consultation:</b>	This column references any public agency or City department with which coordination is required to satisfy the identified mitigation measure.
<b>Verification:</b>	These columns will be initialed and dated by the individual designated to verify adherence to the project specific mitigation.



**General Plan Amendment #23-02/Site Utilization Plan Revision #3 to Planned Development (P-D)  
#12/Conditional Use Permit #1274/  
Site Plan Review Permit #516  
Mitigation Monitoring Checklist**

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ File Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Approval Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Location \_\_\_\_\_  
Brief Project Description \_\_\_\_\_

The following environmental mitigation measures were incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for this project in order to mitigate identified environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that this mitigation measure has been complied with and implemented, and fulfills the City of Merced's Mitigation Monitoring Requirements (MMC 19.28) with respect to Assembly Bill 3180 (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

<b>1) Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Agency or Department</b>	<b>City Verification (date and initials)</b>
<i>a</i>	GHG- 1)	Building Permit	Planning Department	

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>a</i></p>	<p>GHG-1) The project applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the applicable BPS strategies to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit. The following BPS strategies are considered to be applicable, feasible, and effective in reducing GHG emissions generated by the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will provide a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects to existing external streets and pedestrian facilities. Existing facilities are defined as those facilities that are physically constructed and ready for use prior to the first 20% of the project's occupancy permits being granted.</li> <li>• Site design and building placement will minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity. Physical barriers such as walls, berms, landscaping, and slopes between residential and nonresidential uses that impede bicycle or pedestrian circulation will be eliminated. Barriers to pedestrian access of neighboring facilities and sites will be minimized. This measure is not meant to prevent the limited use of barriers to ensure public safety by prohibiting access to hazardous areas. This measure is not meant to prevent features needed to securely operate a mini-storage facility.</li> <li>• Merced Regional Transit System The Bus Route MI - Merced West - provides bus service with one-half hour headways. A bus stop for Route MI is located at the Walmart store at Olive Avenue and</li> </ul>	<p>Building Permit/Grading Permit</p>	<p>Building / Engineering Departments</p>
---	--	---------------------------------------	---

	<p>Loughborough Drive, directly south of the project site. The project will provide safe and convenient bicycle/pedestrian access to the bus stop and provides essential transit stop improvements (i.e., shelters, route information, benches, and lighting). The project applicant shall plant trees to provide shade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will install light-colored/high/albedo roof materials on the portion of the project containing climate-controlled units. Light-colored/high/albedo roof materials reflect more of the sun's rays, decreasing the amount of heat transferred into a building.</li> <li>• The project will provide shade (within 5 years) and/or use light-colored/high-albedo materials (reflectance of at least 0.3) and/or open grid pavement for at least 30% of the site's non-roof impervious surfaces, including parking lots, walkways, plazas, etc.; OR use an open-grid pavement system (less than 50% impervious) for a minimum of 50% of the parking lot area. Unshaded parking lot areas, driveways, fire lanes, and other paved areas will have a minimum albedo of 0.3 or greater.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>b</b></p>	<p>GHG-2) Implementation of Mitigation Measure of GHG-1.</p>		

**Certificate of Completion:**

By signing below, the environmental coordinator confirms that the required mitigation measures have been implemented as evidenced by the Schedule of Tasks and Sign-Off Checklist, and that all direct and indirect costs have been paid. This act constitutes the issuance of a *Certificate of Completion*.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Environmental Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date