

## **Tiered CEQA Environmental Checklist from 2013 Colton General Plan Update PEIR**

### **Roquet Ranch Specific Plan Project**

1. Project title: Roquet Ranch Specific Plan Project (hereinafter “Project” or “Proposed Project”)
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Colton, 650 N. La Cadena Drive, Colton, CA 92324
3. Project location: See Roquet Ranch EIR, Sections 2.0 Environmental Setting, and 3.0 Project Description
4. General plan designation and 6. Zoning: See Roquet Ranch EIR, Sections 2.0 Environmental Setting, and 3.0 Project Description
5. Description of project: See Roquet Ranch EIR, Sections 2.0 Environmental Setting, and 3.0 Project Description
6. Surrounding land uses and setting: See Roquet Ranch EIR, Sections 2.0 Environmental Setting, and 3.0 Project Description
7. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): See Roquet Ranch EIR, Sections 1.0 Introduction, and 3.0 Project Description

## Tiering Overview

This Tiered CEQA Checklist provides a comparison between potential environmental impacts that may result from adoption and implementation of the Proposed Project, as evaluated in the Roquet Ranch Draft Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2016061056 (“Project EIR”), and the 2013 Colton General Plan Update PEIR (“General Plan PEIR”). Analysis of potential environmental impacts of development under the Proposed Project, and the mitigation identified to reduce potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project, are consistent with the analysis and mitigation in the General Plan PEIR.

Tiering refers to the coverage of general matters in a broader EIR with subsequent narrower site-specific review incorporating by reference the general discussions of the prior EIR and concentrating analysis solely on the issues specific to the project for which the subsequent review is prepared. Under CEQA Guidelines § 15152, where an EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA, lead agencies are thereafter encouraged to tier any environmental analyses which they prepare for separate but related projects, including development projects, as tiered from broad program EIRs.

CEQA strongly encourages the tiering of review, which “shall be tiered whenever feasible, as determined by the lead agency.”<sup>1</sup> Where a program EIR has been prepared for a project, any lead agency may, and is encouraged to, thereafter tier off of that program EIR for a later project pursuant to or consistent with that prior EIR and incorporate the broader analysis of the program EIR by reference.

For example, where a project is consistent with a programmatic plan, pertinent discussion of cumulative impacts, such as greenhouse gas emissions or air quality, from the EIR for that plan may be incorporated by reference into subsequent project specific review by virtue of tiering from the program EIR.<sup>2</sup> No further discussion of that cumulative impact is then required as long as the project is consistent with the broader plan.

Based on the applicable tiering standards discussed above, this Tiered CEQA Checklist provides a determination of whether the Proposed Project would result in:

- New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR.
- Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR;
- Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR; or
- No Impact.

Where the checkbox for New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR or Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR is checked, there are significant impacts that are:

---

<sup>1</sup> Pub Res Code § 21093, subd (b); See also CEQA Guidelines §§ 15006 (m), 15152, subd. (b).

<sup>2</sup> CEQA Guidelines § 15130 (d).

- Due to new information that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the General Plan PEIR (per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162);
- Due to substantial changes in the project (per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162);
- Due to substantial changes in circumstances under which the project will be undertaken (per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162); or

Where the severity of the impacts of the proposed project would be the same as or less than the severity of the impacts described in the General Plan PEIR, or the Proposed Project will have no impact, the checkbox for either Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR or No Impact is checked.

## **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

An evaluation of the proposed project is provided in the Tiered CEQA Checklist below.

This evaluation concludes that, with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures and conditions, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of impacts that were previously identified in the General Plan PEIR or any new potentially significant impacts that were not previously identified in the General Plan PEIR, for the following impact areas:

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation, Traffic, and Safety
- Utilities

This evaluation concludes that, with implementation of the applicable mitigation measures and conditions, the proposed project would result in a substantial increase in the severity of impacts previously identified in the General Plan PEIR or new potentially significant impacts that were not previously identified in the General Plan PEIR, that such impacts would be significant and unavoidable, and that there is no feasible mitigation reduce such impacts to a less than significant level, in the following impact areas:

- Aesthetics

<b>1. Aesthetics</b>  Would the project:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required. The General Plan Update PEIR concludes that with implementation of existing and proposed policies and standards, impacts would be less than significant.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a) and b), the General Plan PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update does not propose to establish any scenic corridors or highways nor do any occur in the planning area, and there will therefore be no impact to scenic corridors or highways. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.1-5) Because the proposed General Plan Land Use Plan would allow future residential, mixed-use, commercial, and industrial development throughout the planning area, and portions of it are undisturbed hillside, it is possible that development could impact scenic vistas currently visible from the southernmost parts of the City. (Id., p. 4.1-6) However, since the proposed update would not authorize specific land altering activities or any particular development project, infrastructure improvement, community facility, etc., the plan itself would have no direct impact on these vistas, and impacts would be indirect.

(Ibid.) Project impacts would be reduced to less than significant level with the implementation of General Plan Conservation and Open Space policies. (Id., pp. 4.1-6)

Likewise with regard to threshold c), while the General Plan Update would not directly result in the degradation of any portion of the planning area's visual character, indirect impact could occur if proposed policies are not sufficient to preserve and enhance those areas that contribute to a sense of place and provide distinctive community identity. (Ibid.) The proposed General Plan Update allows low-density residential and light industrial development in the Pellisier Ranch area in the southwestern portion of the City, adjacent to the City of Riverside; development of this area over time would convert it from naturalized open space to an urban character. (Ibid.) However, the General Plan Update's proposed policy framework will guide new private and public development to be consistent with existing natural and urban characters, while still providing visual interest. (Id., pp. 4.1-8) A less than significant degradation of the visual character and quality of the planning area would result from implementation of the proposed General Plan policies. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold d), the updated Land Use Element contains goals and policies to protect and enhance visual character, focusing on enhancing the aesthetic quality of new development, including public and private spaces, to ensure compatibility with the community. (Id., pp. 4.1-7, 4.1-8) The General Plan PEIR concludes that implementation of these policies will ensure impacts are less than significant. (Id., pp. 4.1-8, 4.1-9)

The General Plan Update would not cause cumulatively considerable aesthetic impacts. (Id., p. 6-2)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project would not result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas or scenic resources. (Project EIR, pp. 4.1-8 through 4.1-16, 4.1-19) The Project site contains potential scenic vistas, including hills, a prominent ridgeline, and uninterrupted open spaces. (Id.) Additionally, the Project site contains potential scenic resources, including rock outcroppings and a prominent ridgeline. (Id.) The proposed design of the Project preserves the prominent ridgeline, concentrates development in the flatter portions of the Project site, and preserves the most of the natural hillsides as "Open Space Resources." (Id.) Through these measures, the Project avoids substantial adverse effects to scenic vistas and resources at the site; therefore, the Project EIR determines that impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. (Id.) The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project site is not located within or adjacent to a scenic highway corridor, nor is it prominently visible from any state-designated scenic highway corridor. (Project EIR, pp. 4.1-16. Accordingly, the Project would have no impact with respect to impacting scenic resources within a state scenic highway. (Id.) The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR .

With regard to threshold c), the Project would develop the site in compliance with the site planning, architecture, and landscaping themes presented in Section IV, Design Guidelines, of the Roquet Ranch Specific Plan, which would ensure compatibility and continuity of development within the Roquet Ranch community and with the surrounding environs. (Project EIR, pp. 4.1-16 through 4.1-17, 4.1-20) However, the existing hillside setting that represents the visual character of the Project site would be permanently altered by the Project during its operation through its proposed grading of certain hillsides. Accordingly, the proposed Project would have a direct significant

impact on the visual character of the Project site. (Id.) There are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the Project's impacts on the visual quality of the Project site and surroundings and, therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable. (Id.) The Project would cause a Substantial Increase in the Severity of Previously Identified Impact in the General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold d), the Project would not create substantial amounts of light or glare. (Project EIR, pp. 4.1-17, 4.1-20) Compliance with the City of Colton Municipal Code and the outdoor lighting standards defined in Section IV of the Roquet Ranch Specific Plan would ensure less-than-significant impacts associated with light and glare affecting day or nighttime views in the area. (Id.) The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR.

<p><b>2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources</b></p> <p>Would the project result in any action which:</p>	<p><b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>No Impact</b></p>
<p>a. Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural uses.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b. Conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act Contract.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>c. Conflicts with existing zoning for, or causes rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>d. Results in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>e. Involves changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the General Plan PEIR notes that Colton has one area in city limits designated Farmland of Statewide Importance,

and two areas in its Sphere of Influence that are designated Farmland of Statewide Importance and Prime Farmland. The General Plan Update would designate them Reche Canyon Specific Plan, which would not result in direct conversion to non-agricultural use because it would still permit agricultural uses, but could indirectly result in conversion by permitting non-agricultural uses; specific analysis of this potential conversion of designated farmland would be performed at the time development is proposed that would necessitate such an analysis. (General Plan PEIR, pp. 4.2-5, 4.2-6)

Under threshold b), there are no Williamson Act contracts in the City of Colton, and there is therefore no impact. (Id., p. 4.2-6)

Under thresholds c) and d), no impact would occur to existing zoning for forest land or timberland as a result of the General Plan Update, because either the land's proposed General Plan designation is consistent with existing use, the land is not currently used for forest land or timberland, has negligible value as such, and/or is unlikely to be used as such in the future. (Id., pp. 4.2-7, 4.2-8) The City of Colton does not have any land zoned for agricultural use, and the areas designated Farmland of Statewide Importance and Prime Farmland are located within the Reche Canyon Specific Plan. Implementation of the General Plan Update would not prohibited continued use on those properties, and therefore would not create conflicts or result in the loss or conversion of Farmland; no impact would occur. (Id., p. 4.2-8) Because there is no individual impact, the General Plan Update would have no cumulatively considerable impact on agricultural resources. (Id., p. 6-2)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** An initial study was prepared for the Proposed Project, which is included as *Appendix A* to the Proposed Project EIR. As concluded in the Project's Initial Study, the City of Colton has determined that agricultural and forestry resources have no potential to be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project or any Project-related component. (Project EIR, p. 5-9)

The entire Project site is classified as "Grazing Land" and does not contain any soils mapped as "Prime Farmland," "Unique Farmland," or "Farmland of State Importance." (Ibid.) Further, the land in the Project site is not used for agricultural production, nor is it zoned for agricultural production. (Id., p. 5-10) Thus, no impact would occur. The Project site also does not contain forest lands or lands zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Accordingly, there would be no conversion or loss of such land, and there would be no impact. (Ibid.)

Because there is no potential for agricultural and forestry resources to be impacted by the Proposed Project, there is No Impact. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis.

<b>3. Air Quality</b>  Would the project result in any action which:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violates any air quality standard or contributes substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant that the region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Creates objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required. The General Plan Update PEIR concludes that no mitigation beyond continued implementation of General Plan policies are available at the program level to further reduce criteria pollutant emission, and that additional mitigation will be identified at the project level. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.3-23)

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** The General Plan PEIR concludes that future development supported by the policies in the updated Land Use, Mobility, and Housing Elements of the General Plan would result in short-term criteria pollutant emissions during site preparation, grading, building construction paving, and painting. (Id., p. 4.3-16) Short-term project-specific emissions would be analyzed as development proposals are submitted, and mitigation required

as necessary. (Ibid.) Long-term criteria pollutant emissions would also result from operation of future development under the proposed General Plan Update, including from automobiles, trucks, and other vehicle sources associated with daily trips to and from future development. (Id., p. 4.3-17) For thresholds a), b), and c), the General Plan PEIR analyzed impacts pursuant to the methodology provided in Chapter 12 of the 1993 SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, wherein consistency with the SCAQMD 2007 and proposed 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is affirmed when a project: (1) does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new violation and (2) is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP. (Ibid.) The PEIR concluded that based on modeling data, total emissions from new development in the planning area guided by the proposed General Plan Update would exceed the SCAQMD daily operational thresholds used to evaluate potential consistency with criterion 1). (Id., p. 4.3-18) The PEIR further concluded that due to changes in proposed land uses from the then-existing General Plan land use plan, upon which the 2007 AQMP is partially based, and the proposed General Plan Update, potential future development supported by implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not be consistent with the growth projections utilized in the 2007 AQMP; this could result in potentially significant impacts because air quality attainment goals could be delayed because the strategies adopted in the AQMP will not account for land use changes in the planning area. (Id., p. 4.3-19) The PEIR noted that the General Plan Update would also be inconsistent with growth anticipated under the then-forthcoming 2012 AQMP. (Ibid.) The PEIR identifies General Plan Update and existing General Plan Air Quality Element policies that would support attainment of air quality goals through assessment and mitigation of future development projects and City operations in regard to construction and operational pollutants, vehicle miles traveled and trips generated, alternative transit systems, and use of alternative energy. (Id., pp. 4.3-19 to 4.3-23) The PEIR concluded that nonetheless, program-level policies cannot guarantee that proposed land use changes would not conflict with attainment of 2007 or 2012 AQMP goals, and no additional mitigation is available to further reduce criteria pollutant emissions, making impacts significant and unavoidable. (Id., pp. 4.3-23, 4.3-24)

With regard to thresholds d) and e), the PEIR concluded that the proposed General Plan Update has the potential to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutant emissions and odors associated with industrial uses, but that potential impacts can be addressed at the project level and reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of General Plan policies and application of standard development practices, and the imposition of project-specific mitigation measures as necessary. (Id., pp. 4.3-24 to 4.3-30) With implementation of the General Plan Update, air quality impacts could be cumulatively considerable in the long-term in the region. (Id., p. 6-3)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a) , the Project would have no operational impacts under consistency criterion No. 1 of the SCAQMD AQMP. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-16) However, emissions of  $PM_{10}$  during the construction phase of the Project would exceed the applicable SCAQMD LST for  $PM_{10}$ ; therefore, the Project would conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1 of the AQMP, which would be a potentially significant impact under CEQA. (Ibid.) This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures, including Roquet Ranch MM 4.2-1, which requires that all construction equipment greater than 150 horsepower is CARB Tier 3 Certified or better (Id., pp. S-13, 4.2-16). This mitigation measure will reduce the potentially significant construction phase impact to a less than significant level, and the Project would therefore have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to thresholds b), the Project-related construction phase emissions would exceed the criteria pollutant threshold established by SCAQMD for daily emissions of  $NO_x$ , creating a

potentially significant impact. (Id., p. 4.2-17) With the implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.2-1, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. Operation of the Project would result in emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> that exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold. (Ibid.) NO<sub>x</sub> is a precursor for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), a pollutant for which the SCAB is in nonattainment under both federal and State criteria. (Id., p. 4.2-18) Operational emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> are primarily associated with mobile source emissions, including tailpipe emissions from vehicles traveling to and from the Project site, which are regulated by state and federal emissions and beyond the control of the Proposed Project and the City of Colton. (Ibid.) Therefore, even with implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.2-1, emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> associated with long-term operation of the Project would be a significant and unavoidable impact, and is cumulatively considerable. (Id., pp. S-13, 4.2-18) This is consistent with the General Plan EIR impact analysis, and the Project has an Equal or Less Severe Impact Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR. The same is true with regard to threshold c) – in the event the Project's short-term construction and long-term operational activities overlap, emissions of VOCs, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO<sub>2</sub> would be a significant and unavoidable, direct and cumulatively consideration impact, because the emissions would violate the SCAQMD air quality standards, and the implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.2-1 would reduce impacts, but not to a less than significant level. (Id., pp. 4.2-19, 4.2-20) The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard threshold d), the Project would cause construction emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD LST for emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, which has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration. (Id., p. 4.2-21) However, implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.2-1 would reduce Project construction-related emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> to a level that is less than significant, as demonstrated in Project EIR Tables 4.2-13 and 4.2-14. (Ibid.) This is consistent with the General Plan EIR, which, as noted above, concludes that implementation of General Plan policies, typical development controls, and mitigation as necessary for specific projects would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold e), the Project would not produce unusual or substantial construction-related odors that would be objectionable and affect a substantial number of people. (Id., p. 4.2-23) Odors associated VOC emissions during architectural coating have the potential to affect nearby receptors, but VOC odors dissipate quickly and would not affect a substantial number of people, so this impact would be less than significant. (Ibid.) Under long-term operational conditions, the Proposed Project would consist of residential land uses, recreational facilities, neighborhood commercial retail, and public institutions, which are not anticipated to produce objectionable odors; further, any residents, businesses, and agencies would be required to store odorous refuse in covered containers and comply with solid waste collection and disposal requirements in accordance with City solid waste regulations, making impacts less than significant. (Ibid.) This is consistent with the General Plan EIR, which, as noted above, concluded that project-specific mitigation was only required if necessary to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The Project has an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

<b>4. Biological Resources</b>  Would the project:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Biological Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project:				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM 4.4.A-1:** A biological resources assessment shall be prepared for any land use plan or development proposal located on any undeveloped land within a Critical Habitat designation or identified in the General Plan Environmental Impact Report as dry herbaceous, hardwood forest-woodland, shrub, or giant reed-pampas grass vegetation communities or mapped Delhi sands habitat. This assessment shall identify the habitat types and quality, identify species occurrence and distribution, determine the specific impacts to biological resources and characterize the biological significance of those impacts, and define measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any significant impacts attributable to a proposed project. The reduction in impacts may include a redesign of the project. The compensation may include creating and/or preserving in perpetuity equivalent or better quality habitat at a minimum 1:1 ratio, as will be determined through project-specific analysis. The biological resources assessment shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and submitted to the Development Services Director for review/approval in consultation with the biologist and other as appropriate to the project. The biological resources assessment shall be included in the CEQA compliance documentation for all such proposals.

**MM 4.4.A-2:** A focused survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified professional biologist for any new development project proposed on a vacant site of two acres or larger, with a landscape of annual and perennial grasslands, desert, or arid scrubland with low-growing vegetation or agricultural use or vegetation. The purpose of the survey is to determine if burrowing owls are foraging or nesting on or adjacent to the project site. If surveys confirm that the site is occupied habitat, mitigation measures to minimize impacts to burrowing owls, their burrows, and foraging habitat shall be identified. The results of this survey, including any mitigation recommendations, shall be incorporated into the project-level CEQA compliance documentation. Owl surveys and approaches to mitigation shall be in accordance with the Staff Report on

Burrowing Owl Mitigation, issued by the California Department of Fish and Game on March 7, 2012.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concludes that prior to mitigation, buildout under the General has the potential to result in significant impacts to special status species and their habitat. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.4-17) In particular, any future development on vacant land pursuant to the proposed General Plan Land Use Element could potentially impact the burrowing owl. (Id., p. 4.4-17) Some areas proposed for rezoning for development under the General Plan Update include critical habitat protected from destruction or modification pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act and/or applicable HCPs. (Id., p. 4.4-18) In order to minimize potential impacts to protected species, the General Plan PEIR concludes that Mitigation Measures 4.4.A-1 and 4.4.A-2, reproduced above, will be incorporated into the City's standard environmental review process, and impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Id., p. 4.4-19)

With regard to threshold b), there would be no impact to the two areas of sensitive riparian habitat identified within the planning area: the Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest within the Santa Anna River and the Southern Riparian Scrub in the Reche Canyon Area. (Ibid.) The proposed Land Use Element, Housing Element, and Circulation Elements do not propose any land use or transportation changes that would impact the areas, and no impact to these sensitive habitats could occur. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold c), there would be no impact to Section 404 wetlands because there are none in the planning area. (Ibid.) Under threshold d), the proposed General Plan Update does not include any land use policies nor circulation changes that could fragment the Santa Ana River or Lytle Creek and impede their use as local or migratory wildlife corridors, so there is no impact. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold e), There are no existing County or City policies, regulations, or standards designed to protect biological resources applicable to the planning area; therefore, the proposed General Plan could not conflict with such policies, regulations, or standards, and no impact would occur. (Id., p. 4.4-20) No mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold f), the General Plan Update designates active HCP areas for the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly as open space and does not include land use changes or proposed circulation improvements within any adopted HCP area; therefore, the General Plan PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update will have no impact. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required. Implementation of the General Plan Update would not have cumulatively considerable impacts on biological resources. (Id., p. 6-3)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project would temporarily impact designated critical habitat for the southwestern willow flycatcher through trimming of vegetation along the Riverside Avenue bridge during construction activities, and this impact would be significant, direct, and cumulatively considerable absent mitigation. (Project EIR, pp. 4.3-21, 4.3-22) The Project would also remove suitable habitat that has the potential to support the least Bell's vireo, which would be considered a significant direct and cumulatively considerable impact absent mitigation. (Id., p. 4.3-24) The proposed Project would impact 167.1 acres of critical habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher within the Project site, and 15.6 acres of critical habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher in the off-site improvement areas. (Ibid.) These project-related impacts to critical habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher are considered significant direct and cumulatively considerable absent mitigation. (Id., p. 4.3-25) The Project would likely impact

suitable habitat for burrowing owls within the off-site improvement areas, which is considered a significant direct and cumulatively considerable impact absent mitigation. (Id., p. 4.3-26) With incorporation of Roquet Ranch MMs 4.3-1, 4.3-2, 4.3-3, and 4.3-4, potentially significant impacts to these species and habitat would be reduced to less than significant. (Id., p. S-14) The Project is also consistent with General Plan PEIR Mitigation Measures 4.4.A-1 and 4.4.A-2. A biological resource assessment and focused surveys were duly conducted for Coastal California gnatcatcher and burrowing owl (Id., pp. 4.3-10, 4.3-26), and appropriate mitigation duly considered. The biological resources assessment is also duly included in the Project EIR materials. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project would have a significant, direct, and cumulatively considerable impact before mitigation because it would permanently impact a 0.26-acre black willow thicket/ornamental that occurs within the Project site associated with Drainage A. (Id., p. 4.3-27) Accordingly, implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.3-5 would require 1:1 compensatory mitigation by on- and/or off-site creation, restoration, enhancement, and or preservation; this impact would be less than significant with mitigation. (Id., pp. 4.3-27, S-22) Approximately 1.2 acres of on-site, and approximately 0.5-acre of off-site non-wetland streambeds and riparian vegetation under CDFW jurisdiction would also be permanently impacted by the Project, which constitutes a potentially significant impact prior to mitigation; implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.3-5 and 4.3-6 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 4.3-28, S-22, S-23) Because the Project's impact to a riparian habitat or sensitive natural community would be mitigated to a less than significant level, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), the Project would have No Impact because the Project site and off-site improvement areas do not support USACE/CDFW jurisdictional wetlands, or any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. (Id., pp. 4.3-28, S-24) Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal of Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan EIR.

With regard to threshold d), the Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, because of the potential for nest removal. (Id., p. 4.3-29) However, with Roquet Ranch MM 4.3-7 incorporated, this impact would be less than significant. (Id., pp. 4.3-29, 4.3-30, ES-24) Because the Project's potential impact to nesting birds would be mitigated to a less than significant level, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan EIR.

Under threshold e), the Project would have a potentially significant impact absent mitigation because it proposed street tree removal, which could conflict with the City of Colton Street Tree Ordinance. (Id., p. 4.3-30) With incorporation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.3-8, this impact would be less than significant. (Ibid.) Because the Project's potential impact to trees would be mitigated to a less than significant level, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan EIR.

With regard to threshold f), the Project would have No Impact because there is no adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan applicable to the Project site. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan EIR.

5. Cultural Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains including those interred outside of formal cemetery.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM 4.5-1:** Future development proposals subject to environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are subject to the following provisions at the expense of the project proponent, as directed by the Development Services Director.

**Paleontological Assessment.** In areas containing middle to late Pleistocene era sediments (Qof) where it is unknown if paleontological resources exist, prior to grading an assessment shall be made by a qualified paleontological professional to establish the need for paleontologic monitoring. Should paleontological monitoring be required after recommendation by the professional paleontologist and approval by the Development Services Director, paleontological monitoring shall be implemented.

**Paleontological Monitoring.** A project that requires grading plans and is located in an area of known fossil occurrence or that has been demonstrated to have fossils present in a paleontological field survey or other appropriate assessment shall have all grading monitored by trained paleontologic crews working under the direction of a qualified professional, so that fossils

exposed during grading can be recovered and preserved. Paleontologic monitors shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed, to avoid construction delays, and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. Monitors shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Monitoring is not necessary if the potentially fossiliferous units described for the property in question are not present or if present are determined upon exposure and examination by qualified paleontologic personnel to have low potential to contain fossil resources. Should significant paleontological resources be discovered, paleontological recovery, identification, and curation shall be implemented.

**Paleontological Recovery, Identification, and Curation.** Qualified paleontologic personnel shall prepare recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. Qualified paleontologic personnel shall identify and curate specimens into the collections of the Division of Geological Sciences, San Bernardino County Museum or a similar established, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable paleontologic storage. The paleontologist must have a written repository agreement in hand prior to the initiation of mitigation activities. This measure is not considered complete until curation into an established museum repository has been fully completed and documented.

**Paleontological Findings.** Qualified paleontologic personnel shall prepare a report of findings with an appendix itemized of specimens subsequent to implementation of paleontological recovery, identification, and curation. A preliminary report shall be submitted to and approved by the Development Services Director before granting of building permits, and a final report shall be submitted to and approved by the Development Services Director before granting of occupancy permits.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** Under threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concluded that the General Plan Update would not result in any direct adverse impacts to any historic resource because it does not authorize demolition of any structures or approval of any development. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.5-12) Further, future development within the planning area would be subject to goals and policies of the General Plan Update to protect and maintain the City's historic resources. (Id., pp. 4.5-12, 4.5-13) The impact would be less than significant, with no mitigation required. (Ibid.)

Likewise under threshold b), the General Plan PEIR concluded that the General Plan Update would not result in any direct adverse environmental impacts to any archaeological resources because it does not authorize any earthmoving activities or other development. (Id., p. 4.5-13) Further, future development would be subject to the protective policies of the General Plan Cultural Resources Preservation Element. (Id., pp. 4.5-13, 4.5-14) Mitigation would be required as necessary for individual projects. (Id., p. 4.5-14) The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

Under threshold c), the General Plan PEIR concluded that the General Plan update would not result in a direct adverse to paleontological resources because it does not authorize earthmoving activities or other development, but could have an indirect significant impact if, for development pursuant to General Plan policy, there is a failure to survey development sites and, if necessary, monitor earthmoving activities to ensure proper identification and recovery of paleontological resources and fossil resources are lost. (Ibid.) However, the PEIR concludes that General Plan PEIR MM 4.5-1 would be applicable to all future development projects and would make this impact less than significant. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold d), the PEIR concluded that the General Plan Update would not result in any direct adverse impacts to human remains because it does not authorize construction of any development that would result in the conversion of a cemetery to a different use. (Id., p. 4.5-15) However, without implementation of appropriate policies, destruction of human remains would be an indirect, significant adverse impact during development pursuant to the General Plan. (Ibid.) The PEIR concludes that with the implementation of State of California Public Resources Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5-7055 and Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, impacts would be less than significant. (Ibid.) The General Plan Update would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to cultural resources. (Id., p. 6-4)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project would not impact any of the City's identified historic districts, nor would it impact any mapped historic landmarks. (Project EIR, pp. 4.4-19, 4.4-20) The cultural resources assessment conducted by BFSa identified two historic features on the Project site, and on multi-component site that includes a historic feature, but none of the three are considered to be significant. (Id., p. 4.4-21) The impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), there are two cultural resource sites on the Project site that are significant under CEQA. (Id., p. 4.4-22) While both are unlikely to be directly impacted by the Project, the remote potential exists for these resources to be indirectly impacted during grading and construction activities. (Id., pp. 4.4-22, 4.4-23) Roquet Ranch MMs 4.4-1, 4.4-2, and 4.4-3 are therefore required and will reduce this impact to less than significant. (Ibid.) This is consistent with the General Plan PEIR, which indicates that mitigation may be required for individual development projects. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold c), the Project may result in a significant adverse impact absent mitigation, because there is a high potential for Quaternary older alluvial valley and alluvial fan sediments at the Project site to yield paleontological resources that could be uncovered during ground-disturbing grading and construction activities. (Id., p. 4.4-23) Roquet Ranch MM 4.4-4 is required, and would reduce impacts to less than significant. (Id., pp. 4.4-23, 4.4-24) Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold d), the Project would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the Health and Safety Code and California Resources Code in the event human remains are discovered. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that any impacts are less than significant (Id., p. 4.4-25); this is consistent with the General Plan PEIR analysis. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

<p><b>6. Geology and Soils</b></p> <p>Would the project:</p>	<p><b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>No Impact</b></p>
<p>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42). 2. Strong seismic ground shaking. 3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. 4. Landslides.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code (2006), creating substantial risks to life or property.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

6. Geology and Soils	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project: e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a.1), the General Plan PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update would not result in direct impacts because it does not authorize specific construction or land altering activities, but that development pursuant to the General Plan could cause indirect significant impacts by exposing people to the San Jacinto Fault’s Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, if the development is in the vicinity of this fault on the eastern boundary of the planning area. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.6-12) The proposed Land Use Element in the General Plan Update did include residential land use designations within the fault area, and the proposed Housing Element identified vacant parcels within the fault zone as opportunity sites for future residential development, making this a potentially significant impact. (Ibid.) However, Standard 1 of the existing General Plan Safety Element Geologic Hazards Section requires preparation of geologic studies to identify the exact position of faults and establish appropriate setbacks for development, to prevent structural damage and danger; implementation of this existing policy makes the impact less than significant. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold a.2), impacts to life and property resulting from earthquakes would be less than significant with implementation of existing City building plan check and building code compliance procedures, and policies in the existing General Plan Safety Element. (Id., pp. 4.6-12, 4.6-13) With regard to threshold a.3), impacts to life and property resulting from seismically induced liquefaction or settlement will be less than significant with implementation of existing General Plan Safety Element requirements for developers to prepare geotechnical studies to identify any liquefaction and other ground failure potential and require appropriate design parameters on a project-by-project basis. (Id., p. 4.6-13) Further, soils reports are required under the building code. (Ibid.) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., pp. 4.6-13, 4.6-14) With regard to threshold a.4), impacts to life and property within the La Loma Hill, Box Spring Mountains, and other portions of the planning area related to seismically induced landslides would be less than significant with implementation of existing building code provisions to regulate all grading design and criteria; this includes criteria for development on slopes and at the toe of slopes, a requirement for soils reports to include slope stability studies that discuss

grading procedures, soil design criteria for structures and embankments, and site geology, and incorporation of stabilization features as necessary. (Id., p. 4.6-14) Geological studies would also be required under the existing General Plan Safety Element. (Ibid.) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

Under threshold b), indirect impacts related to wind-blown soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant, because existing vacant parcels are not likely to contribute to wind-blown erosion since native vegetation stabilizes soil, and developed sites curtail wind-blow erosion by preventing wind from contact soil, due to the presence of buildings, parking lots, landscaping, and other impervious surfaces. (Id., pp. 4.6-14, 4.6-15) The PEIR concludes that soil erosion and loss of topsoil are expected to decrease over the long term as new development replaces exposed native soil, and impacts will be less than significant. (Id., p. 4.6-15) No mitigation is required.

Under threshold c), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to ground failure will be less than significant with implementation of existing City policies and regulations. (Ibid.) The majority of the planning area is subject to impacts associated with settlement and compressible soils due to the widespread presence of young, unconsolidated alluvial soils, but the existing General Plan Safety Element requires developers to conduct geotechnical studies to identify any liquefaction, collapse, subsidence, and other ground failure potential and required appropriate design parameters to reduce impacts associated with ground failure to less than significant levels. (Ibid.) There could be a potential for ground subsidence under future development that requires extraction of ground water, unless the extraction is done in a controlled manner and/or offset through sufficient recharge activities. (Ibid.) However, the Colton Water District Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) includes programs for long-term management that would address these potential impacts. Implementation of these described policies would reduce impacts to a less than significant level, and no mitigation would be required. (Id., pp. 4.6-15, 4.6-16)

Under threshold d), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to expansive soils will be less than significant by requiring soils testing to determine expansive characteristics for new development pursuant to the City's building code, and mitigation as necessary and required. (Id., p. 4.6-16) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) Note that the PEIR indicates the Project site in particular contains small areas of expansive soils resulting from the presence of Monserate Sandy Loam soil. (Id., Exhibit 4.6-4)

With regard to threshold e), the PEIR concludes that because the planning area is fully supported by a functioning sewer system and there is limited septic use, no impact will occur. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required. Cumulative geologic hazards impacts would also be less than significant. (Id., p. 6-4)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** A geotechnical report was duly prepared for the Project and informs the Project EIR analysis. With regard to threshold a), the geotechnical report revealed that the western portion of the Project site that abuts the Santa Ana River Channel may be underlain by shallow groundwater conditions, and thus may be susceptible to liquefaction absent mitigation. (Project EIR, p. 4.5-8 ) Additionally, due to the Project site's lithology and relatively high topographic relief across the site, the potential for landslides at the Project site and operation of the Project is considered potentially significant absent mitigation. (Id., pp. 4.5-8, 4.5-9) With implementation of Roquet Ranch MMs 4.5-1 and 4.5-2, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis because the Project would be subject to and comply with City of Colton requirements, which would also reduce impacts. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project geotechnical report concluded that on-site native soils and fill slopes constructed with native soils have a moderate susceptibility to erosion, but that mandatory compliance with the Project's NPDES permit, regulatory requirements of SCAQMD, and City of Colton, the Project-specific SWPPP and WQMP would ensure that water and wind erosion is minimized, and this impact would be less than significant. (Id., pp. 4.5-9, 4.5-10) No mitigation is required, which is consistent with the General Plan PEIR, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), the western portion of the Project site that abuts the Santa Ana River Channel may, absent mitigation, be susceptible to lateral spreading and liquefaction due to shallow groundwater conditions in this area of the project; due to the lithology and relatively high topographic relief of the site, significant impacts associated with landslides could also occur absent mitigation. (Id., pp. 4.5-10, 4.5-11) The potential for collapse is also "slight" to "moderate" absent mitigation, constituting a potentially significant impact. (Id., p. 4.5-12) With Roquet Ranch MMs 4.5-1 and 4.5-2 incorporated, this impact would be less than significant. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis because the Project would be subject to and comply with City of Colton requirements, which would also reduce impacts. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold d), the Project geotechnical report concluded that on-site soils exhibit an Expansion Index in the "very low" to "medium range," and recognizes that the General Plan PEIR indicates there is a small area of expansive soils on the Project site. (Id., p. 4.5-12) Accordingly, a potentially significant impact would occur absent mitigation. (Ibid.) However, implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.5-1 would reduce impacts to less than significant. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis because the Project would be subject to and comply with City of Colton requirements, which would also reduce impacts. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold e), the Project does not include any septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, and therefore no impact would occur. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change  Would the project:	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

No mitigation beyond continued implementation of the applicable General Plan policies is proposed, as the key way to attain consistency with the 2007 and 2012 AQMPs with regard to GHG emissions would be to adjust land use policies to allow for more residential growth in Colton during the planning horizon extending to 2035. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.7-26)

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concludes that construction emissions of greenhouse gases associated with build-out pursuant to land use policy would be less than significant, but that over the long-term, GHG emissions may exceed regional thresholds established as projected population capacity for Colton falls below population growth assumptions in the regional plans on a citywide basis. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.7-16) This long-term impact would be significant and unavoidable. 7

Short-term emissions from development construction would result from equipment used for demolition, grading, paving, and other building construction activities, and from worker and vendor trips to and from project sites. (Ibid.) The General Plan PEIR concludes that short-term climate change impacts due to future construction activities would not be significant. (Id., pp. 4.7-16, 4.7-17)

Long-term impacts from mobile, area, and operational sources would be continuous, and based on SCAG forecasting at the time the General Plan PEIR was prepared, the General Plan Update would generate approximately 24,502 metric tons of GHGs after the first year of growth and will increase additively as growth occurs over the long term; this volume would exceed the SCAQMD interim-threshold for all uses. (Id., p. 4.7-17) Accordingly, the General Plan PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update would potentially result in significant impacts related to long-term GHG emissions. (Ibid.)

Similarly with regard to threshold b), the PEIR concludes that the proposed General Plan Update has the potential to conflict with the 2012 SCAG RTP/SCS and CARB Scoping Plan—and thereby not attain GHG reductions targets— because land use policy does not support the same level of citywide population growth projected in the 2012 RTP/SCS, and impacts at the program level are significant and unavoidable. (Id., p. 4.7-18) The General Plan Update would not be inconsistent with CARB Scoping Plan reduction measures, including Cap-and-Trade, light-duty vehicle standards, energy efficiency standards, renewable portfolio standards, good movement measures, the million solar roofs program, standards for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, industrial emissions requirements, green building strategy, measures adopted to reduce high global warming potential gases, recycling and waste measures, and water efficiency programs and measures. (Id., pp. 4.7-18 to 4.7-21) However, it would potentially conflict with regional transportation-related GHG targets in place at the time the General Plan PEIR was prepared. (Id., pp. 4.7-19, 4.7-20) Also as assumed in the 2012 RTP/SCS, on a citywide basis, Colton is forecast to grow to a population of 71,700 with 29,600 jobs by 2035, and ultimate buildout under the General Plan Update can only accommodate 67,182 residents and 29,874 jobs, making it inconsistent with population growth estimates. (Id., p. 4.7-25) Despite potential inconsistencies with growth projections of the 2012 RTP/SCS with respect to citywide population growth projections, the proposed General Plan Update will directly support the implementation of the RTP/SCS in achieving mandated GHG reduction targets through its policies oriented towards improvements in the region's multimodal transportation system and coordinating land use patterns around high quality transit corridors; nevertheless, the General Plan Update would not be entirely consistent with the 2012 RTP/SCS's population growth projections for Colton on a citywide basis, and long-term, cumulative impacts with respect to climate change remain potentially significant and unavoidable. (Id., pp. 4.7-26, 6-4, 6-5)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project EIR evaluates the Project's potential to achieve the GHG-reduction performance standard applicable to new development proposals established by the City of Colton's Climate Action Plan (CAP), as well as the Project's consistency with the updated 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS. With regard to the CAP, the Project EIR notes that the CAP establishes a GHG-reduction Performance Standard specifically applicable to new development projects – if a project would exceed 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> of GHG emissions per year, the CAP requires it to reduce its emissions by 25 percent below year 2008 BAU emission levels. Per the CAP, a project can demonstrate compliance with the applicable performance standard by achieving a minimum of 75 points pursuant to CAP screening tables by selecting and implementing a suite of reduction measures that would collectively achieve the points. (Id., p. 4.6-38) Accordingly, to ensure consistency with the CAP, Roquet Ranch MM 4.6-1 requires the Project to implement a suite of GHG-reducing project design features that together achieve a minimum 75 points, thereby satisfying the CAP Performance Standard for new development. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and the Supreme Court's 2015 decision in *Center for Biological Diversity v. Newhall Ranch*, proposed projects determined to be consistent with a CAP may be considered to have a less-than-significant impact related to GHG emissions. (Id., p. 4.6-39) (Ibid.) For the reasons described in the Project EIR, the Project is also consistent with the 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS, which was adopted by SCAG subsequent to certification of the General Plan EIR. (Id., pp. 4.6-40 to 4.6-42) In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and *Newhall Ranch*, proposed projects determined to be consistent with the RTP/SCS may be considered to have a less-than-significant impact related to GHG emissions, as determined in the Project EIR. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project EIR evaluates consistency with regulatory programs designed to reduce GHG emissions and that contribute to the achievement of AB 32's greenhouse gas reduction goals as the primary significance criteria. (Id., p. 4.6-35) The Project EIR concludes that the Project would comply with applicable regulations designed to reduce GHG emissions, thus contributing to the achievement of the GHG reduction goals of AB32 and the Scoping Plan. (Id., p. 4.6-43) The regulations implementing the Scoping Plan apply directly to the Project in regards to energy efficiency of the buildings, water conservation, and refrigerant usage. (Ibid.) Scoping Plan measures regarding motor vehicle fuel efficiency apply to vehicle manufacturers, but result in lower emissions from vehicles accessing the Project site; the Renewable Portfolio Standard applies to electric utilities, but reduce emissions related to electricity used by the Project. (Ibid.) The Project EIR evaluates the Project's significance with respect to consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations by emission source categories of transportation/mobile sources, energy use, water supply, treatment and distribution, and waste. (Id., p. 4.6-44) The EIR also considers consistency with Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15. (Id., pp. 4.6-47, 4.6-48) Based on this analysis, the Project EIR concludes that the Project would comply with and be consistent with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations, and the impact would be less than significant. (Id., pp. 4.6-44 to 4.6-48) These impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Id., pp. 4.6-48, 4.6-49) Under thresholds b), the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

<b>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>  Would the project result in:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. A significant hazard to the public or the environment is created through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A significant hazard to the public or the environment is created through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Hazardous emissions are emitted or hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes are handled within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. A significant hazard to the public or the environment is created through development of a site that is included on a list of hazardous waste sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. People residing or working in the planning area are subject to safety hazards due to the planning area or portions thereof being located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
f. People residing or working in the planning area are subject to safety hazards due to the planning area or portions thereof being located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. The program impairs implementation of or physically interferes with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM 4.8.D-1:** Applications for new development projects requiring City discretionary approval shall include the results of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), prepared in accordance with the latest ASTM protocol for such assessments. If the Phase I ESA indicates some evidence of site contamination exists that could require cleanup to avoid danger to people or damage to the environment, a Phase II level review shall be completed to fully characterize the nature and extent of such contamination, and the scope of required clean up procedures. The results of the Phase II assessment shall be considered as part of the CEQA compliance process prior to any action on the project.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a), b), and c), the General Plan PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update would result in less than significant impacts from the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and waste. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.8-14) While the General Plan Update would indirectly cause the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes, particularly originating from or being delivered to the many industrial businesses in the City, compliance with existing regulations including Mobility

Element Update policies and state and federal law, would adequately prevent, respond to, and/or clean up accidental releases of hazardous materials and wastes. (Id., pp. 4.8-14 to 4.8-16) This impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold d), the PEIR concludes that absent mitigation, the General Plan Update could indirectly result in significant impacts from development on or near contaminated sites. (Id., p. 4.8-16) To ensure that site contamination is identified and addressed during development review, General Plan PEIR MM 4.8.D-1 requires site assessments prior to project approval, and performance standards for clean-up as necessary. (Ibid.) With mitigation incorporated, impacts would be less than significant. (Ibid.)

With regard to thresholds e) and f), the PEIR concludes that no private or public airport or airstrips are located within or near the planning area, and there would therefore be no impact. (Id., p. 4.8-17)

Under threshold g), the PEIR concludes that there would be no impact, because the General Plan Update would not include any proposed changes in the physical organization of the planning area that could interfere with the City's emergency response plan, and disaster response procedures are flexible enough to allow for emergency response services and City staff to adequately respond to varying emergencies. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold h), the PEIR concludes that development allowed for by the General Plan Update in the La Loma Hills and the Box Springs Mountains may expose persons and structures to wildland fires at the interface between natural and built environments, constituting a potentially significant impact over the long term without any protective measures implemented. (Id., p. 4.8-17) However, 701A of the California Building Code would minimize the potential for property destruction and danger to people, and the General Plan would not interfere with implementation of this regulation; impacts would therefore be less than significant. (Ibid.)

The proposed General Plan Update would not result in a considerable contribution to the regional increase in the use, transport, disposal, or exposure to hazardous materials or wastes, or wildfires. (Id., p. 6-5)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** Under threshold a), the Project EIR concludes that Project construction may entail transport and/or disposal of hazardous materials, and potential presence of hazardous material in on-site soils could cause a release into the environment during construction; however, through mandatory compliance with regulations addressing the proper use storage, and disposal of hazardous substances, and implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.7-1, impacts would be less than significant. (Project EIR, pp. 4.7-6 to 4.7-8) Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold b), the Project EIR concludes that there is potential for soil contamination on the site, which is considered a potentially significant impact during Project construction when historical features would be removed and a release could occur. (Id., pp. 4.7-8, 4.7-9) Implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.7-1 would address potential soil contamination on-site, and this impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. (Id., p. 4.7-9) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), the Project is not located within one-quarter mile of any existing or planned school, and the Project would not entail the use of acutely hazardous materials, use of

hazardous materials, or significant hazardous emissions within one-quarter mile of the Project school site. (Id., pp. 4.7-9, 4.7-10) There would be No Impact.

With regard to threshold d), the Project site is not listed on any list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and there would be No Impact. (Id., p. 4.7-10) Because there would be no impact, General Plan PEIR MM 4.8.D-1 does not apply.

With regard to threshold e), the Project site is not located within two miles of an airport, nor is it located within an airport land use compatibility plan area; this is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and there would be No Impact. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold f), the Project site is not located in the vicinity of any private airstrips, this is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and there would be No Impact. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold g), the Project-related development would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, nor does the Project site serve as an emergency evacuation route. (Id., p. 4.7-11) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and there would be No Impact.

Under threshold h), the Project EIR concludes that the Project site is located within a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” of a Local Responsibility Area identified by the City, but that mandatory compliance with the fuel modification requirements and building design requirements of the City of Colton Fire Department, and compliance with Section 701A of the California Building Code, would result in less than significant impacts. (Id., pp. 4.7-11, 4.7-12) No mitigation is required, this is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

<p><b>9. Hydrology and Water Quality</b></p> <p>Would the project:</p>	<p><b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b></p>	<p><b>No Impact</b></p>
<p>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

9. Hydrology and Water Quality	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project: drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a) and f), the General Plan PEIR concludes that implementation of the General Plan Update would not violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or otherwise degrade water quality. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.9-24) While future development consistent with the General Plan land use policy has the potential to increase urban runoff from residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, recreational, utility, and roadway sources, and the Land Use Element allows for the potential conversion of some open space lands to industrial development, the City would inspect all commercial and industrial development and enforces structural and non-structural BMPs as adopted in site specific SWQMPs to ensure compliance with the City’s MS4 permit (through which

the City implements NPDES provisions) and eliminate discharges. (Id., pp. 4.9-24, 4.9-25) Violations of water quality standards due to urban runoff would also be prevented through the continued implementation of existing regional water quality regulations and through the successful implementation of the City's local water quality control standards imposed on new development and redevelopment over the long-term. (Id., p. 4.9-25) Any increase in pollutant loading wastewater due to increased development under the General Plan Update would also be subject to regulation by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, through Order R8-2006-0052, such that waste would be properly treated and beneficial uses of the Santa Ana River would be maintained. (Id., pp. 4.9-25, 4.9-26) Impacts would be less than significant under thresholds a) and f), and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold b), the PEIR concludes that future development could potentially cause impacts because it would require additional water services from local groundwater supply, could impact groundwater recharge by increasing impervious surfaces that could hinder percolation of drainage into subsurface aquifers, and could direct drainage away from natural sources. (Id., p. 4.9-26) However, implementation of the City's Water Department policies and programs, including the Urban Water Management Plan, would support safe yield, ensure groundwater is recharged both naturally and with assistance, and conserve water. (Ibid.) Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.9-27)

With regard to thresholds c) and d), the PEIR concludes that while future development within the planning area is likely to change drainage patterns that could have the potential to result in on- or off-site erosion, siltation, or flooding, flooding and sedimentation impacts would be less than significant with implementation of existing City standards. (Ibid.) The floodplain management regulations of the Colton Municipal Code are specifically designed to prevent and regulate unnatural diversion of drainage that could result in flooding, and to address potential damage associated with fluvial erosion. (Id., p. 4.9-28) Development of storm drainage facilities is subject to the standard designs of the City's Engineering Division, which provide for facilities that include catch basins, pipe bedding, culverts, and drop inlets. (Ibid.) Implementation of these laws and standards would ensure that impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold e), the PEIR concludes that while future development under the General Plan Update could potentially increase stormwater flows into existing storm drain systems and increase the amount of urban runoff and pollutants in stormwater, this impact will be less than significant with implementation of existing standards and regulations. (Ibid.) The City's Engineering Department requires hydrology and stormwater discharge review during the City's standard development review process, and conditions of approval are based on the project's drainage needs pursuant to municipal NPDES permit requirements and standard engineering practices. (Ibid.) Post-construction BMPs are also implemented through preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to identify site design, structural and non-structural source control and treatment control BMPs applicable to individual projects. (Ibid.) On- and off-site drainage control and storm drain design is reviewed through applicable submission of hydrology reports and storm drain plans, and drainage must comply with the City's Master Plan of Drainage. (Id, p. 4.9-29) Consistency with all of these requirements ensures that impacts would be less than significant, with no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold g), the PEIR concludes that the proposed Land Use Element update would not include land use changes that would increase residential densities in a 100-year flood hazard zone, and there would therefore be no impact. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold h), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the diversion of floodwaters would be less than significant with implementation of existing City regulations, because structures within portions of the Santa Ana River area would be subject to the Floodplain Management Regulations (Chapter 15.18 of the Colton Municipal Code) that require hydrological evaluation to ensure minimal diversion to prevent flooding; these regulations specifically prohibit construction of structures that could cause or divert floodwater without appropriate site planning and structural design. (Id., pp. 4.9-29, 4.9-30) Compliance with these requirements would ensure impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.9-30)

With regard to threshold i), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to inundation due to dam or levee failure will be less than significant with implementation of existing Federal and County regulations. (Ibid.) The update would allow for development in areas subject to inundation due to failure of the Seven Oaks Dam and Levee ID 4964, Levee ID 13544, and Santa Ana River, but the General Plan Update would not interfere with the City's responsibilities to rectify any levee within or protecting the planning area, and continued maintenance in accordance with Federal law will provide sufficient safeguards against potential damage. (Ibid.) The National Dam Safety Act of 2006 also requires regular inspection of dams to reduce risks associated with dam failure, and requires submittal of an evacuation plan. (Ibid.) An evacuation for the Seven Oaks Dam is on file with the State Office of Emergency Services, and the dam is designated for a five-year inspection schedule; continued inspection, maintenance, and the procedures outlined in the evacuation plan would ensure this impact is less than significant. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold j), the PEIR concludes that impacts associated with mudflows, tsunami, and seiche will be less than significant with implementation of existing City regulations. (Id., p. 4.9-31) The potential for mudflow is minimal because of generally level grade and lack of hillsides and floodplains, but the southern portion of the planning area is subject to mudflows from the Box Springs Mountains. (Ibid.) The City's Floodplain Management Regulations address debris flow hazards and set provisions for minimizing hazards within floodways; future development will be subject to this ordinance to prevent hazards from mudflows and other debris flow issues. (Ibid.) Due to the planning area's distance to the Pacific Ocean, there is no potential for tsunami hazards, and there are no open reservoirs or other bodies of water that could cause potential seiche hazards. (Ibid.) This impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

The proposed General Plan Update will not have a cumulatively considerable impact on groundwater resources, drainage and water quality, or flooding. (Id., pp. 6-6, 6-7)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during long-term operation. (Project EIR, p. 4.8-11) However, Project construction would require clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, landscaping activities, and the building of homes and other non-residential structures which would generate potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents. (Id., p. 4.8-10) The Project would therefore potentially cause short-term water quality impacts, in the absence of any avoidance or protection measures. (Ibid.) The Project would be subject to Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and City of Colton regulatory requirements, and is therefore required to prepare a Storm Water Pollutant Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with BMPs to address construction-related water quality issues and propose design features including water quality basins and water quality/detention basins to address long-term water quality. (Ibid.) Mandatory compliance with these requirements would ensure that the Project has less than significant impacts, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with

General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project EIR concludes that the Project has a reliable source of domestic water and does not propose any new potable water wells that would directly extract groundwater, nor would it increase the current rate of extraction at the on-site domestic water well. (Id., pp. 4.8-11, 4.8-12) Further, groundwater recharge would occur in onsite detention basins and landscaped areas, and water conveyed off-site would have the ability to percolate into the groundwater table; the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. (Id., p. 4.8-12) Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) The Project would also be subject to policies in the Urban Water Management Plan, as noted in the General Plan PEIR. The Project EIR analysis is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR

With regard to thresholds c) and d), the Project EIR concludes that the Project would have less than significant impacts, and no mitigation is required. (Id., pp. 4.8-12 to 4.8-16) The Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation impacts on- or off-site because proposed drainage improvements would reduce erosion and sedimentation and siltation as compared to existing conditions by the addition of paved surfaces and landscaping to reduce the area of bare, uncovered soils and the implementation of proposed BMPs to remove sediment from stormwater runoff before it is discharged from the Project site. (Id., p. 4.8-16) The Project's stormwater runoff would also not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, because proposed drainage improvements (four water quality basins and two water quality/detention basins) on-site would ensure that outflow from the site is within the capacity of off-site facilities. (Id., pp. 4.8-13, 4.8-16) As discussed in the General Plan PEIR, construction of the facilities would be subject to design standards of the City's Engineering Division. The analysis is consistent with the General Plan PEIR analysis, impacts would be less than significant with no mitigation required, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR

With regard to threshold e), the Project's stormwater runoff would not exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, for the same reasons described above with regard to thresholds c) and d). (Id., pp. 4.8-16, 4.8-17) The Project would also be subject to the requirements described in the General Plan PEIR. Impacts are less than significant, no mitigation is required, and this analysis is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR

Under threshold f), the Project EIR concludes that there are no other conditions associated with the Proposed Project that would otherwise result in the substantial degradation of water quality, and there would be No Impact. (Id., p. 4.8-17) This analysis is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis.

With regard to thresholds g) and h), small portions of the Project site are located within a 100-year flood hazard zone. (Ibid.) The Project is therefore required to obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and Permanent Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA, without which a significant impact would occur. (Ibid.) If the Project meets the minimum floodplain management criteria of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), FEMA would issue the CLOMR to allow full construction activities to occur on-site and upon issuance of appropriate

permits by the City. (Ibid.) After construction but before home occupation, the Project Applicant would provide FEMA with detailed “as-built” drawings and flood hazard analyses, and a standard application package, to demonstrate that the Project was constructed in accordance with preliminary plans approved by FEMA, and FEMA would issue a LOMR. (Id., pp. 4.8-17, 4.8-18) Implementation of Roquet Ranch MMs 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 would ensure this process is carried out, and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 4.8-18). Because the Project’s potential flood hazards would be mitigated to a less than significant level under thresholds g) and h), the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously identified in the General Plan PEIR for these impact categories.

With regard to threshold i), the Project is not located within an inundation area associated with a dam or levee, and as such would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. (Id., pp. 4.8-18, 4.8-19) However, as discussed under thresholds g) and h), portions of the easterly and southerly areas of the Project site are currently located within an existing 100-year flood hazard area, and the Project’s potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of flooding is considered potentially significant absent mitigation. (Id, p. 4.8-19) As discussed above, the implementation of Roquet Ranch MMs 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. (Ibid.) The Project site is not one of the areas subject to inundation as described in the General Plan EIR. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold j), the Project site is located too far away from enclosed water bodies and the ocean to be subjected to hazards associated with seiches or tsunamis. (Ibid.) Due to the steep topographic relief at the Project site and the potential for landslides discussed in EIR Subsection 4.5, Geology and Soils, the potential exists for mudflow events to occur at the site during construction activities. (bid.) However, implementation of the BMPs from the Project-specific WQMP and SWPPP during construction activities would reduce the potential for mudflow events to a less than significant level. (Id., pp. 4.8-19, 4.8-20) In the post development condition, the potential for the occurrence of mudflow events is low due to the presence of engineered slopes and flood control features. (Id., p. 4.8-20) Accordingly, impacts associated with mudflow are less than significant. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

10. Land Use and Planning	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update would not physically divide an established community, and there would be no impact. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.10-14) This is because the proposed Land Use Plan would retain the City’s primarily residential character, while permitting additional commercial development and industrial uses adjacent to existing concentrations of these uses, and the proposed Circulation Element does not establish any new transportation routes or facilities. (Ibid.) The proposed plan also supports the maintenance of established communities through Land Use Element policies. (Id., pp. 4.10-14, 4.10-15) There would be no impact, and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Id., p. 6-7)

With regard to threshold b), the PEIR notes that no other agency has jurisdiction over land use issues in the City of Colton, and San Bernardino County has jurisdiction over land use issues within the City’s Sphere of Influence; the PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update would have a less than significant impact with regard to possible conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of another agency. (Id., p. 4.10-15) This impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (Id., pp. 6-7 to 6-13)

With regard to threshold c), the PEIR concludes that though portions of the City of Colton are located within Recovery Units of the adopted Delhi-Sands Flower-Loving Fly Recovery Plan, the proposed General Plan Update’s Land Use Plan designates these areas as open space, thereby

promoting the objectives of the plan and resulting in no impact. (Id., pp. 4.10-15, 4.10-16) This impact would not be cumulatively considerable. (Id., p. 6-13)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project EIR concludes that the Project would not physically divide an established community. (Project EIR, p. 4.9-7) The Project site is largely vacant, and is bordered but undeveloped lands to the north and west. (Ibid.) The proposed roadway improvements would accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access between the existing residential neighborhoods located east and south of the Project site, but would not result in division of these existing neighborhoods. (Ibid.) The proposed Project would rather be a logical expansion of the existing residential area located along the western side of La Cadena Drive. (Ibid.) The Project would have No Impact, which is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis.

With regard to threshold b), the Project EIR concludes that although the Project would result in a change to the general plan land use designations for the Project site in order to accommodate the approval of the specific plan, these changes would not result in any conflicts with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or reducing an environmental effect. (Project EIR, p. 4.9-8) Further, Table 4.9-1 of the Project EIR demonstrates that the Project would not be inconsistent with applicable General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. (Id., pp. 4.9-8 to 4.9-31) The Project would also be consistent with the City of Colton Zoning Code upon implementation of a change of zone, would be consistent with the Hillside Standards in Chapter 18.41 of the Colton Municipal Code, and would be consistent with SCAG 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy ("SCAG RTP/SCS"). (Id., pp. 4.9-32 to 4.9-35) This impact would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), the Project site is not located within an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. (Id., p. 4.9-35) The Final West Valley HCP for the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly does not designate the Project site for habitat conservation. (Ibid.) Therefore, the Project would have No Impact, which is consistent with the General Plan PEIR analysis.

11. Mineral Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. The availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State are lost.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. The availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan is lost.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a) the General Plan PEIR concludes that although the General Plan Update will not result in the direct loss of a known mineral resource, implementation of the General Plan Update and development pursuant to the proposed Land Use Plan may result in loss of mineral resources if the proposed Land Use Element changes a vacant area located within MRZ-2 from a land use designation that supports current or future mineral extraction to a designation that would preclude future extraction of mineral resources. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.11-6) In order for the loss to be considered significant, an area and its surroundings must also be conducive to mineral extraction operations. (Ibid.) Based on the analysis of the proposed General Plan Update and the principals of the existing General Plan elements that will not be affected by the Update, impacts related to the loss of known mineral resources will be less than significant. (Id., p. 4.11-7)

With regard to threshold b), there are no identified locally important mineral resources in the City of Colton, and there would therefore be no impacts to locally important mineral resources as a result of implementation of the General Plan Update. (Id., p. 4.11-7) The General Plan Update would not contribute to a significant cumulative loss of mineral resources. (Id., p. 6-13)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** The Proposed Project site is not located in any mineral resource zones, with the exception of a small portion of MRZ-2 that occurs on the southern portion of the site where geologic data indicates Portland cement concrete-grade aggregate resources are present due to the Santa Ana River; the site is not used for mineral resource extraction activities, and such activities have not been known to previously occur on the site. (Project EIR, p. 5-10) The City only permits resource mining activities in the Heavy Industrial (M-2) zone, and none of the Project site is zoned M-2, making future use for mineral extraction improbable. (Ibid.)

No Impact would occur. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

12. Noise  Would the project:	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established by the City of Colton General Plan or Municipal Code.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above the existing levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels above existing levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Expose people residing or working within two miles of any public airport to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Expose people residing or working within two miles of a private airport to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required. The General Plan Update PEIR concludes that no mitigation beyond continued implementation of General Plan policies, proposed Noise Element policies, and Municipal Code policies is required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a) and c), the General Plan PEIR concludes that projected long-term traffic volumes, the extension of new roadway segments, and the proposed land uses located near rail lines and other sensitive land uses would increase noise levels by less than significant levels with continued implementation of General Plan policies. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.12-17) The General Plan Update would not authorize any specific construction, and potential increases in noise levels along existing and proposed roadways would be assessed in conjunction with the City's review of future project-specific noise impact analyses for development pursuant to the update. (Id., p. 4.12-21) The proposed land use plan was also designed to buffer residential land uses from incompatible uses to the greatest extent possible. (Ibid.) Enforcement of General Plan Noise Standard 1, which states that residential structures should be constructed to maintain interior noise levels of not greater than 45 dBA through the use of sound barrier improvements, building design, construction materials and/or insulating, will reduce noise impacts related to incompatible land uses to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 4.12-22) No mitigation is necessary.

With regard to threshold b), exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels with implementation of the General Plan Update will result in a less than significant impact. (Ibid.) First, there are no extremely fragile or fragile historic structures, ruins, or ancient monuments in the planning area. (Id., p. 4.12-23) Second, the proposed General Plan Update does not authorize any construction or other land altering activity that could result in construction-related vibration, and potential vibration impacts due to future construction activities would be assessed in conjunction with the City's routine review of site-specific geotechnical studies, with recommended grading and foundation design measures incorporated as necessary. (Id., pp. 4.12-24, 4.12-25) This would provide an adequate mechanism to require special measures to mitigate potentially significant vibration impacts. (Id., p. 4.12-25) The same would be true for a project within an area affected by train vibration near the UP and BNSF railway lines that run through Colton – project-level studies would estimate potential vibration levels and identify specific building construction methods that would mitigate potentially significant vibration impacts. (Ibid.) Therefore, this impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold d), while the General Plan Update would allow for additional development of residential and mixed-use development resulting in increased temporary or intermittent noise impacts, those impacts would be less than significant with the continued implementation of the City's Municipal Code Section 8.108.020, which specifies that it is "unlawful for any person to make, continue or cause to be made or continued any loud, unnecessary and excessive noise which disturbs, offends, injures or endangers the peace, quiet, comfort, repose, health or safety of any neighborhood or person within the limits of the City." (Id., pp. 4.12-26, 4.12-27) Enforcement of this section would ensure impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.12-27)

With regard to thresholds e) and f), the PEIR concludes that the General Plan Update would not expose people residing or working within two miles of any public airport or private airport to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic, and there would be no impact, because the City of Colton is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. (Ibid.) The General Plan Update also would not result in cumulatively considerable noise impacts. (Id., p. 6-14)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a), c), and d), the Project EIR concludes that while Project construction could create temporary, intermittent noise, it would not exceed the 85 dBA Leq for construction activities occurring near sensitive receptors over a period

of eight hours or more adopted by NIOSH. (Project EIR, p. 4.10-15) Impacts would be further reduced by implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.10-1, which limits construction activities to 7:00 am-7:00 pm Mondays to Saturdays. (Ibid.) This impact would be less than significant. With regard to off-site transportation-related noise, the Project would have less than significant impacts in Existing with Project Conditions, Opening Year 2020 With Project Conditions, and Horizon Year 2040 With Project Conditions scenarios. (Ibid.) If unmitigated, the Project would expose residential homes to on-site exterior traffic noise that would exceed the standard in Planning Areas 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9, but that with Roquet Ranch MM 4.10-2 incorporated, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 4.10-17) With regard to on-site interior traffic noise, without the installation of upgraded windows (i.e., windows with a minimum STC rating of 32), proposed residences within Planning Area 9 that abut La Cadena Drive would experience interior noise levels that exceed the City of Colton 45 dBA CNEL interior noise level standard, but that with Roquet Ranch MM 4.10-3 incorporated, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 4.10-18) The Project EIR analysis is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), while the Project construction vibration levels would approach 0.028 in/sec PPV at a distance of 54 to 3,629, and a peak of 0.098 in/sec PPV at a distance of 25 feet, this is below the County of San Bernardino standard of 0.2 in/sec PPV. (Id., p. 4.10-20) Construction would further be restricted to daytime hours consistent with City of Colton requirements and Roquet Ranch MM 4.10-1 (not required for this impact, but would further reduce impacts), thereby eliminating potential vibration impacts during the sensitive nighttime hours. (Id., pp. 4.10-20, 4.10-21) Therefore, construction-related vibration impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.10-21) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold e), the Project EIR concludes that while Flabob Airport is 4 miles from the Project site, the Project site is not within the airport land use compatibility plan area of any airport, or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. (Id., p. 4.10-20) Therefore, the Project would have No Impact, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis.

With regard to threshold f), the Project EIR concludes that because there are no private airfield or airstrips in the vicinity of the Project site, implementation of the Project would not expose on-site residents or workers to safety hazards associated with private airfields or airstrips. (Id., p. 4.10-21) The project would have No Impact, this is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

13. Population, Housing, and Employment	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units and necessitates the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace a substantial number of people and necessitates the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concludes that implementation of the General Plan Update would have a less than significant impact on inducing population and housing growth, because the anticipated increase is consistent with SCAG’s 2012-2035 forecasts. (General Plan PEIR, pp. 4.13-2, 4.13-3) No mitigation is required.

Under thresholds b) and c), the PEIR concluded that there would be no impact because the General Plan Update does not propose policies that would result in displacement or demolition of permanent or temporary residential structures. (Id., pp. 4.13-3, 4.13-4) While some older, existing structures might be removed due to deterioration or replaced with more efficient and valuable land uses, this would occur with or without implementation of the General Plan Update, and there is no impact; no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

While the General Plan Update will not directly or indirectly create growth, since it does not provide the capacity for projected long-term population growth and may indirectly guide population growth elsewhere in the region, thus potentially resulting in a cumulative significant indirectly induced population growth. (Id., pp. 6-14, 6-15)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project EIR concludes that although the Project would accommodate a population of approximately 3,633 residents, the

City's General Plan anticipated this growth, and it would not qualify as substantial growth induced by the Project – the growth is nominal as compared to the 5,958 residents that could result from development in accordance with existing General Plan land use designations applicable to the Project site. (Project EIR, p.4.11-3) There are no physical environmental effects specific to population growth on the Project site that would result in a significant adverse effect to the environment. (Id., p. 4.11-4) As such, the Project would have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the General Plan PEIR.

With regard to thresholds b) and c), the Project EIR concludes that the Project site is predominantly vacant and undeveloped, and contains no housing under existing conditions; it therefore would not result in the displacement of a substantial amount of existing housing or people, nor result in the need for construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and would in fact improve the City's housing supply. (Ibid.) The Project would have No Impact. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis.

<b>14. Public Services</b>  Would the project result in Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following services:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Fire Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Public Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** Under threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concludes that with implementation of existing General Plan and Municipal Code policies and requirements, impacts related to the expansion of fire protection facilities to maintain applicable service standards will be less than significant. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.14-7) Fire protection facilities would need to be expanded under General Plan Update buildout, to ensure that engine- and ladder-equipped facilities are within the appropriate distance and ensure that emergency service calls are responded to within the recommended six minute response time, in the Pellissier Ranch, Reche Canyon, and West Valley areas. (Ibid.) The General Plan Safety Element requires review of development proposals by the Fire Department to monitor the adequacy of fire service and ensure adequate water pressure and supply, and the collection of development impact fees will incrementally fund expansion or construction of new facilities as growth is accommodated in the City guided by the proposed General Plan Update’s policies. (Id., p. 4.14-8) The PEIR concludes that at the time particular fire facilities are proposed, they will undergo development review and be subject to environmental review subject to CEQA; mitigation will be identified as necessary to reduce impacts related to expansion or new construction. (Ibid.) Impacts would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

Under threshold b), the PEIR concludes that with implementation of existing General Plan and Municipal Code policies and requirements, impacts related to the expansion of police protection

facilities to maintain applicable service standards would be less than significant. (Ibid.) In order to ensure that police protection and emergency services are adequate as the community grows under the General Plan Update, expansion or construction of new facilities, purchasing of new equipment, and hiring of more employees may be necessary. (Id., p. 4.14-9) The General Plan Safety Element requires Police Department review of development proposals to monitor the adequacy of police services and implement crime prevention development techniques, and the collection of development impact fees will incrementally fund expansion or construction of new facilities as growth is accommodated in the City guided by the proposed General Plan Update's policies. (Ibid.) Further, If a police protection facility is to be expanded or constructed, the police facility will undergo a development review process and will be subject to environmental review pursuant to CEQA, with mitigation identified as necessary to minimize environmental impacts. (Ibid.) The impacts would therefore be less than significant with implementation of General Plan policies and environmental review standards, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

Under threshold c), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the expansion of school facilities to maintain applicable service standards would be less than significant with implementation of existing state regulations. (Ibid.) While an estimated three new elementary schools, one new middle school, and one new high school would need to be constructed to accommodate the anticipated General Plan buildout population, each district would continue to collect development impact fees to pay for the cost of expanding and constructing facilities, in accordance with state law. (Id., pp. 4.14-10, 4.14-11) Further, environmental review under CEQA would be required for expansion or new construction projects, and mitigation identified and incorporated as necessary. (Id., p. 4.14-11) Therefore, the impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

Under threshold d), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the expansion and construction of parks to maintain applicable service standards would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of existing General Plan and Municipal Code policies and requirements. (Ibid.) While the City does not currently meet its goal of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, and additional parkland would be needed as the population grows, the existing General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element includes proposals for the acquisition, maintenance, and financing of parkland and open space. (Ibid.) The City would continue to implement these through the collection of Quimby fees and development impact fees during building check of development projects. (Ibid.) For individual park projects, identification and mitigation of potentially significant impacts would occur as part of the City's routine planning and design process. (Ibid.) However, the General Plan PEIR concludes that the standard will likely still not be met, and the impact would be remain significant with implementation of existing requirements; no mitigation is identified (Id., pp. 4.14-11, 2-16) This impact is potentially cumulatively significant. (Id., p. 6-15)

With regard to threshold e), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the expansion and construction of libraries to maintain applicable service standards would be less than significant with implementation of existing Municipal Code requirements. (Id., p. 4.14-12) At the time, a new library facility was tentatively planned to be constructed with Civic Center improvements. (Ibid.) The PEIR notes that the City collects and would continue to collection development impact fees to support incremental expansion of library services, and any new or expanded facilities would be subject to environmental review under CEQA. (Ibid.) If necessary, appropriate mitigation will be identified and implemented for those projects. (Ibid.) As such, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project EIR concludes that development of the proposed Project site would result in up to 1,050 residential units and other

uses, which would increase the demand for fire protection services from the CFD as compared to existing conditions. (Project EIR, p. 4.12-5) Implementation of the Project would accommodate development of an on-site fire station site, which would not result in additional physical impacts to the environment that are not already addressed throughout the EIR and that would not be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated. (Id., pp. 4.12-5, 4.12-6) Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.12-6) This consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project EIR concludes that the Colton Police department has adequate physical capacity to serve the proposed Project, and no new or expanded police protection facilities are required. (Ibid.) Further, the Project would be required to pay Development Impact Fees, which would further reduce impacts. (Ibid.) The Project would have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with the General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), the Project EIR notes that the Project proposes a 10.3-acre site to accommodate development of an on-site elementary school facility; its construction and operation impacts are studied throughout the Project EIR, and it would not have additional physical impact other than those discussed in the EIR. (Id., p. 4.12-7) Further, the Project will be required to contribute fees to the CJUSD in accordance with SB 50 and the Colton Municipal Code, to offset the costs associated with increasing school capacity needs. (Ibid.) With mandatory compliance, the Project would have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with the General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold d), the Project would provide 19.3 acres of parkland, which is 8.4 acres above the City's Municipal Code parkland requirement, and 1 acre above the minimum required to meet the goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. (Id., p. 4.12-7) The Project would meet the standard to contribute toward meeting the City's goal, and would not be required to pay in-lieu park dedication fees. (Ibid.) Impacts due to the physical construction and operation of the parks are studied throughout the Project EIR, and it would not have additional physical impact other than those discussed in the EIR. (Ibid.) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) While the General Plan PEIR concluded that the impact would remain significant due to the infeasibility of meeting the standard city-wide, the Project would exceed the standard, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold e), the Project would be required to pay required development impact fees to support the expansion of library services commensurate with the Project. (Id., p. 4.12-8) The development of these expanded or new library facilities would be subject to further environmental review, to ensure the minimization of environmental impacts to the extent feasible. (Ibid.) As such, the Project would have a less than significant impact. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

15. Recreation	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project: a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or requires the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM 4.15-1:** Either as part of a parks master plan or other method, the City will identify residential neighborhoods that are not well served by public parks, and will establish a long-range strategy for meeting the goals of: a) providing five acres of park space per 1,000 residents and b) having a City park within one-half mile of every residential neighborhood. In addition to using Quimby Act and Development Impact Fees to fund parkland acquisition and enhancements, the City will seek grant funds to finance these initiatives.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a) and b), the General Plan Update would not result in direct deterioration to recreational facilities because it does not authorize any specific development project or other kind of land altering activity that could increase the use of existing recreational facilities. However, the increase in the resident population associated with long term implementation of land use policy could result in increased use of existing parks and recreation facilities, and therefore increased deterioration if no new park facilities are provided. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.14-4) The draft Land Use Element does not specifically provide for new park facilities, but does incorporate goals and policies to encourage their provision. (Id., pp. 4.14-4, 4.14-5) Colton is deficient in park space relative to its goal of five acres per 1,000 residents, a deficiency that would continue with adoption of the General Plan Update. (Id., p. 4.14-5) Impacts are assumed to be cumulatively significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated, because it cannot be projected whether requiring payment of Quimby fees and Development Impact Fees would result in new park space and adequate maintenance. (Id., pp. 4.14-5, 6-15)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would allow for the development of up to 1,050 residences on the Project site, with an estimated population of 3,633 residents (per General Plan Housing Element, average of 3.46 persons per household). (Project EIR, p. 4.13-4) The Proposed Project would provide 19.3 acres of combined park space, which is 8.4 acres above what is required to meet the City's Municipal Code parkland requirement of 3 acres per 1,000 residents (10.9 acres required) and 1.1 acre above what is required to meet the General Plan objective of 5 acres per 1,000 residents (18.2 acres required). (Ibid.) The Project would therefore contribute toward meeting the City's park land goals. Further, Project residents would be unlikely to utilize off-site parks to such an extent that it would contribute to deterioration, because the Project would adequately provide recreational amenities and parks in the Project site for the use of future residents, which would offset use of off-site facilities. (Ibid.) The Project's impacts to existing recreational facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. The physical impacts of constructing the on-site recreational facilities have been fully analyzed in the topic sections of the Project EIR (e.g., air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, etc.), and all impacts are less than significant or would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated. (Id., p. 4.13-5) Because the Proposed Project would have less than significant impacts, consideration of General Plan PEIR MM 4.15-1 is not required. The Proposed Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

<b>16. Transportation, Traffic, and Safety</b>  Would the project:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., results in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## PEIR Mitigation Measures

**MM 4.16-1:** Mitigation is required to address projected LOS F conditions at the study intersections identified in PEIR Table 4.16-4 and the roadway segments identified in PEIR Table 4.16-5. The recommended mitigation measures and their estimated effect on LOS values are summarized in PEIR Table 4.16-6 (a.m. peak) and PEIR Table 4.16-7 (p.m. peak). Collectively, these are referenced as Mitigation Measure 4.16-1 and then by the intersection location (for example, 4.16-1 #2). Mitigation and funding will be achieved in two ways. For those improvements that are identified in the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program (CMP) Development Mitigation Nexus Study, development impact fees will be paid as established by law. For those facilities not included in the CMP, localized intersection impacts will be addressed in conjunction with individual development applications that directly affect intersection LOS, as identified by a project-specific traffic study prepared during the entitlement process. As deemed appropriate by City staff, fair-share contributions could be made for these improvements until funding is fully available for implementation of the future identified mitigation measure. Final engineering studies would need to be completed for each physical improvement before implementation. A planning-level analysis was conducted for this analysis in order to provide a program-level review of potential mitigation measures. The general need for widening, and the extent of such required for each measure, would be determined as future development is entitled.

**MM 4.16-2: Colton Avenue, between Fairview Avenue and Mt. Vernon Avenue** The City will increase the roadway capacity to a four-lane cross-section. This configuration would affect existing bicycle path and service road segments. Alternatively, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization, and add additional traffic signals as warranted with future development. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees, and available state and federal grants.

**MM 4.16-3: La Cadena, between C Street and Valley Boulevard** As part of a broader citywide program, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization and add new traffic signals to unsignalized intersections as warranted with future development. This condition will be monitored over time and implemented as warranted. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees, and available state and federal grants.

**MM 4.16-4: Mount Vernon Avenue, between the I-10 freeway and M Street**

The City will increase roadway capacity to a four-lane cross-section. As this is a major capital improvement project that would affect the interchange ramp intersection with I-10, the bridge over railroad corridor/yard, and potentially the bridge over the Santa Ana River to the south of this segment, this is a long-term project that will require outside funding and coordination with the railroads, Caltrans, SANBAG, and possibly other agencies. The City will monitor conditions to determine when the improvements are warranted and schedule this improvement as part of a future Capital Improvement Plan. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees, the railroads, and available state and federal grants.

**MM 4.16-5: Mount Vernon Avenue, between I-215 and the Grand Terrace City limits** Provision of additional lanes, to a four-lane cross-section, may not be feasible due to challenging geography. Thus, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization, linked into Grand Terrace and Colton traffic signals. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees (in Colton and Grand Terrace), and available state and federal grants.

**MM 4.16-6: Reche Canyon Road, south of Washington Street**

The provision of additional lanes, to a six-lane cross-section in addition to planned corridor improvements, may not be feasible due to adjacent residential neighborhoods. Thus, as traffic signals become necessary with future residential development, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization. Funding sources will include SANBAG1, developer mitigation fees, and available state and federal grants.

MM 4.16-7: To implement Policy M-7.2 of the Mobility Element, the City of Colton shall attempt to enter into an agreement with the Cities of Riverside and/or Grand Terrace establishing a fair-share fee program for the purpose of funding necessary traffic improvements at any intersection immediately adjacent to the mutual boundaries of the Cities of Colton, Grand Terrace, and Riverside that is significantly impacted on a cumulative basis. Projects within each city shall be responsible for paying their fair share towards such improvements. In recognition that each city affects the other's roadway network, such fair share fee program shall cover improvements and intersection within all three cities. Such a fair share fee program shall be established after the commissioning of a traffic study and nexus study (jointly funded by the participating cities) to specifically identify the nature, location, timing, and cost of all improvements necessary to ensure that cumulative significant impacts are all adequately addressed and mitigated, and the fair share fee program shall require the implementation of identified improvements at the appropriate time.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to thresholds a) and b), the General Plan PEIR concludes that long-term implementation of land use policy, in combination with regional contributions to traffic on the local road network, will cause an increase in traffic that will result in two intersections and several roadway segments operating below an acceptable Level of Service, causing a significant impact. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.16-20) Because complete funding for all of the mitigation requirements could not be identified, and because the analysis indicated that not all identified improvements can be mitigated based on available information, at the time the General Plan PEIR was certified, impacts are assumed to remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated. (Id., pp. 4.16-32, 6-23, 6-24)

With regard to threshold c), the PEIR concludes that impacts with respect to air traffic patterns would be less than significant, because future development pursuant to the proposed General Plan Update would be a sufficient distance from applicable airports. (Id., p. 4.16-25)

Under threshold d), the PEIR concludes that impacts with respect traffic hazards would be less than significant because implementation of the Mobility Element would provide safe traffic conditions, and circulation network plan improvements would be designed in accordance with all applicable standards relating to vehicle traffic, bicycles, and pedestrian safety. (Ibid.)

Under threshold e), the PEIR concludes that because future development will be subject to the City's Fire Code, the General Plan update does not include policies that would change standards related to emergency access, and nor will it interfere with policy implementation, no impact will occur. (Id., pp. 4.16-25, 4.16-26)

With regard to threshold g), the PEIR concludes there will be no adverse impact with respect to alternative transportation plans, programs, or facilities because the General Plan would not interfere with any adopted policies or plans related to alternative transportation, and many General Plan policies in fact support such transportation. (Ibid.) There would be no impact, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative circulation and Congestion Management Program impacts through the year 2020 and the year 2030 are potentially significant. (Id., p. 6-15) The proposed General Plan Update will not have a cumulatively considerable impact on rail freight operations. (Id., p. 6-16)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** The Project EIR studies potential impacts to local roadway intersections and roadway segments, based on the acceptable LOS standards established by the City of Colton. (Project EIR, p. 4.14-16) This is because at the time the NOP for the Project EIR was released (June 24, 2016), a VMT metric was not published by OPR, and the City of Colton in its capacity as lead agency, as well as surrounding local agencies in which the Project's traffic would circulate, use LOS as the significance criteria for evaluating a Project's congestion impacts. (Id., p. 4.14-3) As such, an LOS metric is appropriate for this EIR.

With regard to threshold a), the Project EIR concludes that prior to mitigation, the following Project-generated traffic impacts would result. Traffic impacts would result in level of service deficiencies and direct impacts at four intersections under Existing Plus Project conditions:

- Intersection #21- South La Cadena Drive / West Maryknoll Drive;
- Intersection #3 – Main Street / Strong Street;
- Intersection #27 – South Iowa Avenue / South La Cadena Drive / I-215 southbound off-ramp; and

(Id., pp. 4.14-18, 4.14-19) Project traffic would also have a cumulatively considerable impact on the forecasted level of service at seven intersections under the Opening Year Cumulative (2020) conditions:

- Intersection #1 – South Riverside Avenue / Main Street / Placentia Lane;
- Intersection #3 – Main Street / Strong Street;
- Intersection #14 - Stephens Avenue / West Center Street;
- Intersection #5 – Orange Street / West Center Street;
- Intersection #36 – Michigan Avenue / West Main Street;
- Intersection #20 – South La Cadena Drive / South Iowa Avenue; and
- Intersection #21 – South La Cadena Drive / West Maryknoll Drive).

(Id., pp. 4.14-19 to 4.14-21) The Project would result in cumulatively considerable impacts to seven intersections in the Horizon Year Cumulative (2040) condition, including:

- Intersection #3 – Main Street / Strong Street,
- Intersection #5 – Orange Street / West Center Street;
- Intersection #18 – South La Cadena Drive / West Litton Avenue;
- Intersection #20 – South La Cadena Drive / South Iowa Avenue;

- Intersection #21 – South La Cadena Drive / West Maryknoll Drive;
- Intersection# 22 – La Cadena Drive South / Pellissier Road / I-215 southbound on-ramp; and
- Intersection #38 – Mt. Vernon Avenue / Main Street.

(Id., pp. 4.14-21, 4.14-22) Project traffic would also result in a cumulatively considerable impact on one roadway segment (La Cadena Drive between West Litton Avenue and Barton Road) under the Horizon Year Cumulative (2040) condition. (Id., p. 4.14-22)

While some impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.14-2, some others of the above-described impacts would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with mitigation measures MM 4.14-3 incorporated, because the intersection improvements listed in the measure are not part of an established City of Colton fee program, and there is therefore no assurance that they will be implemented at the time of need. (Id., pp. 4.14-38 to 4.14-41) The mitigation identified for this Project was specific to the needs of the Project, and is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, which assumes that the improvements identified in General Plan PEIR MM 4.16-1 through 4.16-7 would be undertaken by the City. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project EIR concludes that the contribution of Project traffic would have the following impacts without mitigation. There would be a significant direct impact to two freeway segments (I-215 northbound to the north of Barton Road and I-215 northbound between Barton Road and La Cadena Drive) under the Existing plus Project scenario. (Id., p. 4.14-25) Under the Opening Year (2020) scenario, the Project would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to one off-ramp (South Iowa Avenue / I-215 northbound ramps (AM peak hour only)) due to off-ramp queuing. (Id., p. 4.14-26) Project traffic would have a cumulatively considerable impact on the forecasted LOS at three freeway segments and two freeway ramps in the Opening Year (2020) condition. (Id., pp. 4.14-26, 4.14-27) Project-generated traffic would have a cumulatively considerable impact on the forecasted level of service at six freeway segments and five of the on- and off-ramps (with respect to merge/diverge operations) in the Horizon Year (2040) condition. (Id., pp. 4.14-27, 4.14-28) These impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with Roquet Ranch MM 4.14-4 incorporated, because the City of Colton cannot assure the recommended improvements would be in place at the time of need. (Id., pp. 4.14-41, 4.14-42) The mitigation identified for this Project was specific to the needs of the Project, and is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, which assumes that the improvements identified in General Plan PEIR MM 4.16-1 through 4.16-7 would be undertaken by the City. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), the Project EIR concludes that impacts would be less than significant without mitigation required because the tallest Project components would be trees, utility poles, attached townhomes, commercial signage, and structures in the park, none of which would be tall enough to interfere with a flight path or change air traffic patterns at any of the nearby airport facilities. (Id., p. 4.14-29) Further, the de minimus increase in demand for air travel caused by the Project would not measurably increase air traffic. (Ibid.) The Project would have a less than significant impact. This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under thresholds d) and e), the Project EIR notes that when the City reviewed the Project's proposed Specific Plan and Tentative Tract Map, it reviewed the proposed design plans to ensure that no hazardous roadway features would be implemented and that adequate emergency access would be available at the site. (Id., p. 4.14-30) During Project construction, no temporary hazards are reasonably foreseeable, but the Project-related construction traffic would nonetheless be required to comply with a temporary traffic control plan that meets applicable requirements of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. (Ibid) Although impacts would be less than significant, they would be further reduced by compliance with MM 4.14-1. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold g), the Project EIR concludes that the Project would have less than significant impacts with no mitigation required because it would require a Construction Management and Traffic Control Plan consistent with local requirements, would encourage pedestrian movement through the site with pedestrian trails, sidewalks, and integrated bike lanes, and would not impede existing bus service. (Id., pp. 4.14-31, 4.14-32) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

<b>17. Utilities and Service Systems</b>  Would the project:	<b>New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements adopted by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities that the construction of could cause significant environmental effects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that the construction of could cause significant environmental effects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Require new or expanded water supply entitlements due to lack of existing entitlements or resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it will have inadequate capacity to serve the planning area based on projected demand and the provider's existing commitments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by landfills with sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's disposal needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Fail to comply with federal, state, or local statutes and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Utilities and Service Systems	New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in General Plan PEIR	Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR	No Impact
Would the project: regulations related to solid waste.				

**PEIR Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**General Plan PEIR Analysis:** With regard to threshold a), the General Plan PEIR concludes that impacts related to the exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the Colton Wastewater Reclamation Facility will be less than significant based on existing City plans and regulatory requirements. (General Plan PEIR, p. 4.17-13) While future development within the planning area guided by the policies of the General Plan Update could affect RWQCB treatment standards by increasing wastewater production, the wastewater conveyance and treatment system is anticipated to be sufficient to provide for the projected population growth of the planning area. (Ibid.) Further, the City’s Municipal Code requires incremental expansion of wastewater facilities based on new development through the collection of Public Improvement Fees, ensuring that adequate funding is available to meet future needs. (Ibid.) Mandatory compliance with RWQCB discharge requirements will also ensure that effluent discharges are within acceptable water quality parameters. (Ibid.) The impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold b), the General Plan PEIR concludes that impacts related to the potential future construction of water and wastewater infrastructure will be less than significant with implementation of existing City standards. (Ibid.) While future development in the planning area would require expanded water and wastewater facilities to meet demand from anticipated growth, the City plans to update water and wastewater master plans as necessary to address this growth, such as with service fees and assessment charges for new development. (Id., pp. 4.17-13, 4.17-14) Environmental impacts for future water and wastewater facilities projects would be subject to environmental review under CEQA, ensuring impacts are studied and reduced to the extent feasible. (Id., p. 4.17-14) Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Under threshold c), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to the potential future expansion of storm drain facilities will be less than significant with implementation of existing City standards. (Ibid.) Growth in the planning area under the General Plan Update could result in the need for expanded storm drain facilities, but as part of the development review process for major development projects, the City requires assessment of the adequacy of regional and localized drainage facilities, and requires developers to fund/provide any new facilities required (beyond those identified in the master drainage plans and City’s CIP) to address project-specific impacts. (Ibid.) Construction of any new or expanded storm drainage facilities could result in environmental impacts, but such impacts would be identified, along with measures to mitigate any significant impacts, as part of the project review and CEQA compliance process for future project-specific planning actions. (Ibid.)

Under threshold d), the PEIR concludes that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update will not require new or expanded water supply entitlements to be secured. (Ibid.) The UWMP anticipated demand to increase to 14,853 AFY in 2035. (Ibid.) The City Water Department anticipates pumping 14,853 AF in 2035, or more than enough needed to serve the projected population. (Id., p. 4.17-14) Based on these estimates, there will be sufficient water to meet the long-term demand of the City, this impact will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.17-15)

Under threshold e), the PEIR concludes that impacts related to insufficient wastewater treatment capacity will be less than significant with implementation of existing standards and regulations. (Ibid.) While future development accommodated under the General Plan Update could require expanded wastewater infrastructure in order to meet future needs when considered in light of existing demand, localized environmental impacts associated with the future expansion of facilities are subject to project-level environmental review pursuant to CEQA. (Ibid.) The City's Wastewater System Master Plan also identifies long-term programs designed to maintain and expand wastewater treatment facilities, and the City's collects a Public Improvement fee to facilitate expansion. (Ibid.) Facilities may also be expanded by development project proponents to ensure adequate facilities are available to serve new development needs. (Ibid.) The General Plan Update would have less than significant impacts, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.17-16)

With regard to thresholds f) and g), the PEIR concludes that impacts associated with solid waste regulations and adequacy of disposal sites will be less than significant pursuant to existing policies and regulations. (Ibid.) Over 55 percent of exiting servicing Colton Landfill capacity remained, and the PEIR concludes that this would likely be sufficient to support the disposal needs of the planning area over the long term. (Ibid.) The City would also continue to implement a variety of solid waste reduction, recycling, and re-use measures to meet its obligations under AB 939, and solid wastes would be disposed of in accordance with federal and state laws. (Ibid.) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. The General Plan Update would not have cumulatively considerable utilities and service systems impacts. (Id., p. 6-24)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the Project EIR concludes that there is no potential for the Project to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the SARWQCB, because wastewater generated at the Project site would be conveyed to and treated by the Colton Wastewater Reclamation Plant, which is under the jurisdiction of the SARWQCB, which ensures that all regulatory requirements regarding wastewater treatment are met. (Project EIR, p. 4.15-8) The Project would have No Impact.

Under threshold b), the Project EIR concludes that with the exception of water and sewer facilities that would be installed during the Project's construction period and whose environmental impacts are evaluated throughout the EIR, the Project would not require the construction of any new water or wastewater systems that have the potential to cause significant environmental effects. (Id., pp. 4.15-8, 4.15-9) Accordingly, mitigation measure beyond those already identified to address physical environmental impacts in other areas of the Project EIR are required. (Id., pp. 4.15-8, 4.15-9) The Project would have less than significant impacts, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 4.15-10) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold c), the Project EIR explains that storm water would be collected on the Project site by an on-site drainage system and proposed on-site water quality/detention basins that would be installed during the Project's construction phase and which are evaluated throughout this EIR.

(Id., p. 4.15-11) The Project would not require the construction of any other new storm water drainage facilities that have the potential to cause significant environmental effects, and no mitigation is required that is not already applied in other parts of the EIR. (Ibid.) The Project would therefore have less than significant impacts, this analysis is consistent with the General Plan PEIR, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

Under threshold d), the Project EIR concludes, supported by information in the San Bernardino Valley 2010 UWMP, that there are sufficient water supplies available to service the residential development on the Project site, and the Project's proposed residential uses would not exceed available supplies of water, even during dry year conditions. (Id., p. 4.15-12) Accordingly, the Project would not result in a need for new or expanded water entitlements or treatment capacity, and would result in less than significant impacts with no mitigation required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold e), the Project EIR concludes that the Project would generate approximately 274,275 gallons (0.45 MGD) of wastewater per day, which could be adequately accommodated by the excess capacity of 2.4 MGD of the CWRP. (Id., pp. 4.15-12, 4.15-13) Accordingly, the CWRP has sufficient capacity to treat wastewater generated by Project-related development in addition to existing commitments, and the Project would not result in the need for any new or expanded off-site wastewater facilities (such as conveyance lines, treatment facilities, or lift stations). (Ibid.) Because there is adequate capacity at the CWRP to serve the Project's projected sewer demand, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold f), the Project EIR concludes that there is adequate capacity in the California Street Landfill to accept the Project's solid waste, and the impact is therefore less than significant. (Id., pp. 4.15-13, 4.15-14) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR.

With regard to threshold g), the Project EIR concludes that the Project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statute and regulations related to solid waste disposal, recycling, and reduction, and would therefore have less than significant impacts with no mitigation required. (Id., p. 4.15-14) This is consistent with General Plan PEIR analysis, and The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in General Plan PEIR. The impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. (Id., pp. 4.15-15, 4.15-16)