**Tiered CEQA Environmental Checklist from 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy by the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") 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 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Communities Strategy by the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG") PEIR ("SCAG 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 SCAG 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."[1] 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.[2] 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 SCAG PEIR.
- Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Significant Impact in SCAG PEIR;
- Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR; or
- No Impact.

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

[1] Pub Res Code § 21093, subd (b); See also CEQA Guidelines §§ 15006 (m), 15152, subd. (b).
[2] CEQA Guidelines § 15130 (d).

- Due to new information that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR, or the Proposed Project will have no impact, the checkbox for either Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR or any new potentially significant impacts that were not previously identified in the SCAG PEIR, for the following impact areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- 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

| 1. **Aesthetics/Visual Quality**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Potential to result in shade and shadow impacts. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-AES-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects of visual intrusions on scenic vistas, or National Scenic Byways that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of Caltrans, other public agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with regulations for Caltrans scenic vistas and goals and policies within county and city general plans, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Use a palette of colors, textures, building materials that are graffiti-resistant, and/or plant materials that complement the surrounding landscape and development.
- Use contour grading to better match surrounding terrain. Contour edges of major cut-and-fill to provide a more natural looking finished profile.

- Use alternating facades to “break up” large facades and provide visual interest.
- Design new corridor landscaping to respect existing natural and man-made features and to complement the dominant landscaping of the surrounding areas.
- Replace and renew landscaping along corridors with road widenings, interchange projects, and related improvements.
- Retain or replace trees bordering highways , so that clear-cutting is not evident.
- Provide new corridor landscaping that respects and provides appropriate transition to existing natural and man-made features, and is complementary to the dominant landscaping or native habitats of surrounding areas.
- Implement design guidelines, local policies, and programs aimed at protecting views of scenic corridors and avoiding visual intrusions in design of projects to minimize contrasts in scale and massing between the project and surrounding natural forms and developments. Avoid, if possible, large cuts and fills when the visual environment (natural or urban) would be substantially disrupted. Site or design of projects should minimize their intrusion into important viewsheds and use contour grading to better match surrounding terrain.

**MM-AES-3(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects of degrading the existing public viewpoints, visual character or quality of the site that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of local jurisdictions and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the goals and policies within county and city general plans, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Minimize contrasts in scale and massing between the projects and surrounding natural forms and development, minimize their intrusion into important viewsheds, and use contour grading to better match surrounding terrain in accordance with county and city hillside ordinances, where applicable.
- Design landscaping along highway corridors to add significant natural elements and visual interest to soften the hard-edged, linear transportation corridors.
- Require development of design guidelines for projects that make elements of proposed buildings/facilities visually compatible, or minimize visibility of changes in visual quality or character through use of hardscape and softscape solutions. Specific measures to be addressed include setback buffers, landscaping, color, texture, signage, and lighting criteria.
- Design projects consistent with design guidelines of applicable general plans.
- Apply development standards and guidelines to maintain compatibility with surrounding natural areas, including site coverage, building height and massing, building materials and color, landscaping, site grading, and so forth in accordance with general plans and adopted design guidelines, where applicable.
- Require that sites are kept in a blight/nuisance-free condition. Remove blight or nuisances that compromise visual character or visual quality of project areas including graffiti abatement, trash removal, landscape management, maintenance of signage and billboards in good condition, and replace compromised native vegetation and landscape.

**MM-AES-4(b)**: Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or minimizing the effects of light and glare on routes of travel for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, or on adjacent properties,

and limit expanded areas of shade and shadow to areas that would not adversely affect open space or outdoor recreation areas that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of local jurisdictions and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the goals and policies within county and city general plans, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Use lighting fixtures that are adequately shielded to a point below the light bulb and reflector and that prevent unnecessary glare onto adjacent properties.
- Restrict the operation of outdoor lighting for construction and operation activities in accordance with local regulations.
- Use high pressure sodium and/or cut-off fixtures instead of typical mercury-vapor fixtures for outdoor lighting.
- Use unidirectional lighting to avoid light trespass onto adjacent properties.
- Design exterior lighting to confine illumination to the project site, and/or to areas which do not include light-sensitive uses.
- Provide structural and/or vegetative screening from light-sensitive uses.
- Shield and direct all new street and pedestrian lighting away from light-sensitive off-site uses.
- Use non-reflective glass or glass treated with a non-reflective coating for all exterior windows and glass used on building surfaces.
- Architectural lighting shall be directed onto the building surfaces and have low reflectivity to minimize glare and limit light onto adjacent properties.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the 2016 RTP/SCS (or "the Plan") includes transportation projects and development influenced by land use strategies that would require the conversion of open space to development, including designated open space that is visible from USFS, Caltrans, county, and city designated scenic vistas, constituting a significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.1-23) Construction of new transportation facilities, expansion of existing facilities, development influenced by land use strategies, or growth in previously undisturbed areas would block or impede views of scenic resources. (Ibid.) Short-term construction impacts would similarly occur, and would often be unavoidable even with implementation of typical measures such as careful construction staging, fencing/screening, and revegetation of exposed slopes as early as possible. (Id., pp. 3.1-23, 3.1-24) Several transportation projects included in the Plan would have the potential to create a significant visual impact, such as highway projects involving noise barriers that can block views; construction that involves cut and fill within the viewshed of Caltrans, county, or city designated scenic vistas; or construction of tall structures that obstruct views. (Id., p. 3.1-24) Construction of transportation projects and facilities that involve modifications such as widening or upgrading existing roadways and safety improvements would involve lesser changes to the visual environment; these modification projects would most likely occur within existing highway and roadway facilities, and such changes may not block or impede views of scenic resources or view from designated scenic vistas much more than at present. (Id., p. 3.1-25) The 2016 RTP/SCS also includes active transportation projects such as regional greenway networks, regional and local bikeway networks, coastal trails access, and safe routes to school, which in many cases would not only improve access to scenic parts of the region, such as coastal areas, but would also add visually pleasing elements to the region through landscaping, lighting, and sustainable or a complete street approach to design. (Ibid.) However, due to the large number of transportation projects and potential development influenced by land use strategies included in the Plan, it is expected that

new and expanded development would result in significant impacts to vistas and scenic resources in the region. (Ibid.) Such impacts would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with implementation of mitigation measures. (Id., p. 3.1-36)

With regard to threshold b), the general location of 2016 RTP/SCS transportation projects in urban areas and anticipated new growth and development focused within high quality transit areas avoids the potential to substantially damage scenic resources within a state-designated scenic highway, so the Plan would have a less than significant impact on scenic resources within designated scenic highways. (Id., p. 3.1-25) Additionally, the 2016 RTP/SCS includes land use strategies that encourage more compact growth development patterns in the region and aim to shift growth away from high value habitat areas toward existing urbanized areas with transportation infrastructure in place and opportunity areas that are conducive to more mixed-use and higher-density housing in the future. (Id., p. 3.1-26) However, the Plan has the potential to create impacts because several high quality transit areas extend along scenic highways, have scenic rock outcroppings, or other scenic elements. (Ibid.) Due to the general location of projects in urban areas and anticipated new growth and development focused within high quality transit areas instead of along scenic highways, this would be a less than significant impact. (Id., pp. 3.1-26, 3.1-27).

With regard to threshold c), the transportation projects and development influenced by land use strategies considered in the 2016 RTP/SCS would have the potential to degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings where such improvements pass through open space areas, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.1-27) While the 2016 RTP/SCS focuses the majority of new housing and job growth in high quality transit areas and other opportunity areas in existing urbanized areas, and this strategy supports and complements, the densification of uses, even in existing urbanized areas, would result in changes to the overall visual character. (Ibid.) Improvement of existing highway facilities in highly urbanized areas would result in relatively minor impacts to visual quality because of their location in urban environments. (Id., p. 3.1-28) Similarly, careful alignment and design, conformance with local grading ordinances, and installation of landscaping to ensure compatibility with local grading ordinances would reduce impacts from proposed alignment or transportation facilities that require large cut-and-fill slopes or noise barriers to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 3.1-28) And, since the majority of the transportation projects documented in the Plan are in areas with existing roadway networks, impacts to areas such as wetlands, coastal bluffs, and forests are generally unlikely. (Id., p. 3.1-28) Overall, this impact would be significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with the implementation of mitigation measures. (Id., p. 3.1-36)

Under threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that the Plan would also have the potential to result in significant impacts in relation to creating a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views and expanded areas of shade and shadow in jurisdictions without ordinances protecting night skies or local standards protecting shadow-sensitive land uses. (Id., p. 3.1-29) New Mixed Lane Flow Projects, Toll Lanes, and HOT Lanes in San Bernardino County would occur in areas with low levels of nighttime light, creating new sources of light and glare. (Id.) Transportation projects and development influenced by land use strategies included in the 2016 RTP/SCS would be subject to the provisions of dark skies ordinances and/or general plan policies in select cities in affected counties, including San Bernardino County. (Id., p. 3.1-29) These provisions including shielding lights at night to avoid light trespass on other properties and toward the night sky, but none of the counties within SCAG jurisdiction are completely within the jurisdiction of a dark skies ordinance district or city, so several of the Plan projects would not be inherently required to reduce light and glare impacts as part of their design. (Id., pp. 3.1-20, 3.1-30) Compact growth patterns encouraged by the Plan

would also result in more intense light and glare in urbanized areas. (Id., p. 3.1-30) Therefore, the Plan would result in a significant impact with regard to light and glare. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with mitigation incorporated. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.1-36) The 2016 RTP/SCS includes transportation projects such as new transit transfer terminals, street and rail grade separation projects, sound walls, new potentially elevated freeway lanes and off-ramps, new potentially elevated light rail extensions, and new bridges, that may be tall enough to cast a shadow on adjacent property. However, most transportation projects would not be expected to result in shade or shadow impacts because most transportation infrastructure is not located near sensitive outdoor uses. (Id., p. 3.1-30) Shade and shadow impacts would also be expected to occur as an indirect impact from the Plan in urban areas as a result of the densification of land uses in urbanized areas. (Ibid.) This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with mitigation incorporated. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.1-36)

**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.) Because the impact would be less than significant, no mitigation is required, and SCAG PEIR MM-AES-1(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the SCAG 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 SCAG 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.) The Project is designed in a manner that is consistent with SCAG PEIR MM-AES-3(b) because the proposed Roquet Ranch Specific Plan establishes development standards, and landscaping and design guidelines, that are consistent with the General Plan, and establish (i) a list of permitted uses and dimensional standards for development in each Project planning area, and (ii) address the community's proposed site planning, architecture, and landscaping themes, all of which would ensure continuity and compatibility throughout the Project site and its surroundings. (Id). Nevertheless, this impact would be significant and unavoidable and there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the Project's impacts on the visual quality of the Project site and surroundings. (Id.) The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the SCAG 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). Because the impact would be less than significant, no mitigation is required, and SCAG PEIR MM-AES-4(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in the SCAG PEIR.

| **2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Potential to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c. Potential to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d. Potential to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e. Potential to involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM AF-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects from the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the California Resources Agency, other public agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the Farmland Protection Act and implementing regulations, and the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans to protect agricultural resources consistent with the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Such measures may include the following, other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency taking into account project and site-specific considerations as applicable and feasible:

- For projects that require approval or funding by the USDOT, comply with Section 4(f) U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (USDOT Act).
- Project relocation or corridor realignment to avoid Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local or Statewide Importance.
- Maintain and expand agricultural land protections such as urban growth boundaries.
- Support the acquisition or voluntary dedication of agriculture conservation easements and other programs that preserve agricultural lands, including the creation of farmland mitigation banks. Local governments would be responsible for encouraging the development of agriculture conservation easements or farmland mitigation banks, purchasing conservation agreements or farmland for mitigation, and ensuring that the terms of the conservation easement agreements are upheld. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife provides a definition for conservation or mitigation banks on their website (please see https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/Banking). "A conservation or mitigation bank is privately or publically owned land managed for its natural resource values. In exchange for permanently protecting, managing, and monitoring the land, the band sponsor is allowed to sell or transfer habitat credits to permittees who need to satisfy legal requirements and compensate for the environmental impacts of development projects. A privately owned conservation or mitigation bank is a free-market enterprise that: Offers landowners economic incentives to protect natural resources; Saves permittees time and money by providing them with the certainty of pre-approved compensation lands; Consolidates small, fragmented wetland mitigation projects into large contiguous sites that have much higher wildlife habitat values; Provides for long-term protection and management of habitat. A publicly owned conservation or mitigation bank: Offers the sponsoring public agency advance mitigation for large projects or multiple years of operation or maintenance." In 2013, the University of California published an article entitled "Reforms could boost conservation banking landowners" that speaks specifically to the use of agricultural lands in conjunction with conservation banking programs.
- Provide for mitigation fees to support a mitigation bank that invests in farmer education, agricultural infrastructure, water supply, marketing, etc. that enhance the commercial viability of retained agricultural lands.
- Include underpasses and overpasses at reasonable intervals to maintain property access.
- Use berms, buffer zones, setbacks, and fencing to reduce conflicts between new development and farming uses and protect the functions of farmland.

- Ensure individual projects are consistent with federal, state, and local policies that preserve agricultural lands and support the economic viability of agricultural activities, as well as policies that provide compensation for property owners if preservation is not feasible.
- Contact the California Department of Conservation and each county's Agricultural Commissioner's office to identify the location of prime farmlands and lands that support crops considered valuable to the local or regional economy and evaluate potential impacts to such lands using the land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) analysis method (CEQA Guidelines §21095), as appropriate. Use conservation easements or the payment of in-lieu fees to offset impacts.

**MM AF-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects from conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the California Department of Conservation, other public agencies, and Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to mitigate the significant effects of agriculture and forestry resources to ensure compliance with the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans to protect agricultural resources consistent with the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, the Farmland Security Zone Act, and county and city zoning codes, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency taking into account project and site-specific considerations as applicable and feasible:

- Project relocation or corridor realignment to avoid lands in Williamson Act contracts.
- Establish conservation easements consistent with the recommendations of the Department of Conservation, or 20-year Farmland Security Zone contracts (Government Code Section 51296 et seq.), 10-year Williamson Act contracts (Government Code Section 51200 et seq.), or use of other conservation tools available from the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection.
- Prior to final approval of each project, encourage enrollments of agricultural lands for counties that have Williamson Act programs, where applicable.

**See MM-GHG-1(b).**

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** The SCAG PEIR determined that implementation of transportation projects and anticipated development resulting from land use strategies in the 2016 RTP/SCS would have the potential to convert Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland in all six counties and affect Local Farmland and Grazing land in five of the six counties because these important farmlands are located in the vicinity of the transportation projects; with mitigation incorporated, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.2-17) New development in the counties could also be on agricultural lands, and anticipated land use strategies in the Plan could result in the consumption of agricultural lands. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.2-19) Implementation of transportation projects and anticipated development could also directly affect existing zoning for agricultural use in San Bernardino County because the Plan's worst-case scenario construction radius includes land zoned for agricultural use; with mitigation incorporated, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.2-19) Impacts with regard to the zoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production would be less than significant because planned transportation projects and anticipated development projects are not anticipated in said areas. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.2-20) The same is true with regard to loss of forest land or conversion

of forest land to non-forest use; transportation projects and development would not be in such areas, except in limited areas where impacts would be minor; the impact would be less than significant. (SCAG PEIR, pp. 3.2-21, 3.2-22) However, the SCAG PEIR determined that the cumulative loss of forest land or forest land conservation would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable, even with mitigation. (SCAG PEIR, p. 9-14) The Plan would exceed SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets, and therefore create an indirect significant impact with regard to the loss of forest land due to risk of wildfires; the Plan would also potentially directly impact up to 0.8 percent of existing Farmland in the SCAG region in the worst-case scenario construction radius, and could indirectly result in conversion of further Farmland or forest land as a result of increased development near urbanized areas or suburban towns; these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated. (SCAG PEIR, pp. 3.2-22, 3.2-23)

**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." (Project EIR, p. 5-9) Further, the land in the Project site is not used for agricultural production, nor is it zoned for agricultural production. (Project EIR, 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. (Project EIR, p. 5-10)

Because there is no potential for agricultural and forestry resources to be impacted by the Proposed Project, the above-described mitigation measures identified in the SCAG PEIR are not required, and there is No Impact.

| **3. Air Quality**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable NAAQS or CAAQS | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and harm public health outcomes substantially. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e. Expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-Air-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures that are within the jurisdiction and authority of the CARB, air quality management districts and other regulatory agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider the measures that have been identified by CARB and air district(s) and other agencies as set forth below, or other comparable measures, to facilitate consistency with plans for attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS, as applicable and feasible.

CARB, South Coast AQMD, Antelope Valley AQMD, Imperial County APCD, Mojave Desert AQMD, Ventura County APCD, and Caltrans have identified project-level feasible measures to reduce construction emissions:

- Minimize land disturbance.

- Use watering trucks to minimize dust; watering should be sufficient to confine dust plumes to the project work areas.
- Suspend grading and earth moving when wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour unless the soil is wet enough to prevent dust plumes.
- Cover trucks when hauling dirt.
- Stabilize the surface of dirt piles if not removed immediately.
- Limit vehicular paths on unpaved surfaces and stabilize any temporary roads.
- Minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities.
- Revegetate disturbed land, including vehicular paths created during construction to avoid future off-road vehicular activities.
- On Caltrans projects, Caltrans Standard Specifications 10-Dust Control, 17-Watering, and 18-Dust Palliative shall be incorporated into project specifications.
- Require contractors to assemble a comprehensive inventory list (i.e., make, model, engine year, horsepower, emission rates) of all heavy-duty off-road (portable and mobile) equipment (50 horsepower and greater) that could be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project. Prepare a plan for approval by the applicable air district demonstrating achievement of the applicable percent reduction for a CARB-approved fleet.
- Ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained.
- Minimize idling time to 5 minutes—saves fuel and reduces emissions.
- Provide an operational water truck on-site at all times. Use watering trucks to minimize dust; watering should be sufficient to confine dust plumes to the project work areas. Sweep paved streets at least once per day where there is evidence of dirt that has been carried on to the roadway.
- Project sponsors should ensure to the extent possible that construction activities utilize grid-based electricity and/or onsite renewable electricity generation rather than diesel and/or gasoline powered generators.
- Develop a traffic plan to minimize traffic flow interference from construction activities. The plan may include advance public notice of routing, use of public transportation, and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service. Schedule operations affecting traffic for off-peak hours. Minimize obstruction of through-traffic lanes. Provide a flag person to guide traffic properly and ensure safety at construction sites.
- As appropriate require that portable engines and portable engine-driven equipment units used at the project work site, with the exception of on-road and off-road motor vehicles, obtain CARB Portable Equipment Registration with the state or a local district permit. Arrange appropriate consultations with the CARB or the District to determine registration and permitting requirements prior to equipment operation at the site.
- Implement EPA's National Clean Diesel Program.
- Diesel- or gasoline-powered equipment shall be replaced by lowest emitting feasible for each piece of equipment from among these options: electric equipment whenever feasible, gasoline-powered equipment if electric infeasible.
- On-site electricity shall be used in all construction areas that are demonstrated to be served by electricity.
- If cranes are required for construction, they shall be rated at 200 hp or greater equipped with Tier 4 or equivalent engines.
- Use alternative diesel fuels, such as Clean Fuels Technology (water emulsified diesel fuel) or O2 diesel ethanol-diesel fuel (O2 Diesel) in existing engines.
- Convert part of the construction truck fleet to natural gas.

- Include “clean construction equipment fleet,” defines as a fleet mix cleaner than the state average, in all construction contracts.
- Fuel all off‐road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB‐certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non‐taxed version suitable for use off‐road).
- Use electric fleet or alternative fueled vehicles where feasible including methanol, propane, and compressed natural.
- Use diesel construction equipment meeting ARB’s Tier 4 certified engines or cleaner offroad heavy‐duty diesel engines and comply with State off‐road regulation.
- Use on‐road, heavy‐duty trucks that meet the ARB’s 2007 or cleaner certification standard for on‐road diesel engines, and comply with the State on‐road regulation.
- Use idle reduction technology, defined as a device that is installed on the vehicle that automatically reduces main engine idling and/or is designed to provide services, e.g., heat, air conditioning, and/or electricity to the vehicle or equipment that would otherwise require the operation of the main drive engine while the vehicle or equipment is temporarily parked or is stationary.
- Minimize idling time either by shutting off equipment when not in use or limit idling time to 3 minutes Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and/or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the 3 minute idling limit. The construction contractor shall maintain a written idling policy and distribute it to all employees and subcontractors. The on‐site construction manager shall enforce this limit.
- Prohibit diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors.
- Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline‐powered equipment.
- Signs shall be posted in designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers and operators of the idling limit.
- Construction worker trips shall be minimized by providing options for carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
- Use new or rebuilt equipment.
- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working order, according to manufacturer’s specifications. The equipment must be check by an ASE‐certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before it is operated.
- Use low rolling resistance tires on long haul class 8 tractor‐trailers.
- Suspend all construction activities that generate air pollutant emissions during air alerts.
- Install a CARB‐verified, Level 3 emission control device, e.g., diesel particulate filters, on all diesel engines.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** Analysis of the potential air quality impacts of the Plan was conducted based on SCAG’s Regional Travel Demand Model, evaluation of relevant AQMPs/SIPs, and a mobile source HRA. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.3-38) The PEIR concludes that the Plan would result in a less than significant impact with regard to threshold a), because the projected long-term emissions under the Plan are in alignment with local SIPs/AQMPs as demonstrated in the Plan’s transportation conformity analysis; the emissions resulting from the Plan are within the applicable emissions budgets as stated in the SIPs/AQMPs for each nonattainment or maintenance area for all milestone, attainment, and planning horizon years. (Ibid.) No mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold b), the construction and operation of individual transportation projects and anticipated development as result of the proposed transportation and land use strategies in the Plan are expected to have the potential to violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an air quality violation, constituting a potentially significant impact. (Id., p. 3.3-40) This is as a result of anticipated construction activities, including from construction equipment, employee and vendor vehicles, demolition, grading and other ground-disturbing activities, application of paint and other coatings, and paving, that would result in short-term emissions including ROG, $NO_x$, $PM_{10}$, $PM_{2.5}$ and fugitive dust. (Id., p. 3.3-41) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated. (Id., p. 3.3-54)

Per threshold c), the Plan would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is designated nonattainment because the projected long-term emissions are in alignment with the local AQMPs/SIPs as demonstrated in the Plan's conformity analysis and discussed above with regard to threshold a). (Id., p. 3.3-41) When compared to existing conditions, the Plan overall would either result in no change or a decrease for $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10}$, and a decrease for ROG and $NO_x$ (ozone precursors). (Id., p. 3.3-41, 3.3-42) This impact would therefore be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Nevertheless, as discussed above, the construction and operation of new development anticipated under the RTP/SCS would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to short-term emissions including ROG, $NO_x$, $PM_{10}$, $PM_{2.5}$ and fugitive dust.

Per threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that despite efforts to reduce diesel emissions, the cancer risk as measured along freeways would be above the threshold with buildout under the Plan, thereby creating a significant impact to sensitive receptors and public health. (Id., p. 3.3-42) The Plan would actually result in a reduction in cancer risk compared to existing conditions, but would still result in exposure to sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations that exceed the cancer risk threshold of 10 in a million, an impact which remains cumulatively significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.3-44, 3.3-54)

With regard to threshold e), the Plan would have a less than significant impact and would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. (Id., p. 3.3-46) Odor sources within the SCAG region, such as wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, and agricultural operations, are controlled by county and city ordinances and air district rules that prohibit nuisance odors and identify enforcement measures to reduce odor impacts to nearby receptors. (Ibid.) Transportation projects would not be expected to result in substantial odor emissions or affect a substantial number of people when compared to existing conditions. (Id., p. 3.3-47) Further, individual projects would be analyzed for odor impacts, and subject to applicable odor regulations. (Ibid.) The impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

**Project Analysis and Conclusion**: With regard to threshold a) , the Project was evaluated under the applicable SCAQMD AQMP, and would have no operational impacts under consistency criterion No. 1 of the 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. (Id., p. 4.2-16) 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 would 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 SCAG PEIR.

With regard to thresholds b) and c), Project-related short-term construction phase emissions would exceed the criteria pollutant threshold established by SCAQMD for daily emissions of $NO_x$, creating a potentially significant impact. (Project EIR, 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 $NO_x$ that exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-17) $NO_x$ is a precursor for ozone ($O_3$), a pollutant for which the SCAB is in nonattainment under both federal and State criteria. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-18) Operational emissions of $NO_x$ 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. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-18) Therefore, even with implementation of mitigation measures, emissions of $NO_x$ associated with long-term operation of the Project would be a significant and unavoidable impact, and is cumulatively considerable. (Project EIR, pp. S-13, 4.2-18). Similarly, in the event the Project's short-term construction and long-term operational activities overlap, emissions of VOCs, $NO_x$ , and $CO_2$ 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. (Project EIR, pp. 4.2-19, 4.2-20) The Project has an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

With regard threshold d), the Project would cause construction emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD LST for emissions of $PM_{10}$, which has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-21) However, implementation of Roquet Ranch MM 4.2-1 would reduce Project construction-related emissions of $PM_{10}$ to a level that is less than significant, as demonstrated in Project EIR Tables 4.2-13 and 4.2-14. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-21) The Project has an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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. (Project EIR, 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. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-23) 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. (Project EIR, p. 4.2-23) This is consistent with the SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project has an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **4. Biological Resources**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations; or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| **4. Biological Resources**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Potential to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e. Potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f. Potential to conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-BIO 1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on threatened and endangered species and other special status species that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, other public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with Sections 7, 9, and 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act; the California Endangered Species Act; the Native Plant Protection Act; the State Fish and Wildlife Code; and the Desert Native Plant Act; and related applicable implementing regulations, as applicable and feasible. Additional compliance should adhere to applicable implementing regulations from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and/or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Require project design to avoid occupied habitat, potentially suitable habitat, and designated critical habitat, wherever practicable and feasible.
- Where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, provide conservation measures to fulfill the requirements of the applicable authorization for incidental take pursuant to Section 7 or 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act or Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act to support issuance of an Incidental take permit. A wide variety of conservation strategies have been successfully used in the SCAG region to protect the survival and recovery in the wild of federally and state-listed endangered species including the bald eagle:
    - Avoidance strategies
    - Contribution of in-lieu fees
    - Use of mitigation bank credits
    - Funding of research and recovery efforts
    - Habitat restoration
    - Conservation easements
    - Permanent dedication of habitat
    - Other comparable measures
- Design projects to avoid desert native plants, salvage and relocate desert native plants, and/or pay in lieu fees to support off-site long-term conservation strategies.
- Develop and implement a Worker Awareness Program (environmental education) to inform project workers of their responsibilities in regards to avoiding and minimizing impacts on sensitive biological resources.
- Appoint an Environmental Inspector to monitor implementation of mitigation measures.
- Schedule construction activities to avoid sensitive times for biological resources (e.g. steelhead spawning periods during the winter and spring, nesting bird season) and to avoid the rainy season when erosion and sediment transport is increased.
- Conduct pre-construction monitoring to delineate occupied sensitive species' habitat to facilitate avoidance.
- Where projects are determined to be within suitable habitat of listed or sensitive species that have specific field survey protocols or guidelines outlined by the USFWS, CDFW, or other local agency, conduct preconstruction surveys that follow applicable protocols and guidelines and are conducted by qualified and/or certified personnel.

**MM-BIO-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant impacts on state designated sensitive habitats, including riparian habitats, that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; and other public agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with Section 1600 of the State Fish and Wildlife Code, USFS Land Management Plan for the four national forests in the six-county area: Angeles, Cleveland, Los Padres, and San Bernardino, implementing regulations for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; and other related federal, state, and local regulations, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consult with the USFWS and NMFS where such state-designated sensitive or riparian habitats provide potential or occupied habitat for federally listed rare, threatened, and endangered species afforded protection pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act.

- Consult with the USFS where such state-designated sensitive or riparian habitats provide potential or occupied habitat for federally listed rare, threatened, and endangered species afforded protection pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act and any additional species afforded protection by an adopted Forest Land Management Plan or Resource Management Plan for the four national forests in the six-county area: Angeles, Cleveland, Los Padres, and San Bernardino.
- Consult with the CDFW where such state-designated sensitive or riparian habitats provide potential or occupied habitat for state-listed rare, threatened, and endangered species afforded protection pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act, or Fully-Protected Species afforded protection pursuant to the State Fish and Wildlife Code.
- Consult with the CDFW pursuant to the provisions of Section 1600 of the State Fish and Wildlife Code as they relate to Lakes and Streambeds.
- Consult with the USFWS, USFS, CDFW, and counties and cities in the SCAG region, where state-designated sensitive or riparian habitats are occupied by birds afforded protection pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act during the breeding season.
- Consult with the CDFW for state-designated sensitive or riparian habitats where fur-bearing mammals, afforded protection pursuant to the provisions of the State Fish and Wildlife Code for fur-beaming mammals, are actively using the areas in conjunction with breeding activities.
- Utilize applicable and CDFW approved plant community classification resources during delineation of sensitive communities and invasive plants including, but not limited to, the Manual of California Vegetation, the California Invasive Plan Inventory Database, and the Orange County California Native Plant Society (OCCNPS) Emergent Invasive Plant Management Program, where appropriate.
- Encourage project design to avoid sensitive natural communities and riparian habitats, wherever practicable and feasible.
- Where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, develop sufficient conservation measures through coordination with local agencies and the regulatory agency (i.e., USFWS or CDFW) to protect sensitive natural communities and riparian habitats.
- Install fencing and/or mark sensitive habitat to be avoided during construction activities.
- Salvage and stockpile topsoil (the surface material from 6 to 12 inches deep) and perennial plants for use in restoring native vegetation to all areas of temporary disturbance within the project area.
- Revegetate with appropriate native vegetation following the completion of construction activities.
- Complete habitat enhancement (e.g., through removal of non-native invasive wetland species and replacement with more ecologically valuable native species).
- Use Best Management Practices (BMPs) at construction sites to minimize erosion and sediment transport from the area. BMPs include encouraging growth of vegetation in disturbed areas, using straw bales or other silt-catching devices, and using settling basins to minimize soil transport.

**MM-BIO-3(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant impacts on protected wetlands that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of the U.S.Army Corps of Engineers, public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and regulations of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), and other applicable federal, state

and local regulations, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Require project design to avoid federally protected wetlands consistent with the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, wherever practicable and feasible.
- Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project, or other regionally significant project, has the potential to impact other wetlands or waters not protected under Section 404 of
- the Clean Water Act, seek comparable coverage for these wetlands and waters in consultation with the USACOE and applicable Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB).
- Where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, develop sufficient conservation measures to fulfill the requirements of the applicable authorization for impacts to federally protected wetlands to support issuance of a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as administered by the USACOE. The use of an authorized Nationwide Permit or issuance of an individual permit requires the project applicant to demonstrate compliance with the USACOE's Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule. The USACOE reviews projects to ensure environmental impacts to aquatic resources are avoided or minimized as much as possible. Consistent with the administration's performance standard of "no net loss of wetlands" a USACOE permit may require a project proponent to restore, establish, enhance or preserve other aquatic resources in order to replace those affected by the proposed project. This compensatory mitigation process seeks to replace the loss of existing aquatic resource functions and area. Project proponents required to complete mitigation are encouraged to use a watershed approach and watershed planning information. The new rule establishes performance standards, sets timeframes for decision making, and to the extent possible, establishes equivalent requirements and standards for the three sources of compensatory mitigation:
    - Permittee-responsible mitigation
    - Contribution of in-lieu fees
    - Use of mitigation bank credits
- Require review of construction drawings by a certified wetland delineator as part of each project-specific environmental analysis to determine whether wetlands will be affected and, if necessary, perform a formal wetland delineation.

**MM-BIO-4(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant impacts on migratory fish or wildlife species or within established native resident and/or migratory wildlife corridors, and native wildlife nursery sites that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Forest Service, public agencies and/or Lead Agencies, as applicable and feasible. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with regulations of the USFWS, USFS, CDFW, and related regulations, goals and polices of counties and cities, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consult with the USFWS, USFS, CDFW, and counties and cities in the SCAG region, where impacts to birds afforded protection pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act during the breeding season may occur.
- Consult with the USFS where impacts to migratory wildlife corridors may occur in an area afforded protection by an adopted Forest Land Management Plan or Resource

Management Plan for the four national forests in the six-County area: Angeles, Cleveland, Los Padres, and San Bernardino.

- Consult with Counties, cities, and other local organizations when impacts may occur to open space areas that have been designated as important for wildlife movement.
- Prohibit construction activities within 500 feet of occupied breeding areas for wildlife afforded protection pursuant to Title 14 § 460 of the California Code of Regulations protecting fur-bearing mammals, during the breeding season.
- Prohibit clearing of vegetation and construction within the peak avian breeding season (Feburary 1st thorugh September 1st), where feasible.
- Conduct weekly surveys to identify active raptor and other migratory nongame bird nests by a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding surveys within three days prior to the work in the area from February 1 through August 31.
- Prohibit construction activities with 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of occupied nest of birds afforded protection pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, during the breeding season. Delineate the non-disturbance buffer by temporary fencing and keep the buffer in place until construction is complete or the nest is no longer active. No construction shall occur within the fenced nest zone until the young have fledged, are no longer being feed by the parents, have left the nest, and will no longer be impacted by the project. Reductions or expansions in the nest buffer distance may be appropriate depending on the avian species involved, ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors.
- Ensure that suitable nesting sites for migratory nongame native bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or trees with unoccupied raptor nests should only be removed prior to February 1, or following the nesting season.
- Conduct site-specific analyses of opportunities to preserve or improve habitat linkages with areas on- and off-site. Analyze habitat linkages/wildlife movement corridors on a broader and cumulative impact analysis scale to avoid adverse impacts from linear projects that have potential for impacts on a broader scale or critical narrow choke points that could reduce function of recognized movement corridors on a larger scale. Require review of construction drawings and habitat connectivity mapping provided by the CDFW or CNDDB by a qualified biologist to determine the risk of habitat fragmentation.
- Pursue mitigation banking to preserve habitat linkages and corridors (opportunities to purchase, maintain, and/or restore offsite habitat).
- Demonstrate that proposed projects would not adversely affect movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, wildlife movement corridors, or wildlife nursery sites through the incorporation of avoidance strategies into project design, wherever practicable and feasible.
- Evaluate the potential for overpasses, underpasses, and culverts in cases where a roadway or other transportation project may interrupt the flow of species through their habitat. Provide wildlife crossings in accordance with proven standards, such as FHWA's Critter Crossings or Ventura County Mitigation Guidelines and in consultation with wildlife corridor authorities with sufficient knowledge of both regional and local wildlife corridors, and at locations useful and appropriate for the species of concern.
- Install wildlife fencing where appropriate to minimize the probability of wildlife injury due to direct interaction between wildlife and roads or construction.
- Establish native vegetation and facilitate the enhancement and maintenance of biological diversity within existing habitat pockets in urban environments that provide connectivity to large-scale habitat areas.
- Where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, design sufficient conservation measures through coordination with local agencies and the regulatory agency (i.e., USFWS or CDFW) and in accordance with the respective counties and cities general plans to

establish plans to mitigate for the loss of fish and wildlife movement corridors and/or wildlife nursery sites. The consideration of conservation measures may include the following measures, in addition to the measures outlined in MM-BIO-1(b), where applicable:
    - Wildlife movement buffer zones
    - Corridor realignment
    - Appropriately spaced breaks in center barriers
    - Stream rerouting
    - Culverts
    - Creation of artificial movement corridors such as freeway under- or overpasses
    - Other comparable measures
- Where the Lead Agency has identified that a RTP/SCS project, or other regionally significant project, has the potential to impact other open space or nursery site areas, seek comparable coverage for these areas in consultation with the USFWS, CDFW, NMFS, or other local jurisdictions.
- Project sponsors should emphasize that urban habitats and the plant and wildlife species they support are indeed valuable, despite the fact they are located in urbanized (previously disturbed) areas. Established habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors in these urban ecosystems will likely be impacted with further urbanization, as proposed in the Project. Appropriate mitigation measures should be proposed, developed, and implemented in these sensitive urban microhabitats to support or enhance the rich diversity of urban plant and wildlife species.
- Establish native vegetation within habitat pockets or the "wildling of urbanized habitats" that facilitate the enhancement and maintenance of biological diversity in these areas. These habitat pockets, as the hopscotch across an urban environment, provide connectivity to large-scale habitat areas.

**MM-BIO-5(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant impacts related to conflicts with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of local jurisdictions and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to comply with county, city and local policies or ordinances, protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policies or ordinances, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consult with the appropriate local agency responsible for the administration of the policy or ordinance protecting biological resources.
- Prioritize retention of trees on-site consistent with local regulations. Provide adequate protection during the construction period for any trees that are to remain standing, as recommended by a certified arborist.
- If specific project area trees are designated as "Protected Trees," "Landmark Trees," or "Heritage Trees," obtain approval for encroachment or removals through the appropriate entity, and develop appropriate mitigation measures at that time, to ensure that the trees are replaced. Mitigation trees shall be locally collected native species.
- Before the start of any clearing, excavation, construction or other work on the site, securely fence off every protected tree deemed to be potentially endangered by said site work. Keep such fences in place for duration of all such work. Clearly mark all trees to be

removed. Establish a scheme for the removal and disposal of logs, brush, earth and other debris that will avoid injury to any protected tree.

- Where proposed development or other site work could encroach upon the protected perimeter of any protected tree, incorporate special measures to allow the roots to breathe and obtain water and nutrients. Minimize any excavation, cutting, filing, or compaction of the existing ground surface within the protected perimeter. Require that no change in existing ground level occur from the base of any protected tree at any time. Require that no burning or use of equipment with an open flame occur near or within the protected perimeter of any protected tree.
- Require that no storage or dumping of oil, gas, chemicals, or other substances that may be harmful to trees occur from the base of any protected trees, or any other location on the site from which such substances might enter the protected perimeter. Require that no heavy construction equipment or construction materials be operated or stored within a distance from the base of any protected trees. Require that wires, ropes, or other devices not be attached to any protected tree, except as needed for support of the tree. Require that no sign, other than a tag showing the botanical classification, be attached to any protected tree.
- Thoroughly spray the leaves of protected trees with water periodically during construction to prevent buildup of dust and other pollution that would inhibit leaf transpiration.
- If any damage to a protected tree should occur during or as a result of work on the site, the appropriate local agency will be immediately notified of such damage. If, such tree cannot be preserved in a healthy state, require replacement of any tree removed with another tree or trees on the same site deemed adequate by the local agency to compensate for the loss of the tree that is removed.
- Remove all debris created as a result of any tree removal work from the property within two weeks of debris creation, and such debris shall be properly disposed of in accordance with all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations.
- Design projects to avoid conflicts with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources.
- Where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, sufficient conservation measures to fulfill the requirements of the applicable policy or ordinance shall be developed, such as to support issuance of a tree removal permit. The consideration of conservation measures may include:
    - Avoidance strategies
    - Contribution of in-lieu fees
    - Planting of replacement trees at a minimum ratio of 2:1
    - Re-landscaping areas with native vegetation post-construction
    - Other comparable measures.

**MM-BIO-6(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant impacts on HCP and NCCPs that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with Section 7 or 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act or Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act; and implementing regulations, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consult with the appropriate federal, state, and/or local agency responsible for the administration of HCPs,NCCPs or other conservation programs.
- Wherever practicable and feasible, the project shall be designed to avoid through project design lands preserved under the conditions of an HCP or NCCP.
- Where avoidance is determined to be infeasible, sufficient conservation measures to fulfill the requirements of the HCP and/or NCCP, which would include but not be limited to applicable authorization for incidental take pursuant to Section 7 or 10(a) of the federal Endangered Species Act or Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act, shall be developed to support issuance of an Incidental take permit or any other permissions required for development within the HCP/NCCP boundaries. The consideration of additional conservation measures would include the measures outlined in MM-BIO-1(b), where applicable.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** Per threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concluded that transportation projects and anticipated development projects resulting from land use strategies included in the Plan would result in substantial adverse effects to threatened and/or endangered species, fully protected and sensitive species, locally important species, or associated critical habitat through the conversion of natural habitats capable of sustaining these species to development, constituting a significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, pp. 3.4-55, 3.4-56) However, it recognizes that the Plan's regional land use strategies also include conservation of natural habitat capable of sustaining listed and sensitive species to development by focusing new growth on high quality transit areas, existing suburban town center, and more walkable, mixed-used communities and supporting the redirection of growth away from high value habitat areas to existing urbanized areas. (Id., p. 3.4-56) Still, direct impacts would occur during project construction, including direct loss of sensitive plant and wildlife species, direct habitat loss and fragmentation, and introduction of light, noise, and dust; indirect impacts would occur if suitable habitat were encroached upon to the extent that it could no longer support species, and if development related to transportation projects had direct impacts. (Id., pp. 3.4-58, 3.4-59) This impact would remain cumulatively significant unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-BIO 1(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.4-81)

With regard to threshold b), transportation and anticipated development projects would convert sensitive plant communities and riparian habitats to development, constituting a significant impact. However, the Plan also seeks to minimize conversion of natural landscapes that may contain sensitive plant communities and riparian habitats by encouraging land use strategies that focus new growth in high quality transit areas, existing suburban town centers, and more walkable, mixed-used communities; the plan also seeks to preserve natural habitats and redirect growth away from high value habitat areas to existing urbanized areas. (Id., p. 3.4-59) Proposed land use strategies in the Plan are built to support and complement city and county conservation frameworks. (Ibid.) Regardless, impacts would include direct loss and fragmentation of sensitive communities and riparian habitats as new transportation projects are development, and the introduction of non-native plants that would degrade existing communities; indirect impacts would include development of associated manufacturing and institutional infrastructure within surrounding areas that may impact sensitive plant communities and riparian habitats through disturbance and removal of vegetation. (Id., p. 3.4-61) This impact would remain cumulatively significant unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-BIO-1(b) and MM-BIO-2(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.4-82)

Similarly, under threshold c), transportation and development projects resulting from the Plan would convert federally protected wetland habitats to development and divert waters of the United States. (Id., p. 3.4-62) The land use strategies described above also seek to minimize this impact, but despite these growth strategies, impacts would be expected to occur where dredge or fill

would be required within wetlands or other waters of the United States, particularly where transportation projects need to cross drainages and a clearspan to avoid impacts is determined to be infeasible. (Ibid.) The SCAG PEIR concludes that impacts will vary on a project-by-project basis, but that overall, the Plan would have potentially significant impacts absent mitigation. (Id., pp. 3.4-62, 3.4-65) This potentially significant and cumulative impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated, including MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), and MM-BIO-3(b), reproduced above. (Id., p. 3.4-82)

Under threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation and development projects resulting from the Plan would interfere substantially with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites directly as a result of habitat conversion to accommodate transportation projects, or indirectly through interruption of movement or migratory corridors caused by construction of infrastructure for transportation projects and appurtenant structures, constituting a significant impact. (Id., pp. 3.4-65, 3.4-66) The land use strategies described above also seek to minimize this impact, and impacts would vary on a project-by-project basis. (Id., p. 3.4-66) Direct habitat removal and fragmentation would disrupt corridor functionality as new transportation projects are developed, and introduction of lighting and noise during construction and operation may interrupt wildlife movement and disturb nursery sites; construction across existing corridors may also introduce barriers to wildlife movement or increase the impact of barriers to movement by widening barriers and thus narrowing corridors. (Id., pp. 3.4-66, 3.4-67) Indirect impacts would occur when the functionality of a corridor is degraded after transportation project construction, and by increase in human disturbance due to traffic, noise, and lighting, and development of associated manufacturing and institutional infrastructure within surrounding areas. (Id., p. 3.4-67) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with implementation of MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), and MM-BIO-4(b). (Id., p. 3.4-82)

Per threshold e), the SCAG PEIR concludes that development under the Plan would also potentially result in conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources because it may occur in undeveloped locations, including open spaces that may be protected under city or county general plans, and result in the disturbance or removal of trees and other protected vegetation, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.4-67) The above described land use strategies seek to reduce this impact, but impacts might nonetheless be expected to occur because many natural land areas near the edge of existing urbanized areas may be vulnerable to development pressure, and transportation projects that are aimed to improve accessibility might result in expansion of existing urbanized uses. (Ibid.) Transportation projects included in the 2016 RTP/SCS are anticipated to occur throughout the SCAG region, and each project would be subject to, and have the potential to conflict with, the policies and ordinances applicable to the local government with jurisdiction over the project location. (Id., p. 3.4-68) The level of this impact will vary on a project-by-project basis, but overall the Plan would have the potential to result in significant impacts, which would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with mitigation measures MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-BIO-4(b), and MM-BIO-5(b) incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.4-68, 3.4-82, 3.4-83)

Similarly for threshold e), the development expected under the Plan has the potential to conflict with applicable adopted HCPs and NCCPs because the development would be in lands protected by said HCPs and NCCPs, constituting a significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.4-69) The above described land use strategies seek to reduce this impact, but major transportation projects included in the Plan have the potential to impact land within 5 of the 13 HCPs/NCCPs in the SCAG region. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.4-69, Table 3.4.4-10) Potential impacts would include direct impacts to

lands protected under these HCPs and NCCPs as well as potential direct and indirect impacts to plant and animal species and their habitats afforded protection under these HCPs and NCCPs through conversion of habitat and introduction of lighting and noise during construction and operation; impacts would be limited to new transportation segments, and there would be no impacts related to improvements to existing features. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.4-69) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with mitigation measures MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-BIO-4(b), MM-BIO-5(b), and MM-BIO-6(b) incorporated. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.4-83)

**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 SCAG PEIR MM-BIO 1(b), because Roquet Ranch MM 4.3-1, 4.3-2, and 4.3-3 provide for feasible avoidance and mitigation of impacts to southwestern willow flycatcher, least Bell's vireo, California gnatcatcher habitat, and burrowing owl, as well as appropriate compensatory measures where avoidance and preservation are infeasible. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 0.3-acre black willow thicket/ornamental that occurs within the Project site associated with Drainage A. (Id., p. 4.3-27) Accordingly, among other things, 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) These mitigation measures are consistent with SCAG PEIR MM-BIO-1(b) and MM-BIO-2(b), which require appropriate conservation measures where avoiding permanent, direct impacts is not practicable or feasible. The Project would therefore have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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, ES-24) Because there is No Impact, SCAG PEIR MM-BIO-3(b) does not apply.

With regard to threshold d), absent mitigation, the Project has the potential to result in significant impacts to nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Wildlife 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) This measure is consistent with SCAG PEIR MM-BIO-4(b), as it incorporates appropriate mitigation measures comparable to those listed for consideration by the Lead Agency, and tailored to the specific impact identified to nests. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

Under threshold e), the Project would have a potentially significant impact absent mitigation because it proposes 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.) This is consistent with SCAG PEIR MM-BIO-5(b), which indicates that the Lead Agency should consider mitigation measures to comply with applicable local ordinances that protect biological resources, such as tree preservation policies or ordinances. The Project would therefore have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR

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.) Because there is No Impact, SCAG MM-BIO-6(b) does not apply.

| **5. Cultural Resources**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to directly or indirectly destroy unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geological features. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, including tribal cultural resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, including tribal cultural resources, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Potential to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, including Native American Sacred Sites. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-CUL-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on unique paleontological resources or sites and unique geologic features that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of National Park Service, Office of Historic Preservation, and Native American Heritage Commission, other public agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures consistent with Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines capable of avoiding or reducing significant impacts on unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features. Ensure compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 5097.5 of the Public Resources Code (PRC),state programs pursuant to Sections 5024 and 5024.5 of the PRC, adopted county and city general plans, and other

federal, state and local regulations, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Obtain review by a qualified geologist or paleontologist to determine if the project has the potential to require excavation or blasting of parent material with a moderate to high potential to contain unique paleontological or resources, or to require the substantial alteration of a unique geologic feature.
- Avoid exposure or displacement of parent material with a moderate to high potential to yield unique paleontological resources.
- Where avoidance of parent material with a moderate to high potential to yield unique paleontological resources is not feasible:
    - All on-site construction personnel receive Worker Education and Awareness Program (WEAP) training to understand the regulatory framework that provides for protection of paleontological resources and become familiar with diagnostic characteristics of the materials with the potential to be encountered.
    - Prepare a Paleontological Resource Management Plan (PRMP) to guide the salvage, documentation and repository of representative samples of unique paleontological resources encountered during construction. If unique paleontological resources are encountered during excavation or blasting, use a qualified paleontologist to oversee the implementation of the PRMP.
    - Monitor blasting and earth-moving activities in parent material, with a moderate to high potential to yield unique paleontological resources using a qualified paleontologist or archeologists cross-trained in paleontology to determine if unique paleontological resources are encountered during such activities, consistent with the specified or comparable protocols.
    - Identify where excavation and earthmoving activity is proposed in a geologic unit having a moderate or high potential for containing fossils and specify the need for a paleontological or archeological (cross-trained in paleontology) to be present during earth-moving activities or blasting in these areas.
- Avoid routes and project designs that would permanently alter unique features with archaeological and/or paleontological significance,
- Salvage and document adversely affected resources sufficient to support ongoing scientific research and education.

**MM-CUL-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects of on historical resources within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Office of Historical Preservation, Native American Heritage Commission, other public agencies, and/or Local Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures consistent with Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines capable of avoiding or reducing significant impacts on historical resources, to ensure compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 5097.5 of the Public Resources Code (PRC), state programs pursuant to Sections 5024 and 5024.5 of the PRC, adopted county and city general plans and other federal, state and local regulations, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, conduct a record search at the appropriate Information Center to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether historic resources were identified.

- Obtain a qualified architectural historian to conduct historic architectural surveys as recommended by the Information Center. In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Information Center will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the sensitivity of the project area for historical resources within 1,000 feet of the project.
- Comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) including, but not limited to, projects for which federal funding or approval is required for the individual project. This law requires federal agencies to evaluate the impact of their actions on resources included in or eligible for listing in the National Register. Federal agencies must coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Officer in evaluating impacts and developing mitigation. These mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to the following:
    - Employ design measures to avoid historical resources and undertake adaptive reuse where appropriate and feasible. If resources are to be preserved, as feasible, carry out the maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration, preservation, conservation or reconstruction in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. If resources would be impacted, impacts should be minimized to the extent feasible.
    - Where feasible, noise buffers/walls and/or visual buffers/landscaping should be constructed to preserve the contextual setting of significant built resources.
- Secure a qualified environmental agency and/or architectural historian, or other such qualified person to document any significant historical resource(s), by way of historic narrative, photographs, and architectural drawings, as mitigation for the effects of demolition of a resource.
- Consult with the NAHC to determine whether known sacred sites are in the project area, and identify the Native American(s) to contact to obtain information about the project site.
- Prior to construction activities, obtain a qualified archaeologist to conduct a record search at the appropriate Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether resources were identified.
- Prior to construction activities, obtain a qualified archaeologist or architectural historian (depending on applicability) to conduct archaeological and/or historic architectural surveys as recommended by the Information Center. In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Information Center will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the sensitivity of the project area for archaeological resources.
- If a record search indicates that the project is located in an area rich with cultural materials, retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any subsurface operations, including but not limited to grading, excavation, trenching, or removal of existing features of the subject property.
- Conduct construction activities and excavation to avoid cultural resources (if identified). If avoidance is not feasible, further work may be needed to determine the importance of a resource. Retain a qualified archaeologist familiar with the local archaeology, and/or as appropriate, an architectural historian who should make recommendations regarding the work necessary to determine importance. If the cultural resource is determined to be important under state or federal guidelines, impacts on the cultural resource will need to be mitigated.
- Stop construction activities and excavation in the area where cultural resources are found until a qualified archaeologist can determine the importance of these resources.

**MM-CUL-4(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects to human remains that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Native American Heritage Commission, other public agencies, and/or Local Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency should consider mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing significant impacts on human remains, to ensure compliance with the California Health and Safety Code, Section 7060 and Section 18950-18961 and Native American Heritage Commission, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction or excavation activities associated with the project, in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, cease further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required.
- If any discovered remains are of Native American origin:
    - Contact the County Coroner to contact the NAHC to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner should make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods. This may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains.
    - If the NAHC is unable to identify a descendant, or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission, obtain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance where the following conditions occur:
        - The NAHC is unable to identify a descendent;
        - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or
        - The landowner or their authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** Under threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects and anticipated development under the Plan could result in substantial adverse effects to paleontological resources and sites because urbanized areas in the SCAG region are often underlain by parent material that has a moderate to high potential to yield unique paleontological resources or sites. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.5-36) Excavation associated with development and infrastructure construction activities could expose unique resources such as true fossils, fossil cast, and breas, and could also permanently alter unique geologic features, particularly in rock outcroppings, canyons, coastal areas, and mountain passes. (Ibid.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-1(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.5-46)

Under threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects and anticipated development under the plan could result in substantial adverse changes in the significance of historical resources, including tribal cultural resources, such as the over 1,000 historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, and unrecognized historic resources. (Id., p. 3.5-37) Anticipated activities

could impact the physical and aesthetic integrity of historic buildings and communities, as well as negatively impact the structures through increased levels of corrosive air contaminants and vibrations, which may damage the exterior of historic buildings, constituting a significant impacts, requiring mitigation. (Id., pp. 3.5-37, 3.5-38) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-2(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.5-46)

With regard to threshold c), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects and anticipated development under the plan could result in substantial adverse changes in the significance of up to 100,000 archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources, and unrecognized historic resources, due to unanticipated disturbance where resources are not visible at the ground surface, but are buried in native soils below the ground surface, and in some instances below development that has taken place during the historic period. (Id., p. 3.5-38). Construction and transportation projects may expose and/or displace these resources, requiring mitigation. (Id, pp. 3.5-38, 3.5-39.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-2(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.5-46)

With regard to threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that while construction and implementation of transportation projects would not be expected to disturb human remains within areas operating as existing, formal cemeteries, they have the potential to disturb remains interred outside of formal cemeteries or those interred in Native American sacred sites, constituting a significant adverse impact. (Id., p. 3.5-39) This is especially true in previously undisturbed areas or areas with only little previous disturbance. (Ibid.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-4(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.5-46)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion**: Under threshold a), 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) Accordingly, 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 SCAG PEIR.

With regard to threshold b), the Project would not impact any of the City's identified historic districts, nor would it impact any mapped historic landmarks. (Id, 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) Because the impact would be less than significant, no mitigation is required, and SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-2(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), 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.) These measures are consistent with SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-2(b), and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) No mitigation is required, and SCAG PEIR MM-CUL-4(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **7. Geology and Soils**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving (i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; (ii) strong seismic ground shaking; (iii) seismic related groundfailure, including liquefaction; (iv) landslides. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Potential to be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| 7. **Geology and Soils**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Potential to have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-GEO-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on the potential for projects to result in the exposure of people and infrastructure to the effects of earthquakes, seismic related ground-failure, liquefaction, and seismically induced landslides, that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies, regulatory agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with County and City Public Works and Building and Safety Department Standards, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC), and other applicable laws and regulations governing building standards, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consistent with Section 4.7.2 of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, conduct a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults. An evaluation and written report of a specific site be prepared by a licensed geologist. If an active fault is found and unfit for human occupancy over the fault, place a setback of 50 feet from the fault.
- Use site-specific fault identification investigations conducted by licensed geotechnical professionals in accordance with the requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Act, as well as any applicable Caltrans regulations that exceed or reasonably replace the requirements of the Act to either determine that the anticipated risk to people and property is at or below acceptable levels or site-specific measures have been incorporated into the project design, consistent with the CBC and UBC.
- Ensure that projects located within or across Alquist-Priolo Zones comply with design requirements provided in Special Publication 117, published by the California Geological Survey, as well as relevant local, regional, state, and federal design criteria for construction in seismic areas.
- Consistent with the CBC and local regulatory agencies with oversight of development associated with the Plan, ensure that projects are designed in accordance with county and city code requirements for seismic ground shaking. With respect to design, consider

seismicity of the site, soil response at the site, and dynamic characteristics of the structure, in compliance with the appropriate California Building Code and State of California design standards for construction in or near fault zones, as well as all standard design, grading, and construction practices in order to avoid or reduce geologic hazards.

- Consistent with the CBC and local regulatory agencies with oversight of development associated with the Plan, ensure that site-specific geotechnical investigations conducted by a qualified geotechnical expert be required prior to preparation of project designs. These investigations shall identify areas of potential expansive soils and recommend remedial geotechnical measures to eliminate any problems. Recommended corrective measures, such as structural reinforcement and replacing soil with engineered fill, shall be implemented in project designs. Geotechnical investigations identify areas of potential failure and recommend remedial geotechnical measures to eliminate any problems.
- Adhere to design standards described in the CBC and all standard geotechnical investigation, design, grading, and construction practices to avoid or reduce impacts from earthquakes, ground shaking, ground failure, and landslides.
- Consistent with the CBC and local regulatory agencies with oversight of development associated with the Plan, design projects to avoid geologic units or soils that are unstable, expansive soils and soils prone to lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse wherever feasible.

**MM-GEO-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on the potential for projects to result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies, regulatory agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with County and City Public Works and Building and Safety Department Standards, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC), and other applicable laws and regulations governing building standards, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consistent with the CBC and local regulatory agencies with oversight of development associated with the Plan, ensure that site-specific geotechnical investigations conducted by a qualified geotechnical expert are conducted to ascertain soil types prior to preparation of project designs. These investigations can and should identify areas of potential failure and recommend remedial geotechnical measures to eliminate any problems.
- Consistent with the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for projects over one acre in size, obtain coverage under the General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit (General Construction Permit) issued by the SWRCB and conduct the following:
    - File a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the SWRCB.
    - Prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and submit the plan for review and approval by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). At a minimum, the SWPPP should include a description of construction materials, practices, and equipment storage and maintenance; a list of pollutants likely to contact stormwater; site-specific erosion and sedimentation control practices; a list of provisions to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to stormwater; best management practices (BMPs); and an inspection and monitoring program.
    - Submit to the RWQCB a copy of the SWPPP and evidence of submittal of the NOI to the SWRCB. Implementation of the SWPPP should start with the commencement of construction and continue through the completion of the project.

    - After construction is completed, the project sponsor can and should submit a notice of termination to the SWRCB.
- Consistent with the requirements of the SWRCB and local regulatory agencies with oversight of development associated with the Plan, ensure that project designs provide adequate slope drainage and appropriate landscaping to minimize the occurrence of slope instability and erosion. Design features should include measures to reduce erosion caused by storm water. Road cuts should be designed to maximize the potential for revegetation.
- Consistent with the CBC and local regulatory agencies with oversight of development associated with the Plan, ensure that, prior to preparing project designs, new and abandoned wells are identified within construction areas to ensure the stability of nearby soils.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects and development encouraged under the Plan could expose people or structures to substantial risks or hazards from seismic activity, constituting a potentially significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.7-21) Numerous seismic faults are known to exist in the SCAG region, and development under the Plan could therefore be directly exposed to seismic events capable of significantly affecting structures. (Ibid.) This impact remains cumulatively significant and unavoidable with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-GEO-1(b). (Id., p. 3.7-33)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that development of transportation projects and urban development patterns under the Plan that direct more growth into existing suburban town centers, walkable mixed-use communities, and areas well-served by transit may result in significant impacts from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.7-23) Some of these projects and patterns would require significant earthwork including cuts into hillsides, which could become unstable over time, increasing long-term erosion potential; some areas may be more susceptible to landslides than others due to naturally occurring soils with high erosion potential, and even engineered soils can erode due to poor construction methods and design features or lack of maintenance. (Ibid.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-GEO-2(b). (Id., p. 3.7-34)

With regard to threshold c), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects, especially those that involve large-scale disturbance, and regional land use strategies that encourage compact development would expose people and structures to geologic hazards and risks due to subsidence, slope failure, and the presence of expansive soils where projects are located in these types of soils. (Id., p. 3.7-24) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-GEO-1(b). (Id., p. 3.7-34)

With regard to threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects, especially those that involve large-scale disturbance, and regional land use strategies that encourage compact development would expose people and structures to risks where transportation projects and development patterns encouraged by strategies are located within expansive soils, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.7-25) Soils with a high percentage of clay occur in localized areas in the SCAG region, making it necessary to survey project areas extensively prior to construction. (Ibid.) While expansive soils are typically removed during construction, this impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-GEO-1(b). (Id., pp. 3.7-25, 3.7-26, 3.7-34)

With regard to threshold e), the SCAG PEIR concludes that because the Plan does not encourage or anticipate development in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water

or where densities do not support the provision of sanitary sewers, impacts from having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use or septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., pp. 3.7-26, ES-30)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion**: A geotechnical report was 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.) Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) Because the impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required, SCAG PEIR MM-GEO-2(b) does not apply, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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. Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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.) Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to directly or indirectly result in an increase in GHG emissions compared to existing conditions. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to conflict with SB 375 GHG Emission Reduction Targets. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to conflict with AB 32 and or any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-GHG-3(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases that are within the jurisdiction and authority of California Air Resources Board, local air districts, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to mitigate the significant effects of greenhouse gas impacts to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, governing CAPs, general plans, adopted policies and plans of local agencies, and standards set forth by responsible public agencies for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, as applicable and feasible. Consistent with Section 15126.4(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, compliance can be achieved through adopting greenhouse gas mitigation measures that have been used for projects in the SCAG region as set forth below, or through comparable measures identified by Lead Agency:

- Measures in an adopted plan or mitigation program for the reduction of emissions that are required as part of the Lead Agency's decision.
- Reduction in emissions resulting from a project through implementation of project features, project design, or other measures, such as those described in Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines.
- Off-site measures to mitigate a project's emissions.
- Measures that consider incorporation of Best Available Control Technology (BACT) during design, construction and operation of projects to minimize GHG emissions, including but not limited to:

    - Use energy and fuel efficient vehicles and equipment. Project proponents are encouraged to meet and exceed EPA/NHTSA/CARB standards relating to fuel efficiency and emission reduction;
    - Use alternative (non-petroleum based) fuels;
    - Deployment of zero- and/or near zero emission technologies as defined by CARB;
    - Use lighting systems that are energy efficient, such as LED technology;
    - Use the minimum feasible amount of GHG-emitting construction materials that is feasible;
    - Use cement blended with the maximum feasible amount of fly ash or other materials that reduce GHG emissions from cement production;
    - Incorporate design measures to reduce GHG emissions from solid waste management through encouraging solid waste reduction, recycling and reuse;
    - Incorporate passive solar and other design measures to reduce energy consumption and increase production and use of renewable energy;
    - Incorporate design measures like Water Sense fixtures and water capture to reduce water consumption;
    - Use lighter-colored pavement where feasible;
    - Recycle construction debris to maximum extent feasible;
    - Protect and plant shade trees in or near construction projects where feasible; and
    - Solicit bids that include concepts listed above.
- Measures that encourage transit use, carpooling, bike-share and car-share programs, active transportation, and parking strategies, including, but not limited to, transit-active transportation coordinated strategies, increased bicycle carrying capacity on transit and rail vehicles;
- Incorporating bicycle and pedestrian facilities into project designs, maintaining these facilities, and providing amenities incentivizing their use; providing adequate bicycle parking and planning for and building local bicycle projects that connect with the regional network;
- Improving transit access to rail and bus routes by incentives for construction of transit facilities within developments, and/or providing dedicated shuttle service to transit stations; and
- Adopting employer trip reduction measures to reduce employee trips such as vanpool and carpool programs, providing end-of-trip facilities, and telecommuting programs.
- Designate a percentage of parking spaces for ride-sharing vehicles or high-occupancy vehicles, and provide adequate passenger loading and unloading for those vehicles;
- Land use siting and design measures that reduce GHG emissions, including:
    - Developing on infill and brownfields sites;
    - Building high density and mixed use developments near transit;
    - Retaining on-site mature trees and vegetation, and planting new canopy trees; Measures that increase vehicle efficiency, encourage use of zero and low emissions vehicles, or reduce the carbon content of fuels, including constructing or encouraging construction of electric vehicle charging stations or neighborhood electric vehicle networks, or charging for electric bicycles; and
    - Measures to reduce GHG emissions from solid waste management through encouraging solid waste recycling and reuse.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that GHG emissions resulting from that Plan would have a less than significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.8-34) Across the six counties in the SCAG region, the Plan would result in approximately a 24 percent decrease in GHG emissions by 2040, despite a substantial increase

in population, households, and jobs. (Id., pp. 3.8-34, 3.8-35) As part of the Plan, transportation network improvements would be included, and more compact, infill, walkable and mixed-use development strategies to accommodate new region's growth would be encouraged to accommodate increases in population, households, employment, and travel demand. (Id., pp. 3.8-35, 3.8-36) Locating new growth near bikeways, greenways, and transit would active transportation options and the use of other transit modes (public transit, carpooling), thereby reducing the number of vehicle trips and trip lengths and associated emissions. (Id., p. 3.8-36) Land use strategies included in the Plan encourage higher density development in existing urban cores and opportunity areas which would encourage more multi-family and/or mixed-use projects, via vertical development, instead of the traditional single-family home develop. (Ibid.) Compact development and utilization of conservation strategies (i.e. Title 24 building codes, LEED certification), if implemented, would also limit energy and water consumption. (Ibid.) A less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold b), the PEIR concludes that the Plan would have a less than significant impact with respect to its potential to conflict with SB 375 GHG Emission Reduction Targets. (Id., p. 3.8-37) Per capital emissions from cars and light duty trucks would meet the 8 percent decrease in per capita $CO_2$ emissions target by 2020 by the region set by SB 375, and would reach an 18 percent decrease by 2035, which exceeds the 13 percent target for the region. (Id., p. 3.8-38) By meeting and exceeding the SB 375 targets for 2020 and 2035, as well as achieving an approximately 22 percent decrease in per capita GHG emissions by 2040 (an additional 4 percent reduction in the five years between 2035 (18 percent) and 2040 (22 percent)), the Plan is expected to fulfill and exceed its portion of SB 375 compliance with respect to meeting the State's GHG emission reduction goals, and would have a less than significant impact with no mitigation required. (Ibid.)

With regard to threshold c), the PEIR concludes that by meeting its SB 375 targets, the Plan contributes its share, if not greater, to meeting AB 32 targets and consistency with the Scoping Plan. (Id., p. 3.8-39) The compact land use patterns of the Plan provide more efficient use of water and energy of building operations, among others. (Ibid.) This efficiency leads to GHG emissions reduction beyond SB 375 and ensures the region to be on track with AB 32 goals. (Ibid.) The assurance for meeting statewide AB 32 goals as outlined in the Plan as well as in the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan provide a pathway towards meeting the State's long-term GHG emissions reduction goals as set forth in Executive Orders. (Ibid.) Therefore, the Plan is not in conflict with AB 32. (Ibid.) It is also not expected to result in significant impacts on city and county climate-related plans. (Id., p. 4.8-40) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. However, the cumulative impact under threshold c) would potentially be considerable, and the PEIR assumed that it would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of MM-GHG-3(b) and MM-EN-2(b). (Id., pp. 3.8-41, 3.8-45)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion**: With regard to thresholds a) and b), the Project EIR calculates Project GHG emissions in relation to the existing setting consistent with the methodology used in the SCAG PEIR GHG study and 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). (Project EIR, pp. 4.5-5, 4.6-35 – 4.6-42). The Project EIR also evaluates the Project's consistency with the SCAG RTP/SCS prepared pursuant to SB 375. 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 MTCO2e 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 SCAG RTP/SCS, (Id., pp. 4.6-40 to 4.6-42) Accordingly, the Project is within the RTP/SCS's growth projection, although it is just a small part of such growth projection. 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. Under SCAG PEIR thresholds a) and b), the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

With regard to threshold c), 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, and as such SCAG PEIR MM-EN-2(b) and MM-GHG-3(b) do not apply. (Id., pp. 4.6-48, 4.6-49) Under thresholds c), the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d. Potential to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e. Potential for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| **9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| or working in the project area. | | | | |
| f. Potential for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| g. Potential to impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| h. Potential to expose 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-HAZ-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects related to the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Hazardous Waste Control Act, the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program, the Hazardous Waste Source Reduction and Management Review Act of 1989, the California Vehicle Code, and other applicable laws and regulations, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Where the construction or operation of projects involves the transport of hazardous material, provide a written plan of proposed routes of travel demonstrating use of roadways designated for the transport of such materials.
- Where the construction or operation of projects involves the transport of hazardous materials, avoid transport of such materials within one-quarter mile of schools, when school is in session, wherever feasible.
- Where it is not feasible to avoid transport of hazardous materials, within one-quarter mile of schools on local streets, provide notification of the anticipated schedule of transport of such materials.
- Specify the need for interim storage and disposal of hazardous materials to be undertaken consistent with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations in the plans and specifications for transportation improvement project.
- Submit a Hazardous Materials Business/Operations Plan for review and approval by the appropriate local agency. Once approved, keep the plan on file with the Lead Agency (or other appropriate government agency) and update, as applicable. The purpose of the Hazardous Materials Business/Operations Plan is to ensure that employees are adequately trained to handle the materials and provides information to the local fire protection agency should emergency response be required. The Hazardous Materials Business/Operations Plan should include the following:
    - The types of hazardous materials or chemicals stored and/or used on-site, such as petroleum fuel products, lubricants, solvents, and cleaning fluids.
    - The location of such hazardous materials.
    - An emergency response plan including employee training information.
    - A plan that describes the manner in which these materials are handled, transported and disposed.
- Specify the appropriate procedures for interim storage and disposal of hazardous materials, anticipated to be required in support of operations and maintenance activities, in conformance with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations, in the Operations Manual for projects.
- Follow manufacturer's recommendations on use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction.
- Avoid overtopping construction equipment fuel gas tanks.
- During routine maintenance of construction equipment, properly contain and remove grease and oils.
- Properly dispose of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

**MM-HAZ-4(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines; SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects related to a project placed on a hazardous materials site, that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of regulatory agencies, other public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Government Code Section 65962.5, Occupational Safety and Health Code of 197; the Response Conservation, and Recovery Act; the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; the Hazardous Materials Release and Clean-up Act, and the Uniform Building Code, and County and City building standards, and all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations governing hazardous waste sites, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, including a review and consideration of data from all known databases of contaminated sites, during the process of planning, environmental clearance, and construction for projects.
- Where warranted due to the known presence of contaminated materials, submit to the appropriate agency responsible for hazardous materials/wastes oversight a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report if warranted by a Phase I report for the project site. The reports should make recommendations for remedial action, if appropriate, and be signed by a Registered Environmental Assessor, Professional Geologist, or Professional Engineer.
- Implement the recommendations provided in the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report, where such a report was determined to be necessary for the construction or operation of the project, for remedial action.
- Submit a copy of all applicable documentation required by local, state, and federal environmental regulatory agencies, including but not limited to: permit applications, Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments, human health and ecological risk assessments, remedial action plans, risk management plans, soil management plans, and groundwater management plans.
- Conduct soil sampling and chemical analyses of samples, consistent with the protocols established by the U.S. EPA to determine the extent of potential contamination beneath all underground storage tanks (USTs), elevator shafts, clarifiers, and subsurface hydraulic lifts when on-site demolition or construction activities would potentially affect a particular development or building.
- Consult with the appropriate local, state, and federal environmental regulatory agencies to ensure sufficient minimization of risk to human health and environmental resources, both during and after construction, posed by soil contamination, groundwater contamination, or other surface hazards including, but not limited to, underground storage tanks, fuel distribution lines, waste pits and sumps.
- Obtain and submit written evidence of approval for any remedial action if required by a local, state, or federal environmental regulatory agency.
- Cease work If soil, groundwater, or other environmental medium with suspected contamination is encountered unexpectedly during construction activities (e.g., identified by odor or visual staining, or if any underground storage tanks, abandoned drums, or other hazardous materials or wastes are encountered), in the vicinity of the suspect material. Secure the area as necessary and take all appropriate measures to protect human health and the environment, including but not limited to: notification of regulatory agencies and identification of the nature and extent of contamination. Stop work in the areas affected until the measures have been implemented consistent with the guidance of the appropriate regulatory oversight authority.
- Use best management practices (BMPs) regarding potential soil and groundwater hazards.
- Soil generated by construction activities should be stockpiled on-site in a secure and safe manner. All contaminated soils determined to be hazardous or non-hazardous waste must be adequately profiled (sampled) prior to acceptable reuse or disposal at an appropriate off-site facility. Complete sampling and handling and transport procedures for reuse or disposal, in accordance with applicable local, state and federal laws and policies.
- Groundwater pumped from the subsurface should be contained on-site in a secure and safe manner, prior to treatment and disposal, to ensure environmental and health issues are resolved pursuant to applicable laws and policies. Utilize engineering controls, which include impermeable barriers to prohibit groundwater and vapor intrusion into the building.

- Prior to issuance of any demolition, grading, or building permit, submit for review and approval by the Lead Agency (or other appropriate government agency) written verification that the appropriate federal, state and/or local oversight authorities, including but not limited to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), have granted all required clearances and confirmed that the all applicable standards, regulations, and conditions have been met for previous contamination at the site.
- Develop, train, and implement appropriate worker awareness and protective measures to assure that worker and public exposure is minimized to an acceptable level and to prevent any further environmental contamination as a result of construction.
- If asbestos-containing materials (ACM) are found to be present in building materials to be removed, submit specifications signed by a certified asbestos consultant for the removal, encapsulation, or enclosure of the identified ACM in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including but not necessarily limited to: California Code of Regulations, Title 8; Business and Professions Code; Division 3; California Health and Safety Code Section 25915-25919.7; and other local regulations.
- Where projects include the demolitions or modification of buildings constructed prior to 1968, complete an assessment for the potential presence or lack thereof of ACM, lead-based paint, and any other building materials or stored materials classified as hazardous waste by state or federal law.
- Where the remediation of lead-based paint has been determined to be required, provide specifications to the appropriate agency, signed by a certified Lead Supervisor, Project Monitor, or Project Designer for the stabilization and/or removal of the identified lead paint in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations, including but not necessarily limited to: California Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (Cal OSHA's) Construction Lead Standard, Title 8 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 1532.1 and Department of Health Services (DHS) Regulation 17 CCR Sections 35001–36100, as may be amended. If other materials classified as hazardous waste by state or federal law are present, the project sponsor should submit written confirmation to the appropriate local agency that all state and federal laws and regulations should be followed when profiling, handling, treating, transporting, and/or disposing of such materials.
- Where a project site is determined to contain materials classified as hazardous waste by state or federal law are present, submit written confirmation to appropriate local agency that all state and federal laws and regulations should be followed when profiling, handling, treating, transporting, and/or disposing of such materials.

**MM-HAZ-8(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects from the potential exposure of 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; that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with local general plans, specific plans, and regulations provided by County and City fire departments, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Adhere to fire code requirements, including ignition-resistant construction with exterior walls of noncombustible or ignition resistant material from the surface of the ground to the roof system. Other fire-resistant measures would be applied to eaves, vents, windows, and doors to avoid any gaps that would allow intrusion by flame or embers.

- Adhere to the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazards Mitigation Plan, as well as local general plans, including policies and programs aimed at reducing the risk of wildland fires through land use compatibility, training, sustainable development, brush management, and public outreach.
- Encourage the use of fire-resistant vegetation native to Southern California and/or to the local microclimate (e.g., vegetation that has high moisture content, low growth habits, ignition-resistant foliage, or evergreen growth), eliminate brush and chaparral, and discourage the use of fire-promoting species especially non-native, invasive species (e.g., pampas grass, fennel, mustard, or the giant reed) in the immediate vicinity of development in areas with high fire threat.
- Encourage natural revegetation or seeding with local, native species after a fire and discourage reseeding of non-native, invasive species to promote healthy, natural ecosystem regrowth. Native vegetation is more likely to have deep root systems that prevent slope failure and erosion of burned areas than shallow-rooted non-natives.
- Submit a fire safety plan (including phasing) to the Lead Agency and local fire agency for their review and approval. The fire safety plan shall include all of the fire safety features incorporated into the project and the schedule for implementation of the features. The local fire protection agency may require changes to the plan or may reject the plan if it does not adequately address fire hazards associated with the project as a whole or the individual phase.
- Utilize Fire-wise Land Management by encouraging the use of fire-resistant vegetation and the elimination of brush and chaparral in the immediate vicinity of development in areas with high fire threat.
- Promote Fire Management Planning that would help reduce fire threats in the region as part of the Compass Blueprint process and other ongoing regional planning efforts.
- Encourage the use of fire-resistant materials when constructing projects in areas with high fire threat.

**See MM-TRA-5(b).**

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** Under threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that the Plan has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials because proposed freight rail enhancements and other goods movement could result in increased/new transport, and construction and maintenance projects would result in use of equipment that contains or uses routine hazardous materials and transportation of excavated soils and/or groundwater containing contaminants. (SCAG PEIR, pp. 3.9-24, 3.9-25) The increase in transport of hazardous materials is generally anticipated to result in a less than significant impact because handling and transport is subject to numerous laws, regulations, and health and safety standards set forth by federal, state, and local authorities. (Id., p. 3.9-25) Storage of materials is also regulated by local fire departments, Certified Unified Program Agencies, and the Cal OSHA. (Ibid.) However, the SCAG PEIR concludes that this impact would be significant due to the sheer volume contained in the Plan area. (Ibid.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-1(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.9-41)

With regard to threshold b), the PEIR concludes that implementation of transportation projects would facilitate the movement of goods, including hazardous wastes, through the SCAG region, and new development facilitated under the Plan, including industrial use, could generate and involve transportation of hazardous waste. (Id., p. 3.9-26) This would create the potential for significant impacts related to reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the

release of hazardous materials, requiring mitigation. (Ibid.) This impact would cumulatively remain significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-1(b) incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.9-41, 3.9-42)

With regard to threshold c), the PEIR concludes that transportation projects under the Plan would result in a significant impact by emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. (Id., p. 3.9-27) Results of a GIS analysis show that under the Plan, approximately 541 existing kindergarten through 12th-grade schools are within a one-quarter mile buffer of the transportation projects included in the Plan and could be affected. (Ibid.) While compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws, and regulations, would ensure that hazardous materials do not pose a significant risk to nearby receptors, due to the number of transportation projects and increased density of development, this impact would be significant. (Ibid.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-1(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.9-42)

Under threshold d), the PEIR concludes that transportation projects and potential development under the Plan have the potential to be located on listed sites, and there would thus be a significant impact absent mitigation. (Id., p. 3.9-28) This impact would be less than significant with compliance with federal, state, and local laws, and with SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-4(b) incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.9-28, 3.9-42)

Under threshold e), the PEIR concludes that although there are 57 public and private airports in the SCAG region, land use policies in the Plan would focus growth away from airport clear zones and accident potential zones, and airport land use compatibility plans would avoid and/or remedy safety risks associated with air traffic. (Id., p. 3.9-29) This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

Under threshold f), the PEIR concludes that although there are 14 private airstrips in the Plan area, including 3 within 1 mile of a high quality transit area, transportation projects and potential development resulting from the Plan would be discouraged from locating in proximity to a private airstrip. (Id., pp. 3.9-29, 3.9-30) This impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id, p. 3.9-30.)

With regard to threshold g), the PEIR concludes that the Plan would contribute to significant impacts in regard to emergency response services issues, because many areas already have insufficient fire protection and emergency response service, and implementation of the Plan would have the potential to further exacerbate existing needs and expanded needs from related projects. (Id., p. 3.9-34) This impact remains cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-TRA-5(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.9-42)

With regard to threshold h), the PEIR concludes that due to anticipated growth and development patterns under the Plan, significant impacts would occur with regard to more people being exposed to the effects of wildland fires, requiring the consideration of mitigation measures. (Id., pp. 3.9-34, 3.9-40) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-8(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.9-42)

**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 constriction; 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 SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR analysis and SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-1(b), and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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. Because there would be no impact, SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-1(b) does not apply under this threshold.

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, SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-4(b) 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 SCAG 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, so there would be No Impact. (Ibid.) This is consistent with SCAG PEIR analysis.

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) There would be No Impact. Because there is no impact, SCAG PEIR MM-TRA-5(b) does not apply under this threshold.

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, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR. Because the Project does not require mitigation, SCAG PEIR MM-HAZ-8(b) does not apply.

| **10. Hydrology and Water Quality**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to 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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Potential to 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 that would result in flooding on site or off site. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| **10. Hydrology and Water Quality**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Potential to substantially create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or providing substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f. Potential to otherwise substantially degrade water quality. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| g. Potential to 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. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. Potential to place within a 100- year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| i. Potential to 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| j. Potential for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures**:

**MM-HYD-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the potential impacts on water quality on related waste discharge requirements that are within the jurisdiction and authority of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards and other regulatory agencies. Where the

Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and health and safety standards set forth by regulatory agencies responsible for regulating and enforcing water quality and waste discharge requirements in a manner that conforms with applicable water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Complete, and have approved, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to initiation of construction.
- Implement Best Management Practices to reduce the peak stormwater runoff from the project site to the maximum extent practicable.
- Comply with the Caltrans storm water discharge permit as applicable; and identify and implement Best Management Practices to manage site erosion, wash water runoff, and spill control.
- Complete, and have approved, a Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan, prior to occupancy of residential or commercial structures.
- Ensure adequate capacity of the surrounding stormwater system to support stormwater runoff from new or rehabilitated structures or buildings.
- Prior to construction within an area subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, obtain all required permit approvals and certifications for construction within the vicinity of a watercourse:
    - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps): Section 404. Permit approval from the Corps should be obtained for the placement of dredge or fill material in Waters of the U.S., if any, within the interior of the project site, pursuant to Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act.
    - Regional Walter Quality Control Board (RWQCB): Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Certification that the project will not violate state water quality standards is required before the Corps can issue a 404 permit, above.
    - California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW): Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement. Work that will alter the bed or bank of a stream requires authorization from CDFW.
- Where feasible, restore or expand riparian areas such that there is no net loss of impervious surface as a result of the project.
- Install structural water quality control features, such as drainage channels, detention basins, oil and grease traps, filter systems, and vegetated buffers to prevent pollution of adjacent water resources by polluted runoff where required by applicable urban storm water runoff discharge permits, on new facilities.
- Provide structural storm water runoff treatment consistent with the applicable urban storm water runoff permit. Where Caltrans is the operator, the statewide permit applies.
- Provide operational best management practices for street cleaning, litter control, and catch basin cleaning are implemented to prevent water quality degradation in compliance with applicable storm water runoff discharge permits; and ensure treatment controls are in place as early as possible, such as during the acquisition process for rights-of-way, not just later during the facilities design and construction phase.
- Comply with applicable municipal separate storm sewer system discharge permits as well as Caltrans' storm water discharge permit including long-term sediment control and drainage of roadway runoff.
- Incorporate as appropriate treatment and control features such as detention basins, infiltration strips, and porous paving, other features to control surface runoff and facilitate

groundwater recharge into the design of new transportation projects early on in the process to ensure that adequate acreage and elevation contours are provided during the right-of-way acquisition process.

- Design projects to maintain volume of runoff, where any downstream receiving water body has not been designed and maintained to accommodate the increase in flow velocity, rate, and volume without impacting the water's beneficial uses. Pre-project flow velocities, rates, and volumes must not be exceeded. This applies not only to increases in storm water runoff from the project site, but also to hydrologic changes induced by flood plain encroachment. Projects should not cause or contribute to conditions that degrade the physical integrity or ecological function of any downstream receiving waters.
- Provide culverts and facilities that do not increase the flow velocity, rate, or volume and/or acquiring sufficient storm drain easements that accommodate an appropriately vegetated earthen drainage channel.
- Upgrade stormwater drainage facilities to accommodate any increased runoff volumes. These upgrades may include the construction of detention basins or structures that will delay peak flows and reduce flow velocities, including expansion and restoration of wetlands and riparian buffer areas. System designs shall be completed to eliminate increases in peak flow rates from current levels.
- Encourage Low Impact Development (LID) and incorporation of natural spaces that reduce, treat, infiltrate and manage stormwater runoff flows in all new developments, where practical and feasible.
- If a proposed project has the potential to create a major new stormwater discharge to a water body with an established Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), a quantitative analysis of the anticipated pollutant loads in the stormwater discharges to the receiving waters should be carried out.

**MM-HYD-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of the Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the potential impacts to groundwater resources that are within the jurisdiction and authority of the State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Boards, Water Districts, and other groundwater management agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and health and safety standards set forth by federal, state, regional, and local authorities that regulate groundwater management, consistent with the provisions of the Groundwater Management Act and implementing regulations, including recharge in a manner that conforms with federal, state, regional, and local standards for sustainable management of groundwater basins, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- For projects requiring continual dewatering facilities, implement monitoring systems and long-term administrative procedures to ensure proper water management that prevents degrading of surface water and minimizes, to the greatest extent possible, adverse impacts on groundwater for the life of the project, Construction designs shall comply with appropriate building codes and standard practices including the Uniform Building Code.
- Maximize, where practical and feasible, permeable surface area in existing urbanized areas to protect water quality, reduce flooding, allow for groundwater recharge, and preserve wildlife habitat. Minimize to the greatest extent possible, new impervious surfaces , including the use of in-lieu fees and off-site mitigation.
- Avoid designs that require continual dewatering where feasible.

- Avoid construction and siting on groundwater recharge areas, to prevent conversion of those areas to impervious surface.
- Reduce hardscape to the extent feasible to facilitate groundwater recharge as appropriate.

**MM-HYD-8(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the potential impacts of locating structures that would impede or redirect flood flows in a 100-year flood hazard area that are within the jurisdiction and authority of the Flood Control District, County Public Works Departments, local agencies, regulatory agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with all federal, state, and local floodplain regulations, consistent with the provisions of the National Flood Insurance Program, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Comply with Executive Order 11988 on Floodplain Management, which requires avoidance of incompatible floodplain development, restoration and preservation of the natural and beneficial floodplain values, and maintenance of consistency with the standards and criteria of the National Flood Insurance Program.
- Ensure that all roadbeds for new highway and rail facilities be elevated at least one foot above the 100-year base flood elevation. Since alluvial fan flooding is not often identified on FEMA flood maps, the risk of alluvial fan flooding should be evaluated and projects should be sited to avoid alluvial fan flooding. Delineation of floodplains and alluvial fan boundaries should attempt to account for future hydrologic changes caused by global climate change.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion**: With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concluded that absent mitigation, the Plan would result in significant impacts to water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.10-44) The Plan has the potential to increase impervious surfaces and increase urban runoff, resulting in the transportation of more contaminants to receiving waters, and many of the pollutants in urban runoff are attributable to landscape irrigation, highway runoff, and illicit dumping. (Ibid.) Highway runoff is a component of urban runoff contributing oil and grease, sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, and toxic substances. (Ibid.) With implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-1(b), this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. (Id., p. 3.10-61)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR, concluded that the Plan has the potential to 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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted). (Id., p. 3.10-46) Anticipated regional growth of 3.8 million people in the region would result in a net increase in demand, and high-density infill development would potentially interfere with groundwater recharge due to an increase in impervious surfaces. (Ibid.) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable even with SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-2(b) incorporated because of the anticipated net increase in consumptive use of water in the SCAG region. (Id., p. 3.10-61)

With regard to threshold c), the SCAG PEIR concluded that absent mitigation, projects under the Plan could impact water bodies by placing fill material within a stream channel, and construction and earth-moving from projects could result in sediment loading in local waterways. (Id., p. 3.10-47) There would also be the potential, absent mitigation, for unprotected soil to erode as a result

of stormwater runoff construction activity associated with the proposed Plan. (Ibid.) Construction is accordingly required to submit a SWPPP to the State Water Resources Control Board that identifies BMPs to be used during construction. (Ibid.) This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with incorporation of MM-HYD-1(b). (Id., p. 3.10-62)

Under threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concluded that the Plan would have a significant impact to existing drainage patterns of the area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increasing the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that could result in flooding on- or off-site. (Id., p. 3.10-48) Construction activities associated with transportation projects can be a major source of sediment loading and hydrocarbon contamination in local waterways, unprotected soil easily erodes with rainwater, and fueling procedures and maintenance of heavy equipment on construction sites can spill diesel and oil and grease. (Ibid.) While mitigation would reduce impacts, this impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with MM-HYD-5(b) incorporated due to the regional scale of the proposed Plan. (Id., p. 3.10-62)

Under threshold e), the SCAG PEIR concluded that the Plan would result in significant impacts because runoff water would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. (Id., 3.10-48) Stormwater runoff is influenced partially by ground surface permeability, and the Plan would introduce more impermeable surfaces; paved surfaces can also accelerate the velocity of runoff, concentrating peak flows in downstream areas faster than under natural conditions. (Ibid.) Significant runoff increases and peak flow can overwhelm drainage system and alter flood elevations in downstream locations. (Ibid.) Placement of new structures in an existing floodplain would also impede flood waters, altering flood risks both upstream and downstream. (Id., p. 4.10-49) This impact would remain significant and unavoidable with MM-HYD-5(b) incorporated due to the regional scale of the proposed Plan. (Id., p. 3.10-62)

With regard to threshold f), the SCAG PEIR concluded that as described under threshold a), the Plan would increase impervious surfaces, contributing to local water impairments by degrading water quality of receiving waters, both in the short- and long-term. (Id., p. 4.10-49) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with MM-HYD-5(b) incorporated due to the regional scale of the proposed Plan. (Id., p. 3.10-62)

With regard to threshold g), the SCAG PEIR concluded that there would be no impact, because high quality transit areas are generally in areas that are subject to Flood Management Plans and major flood control infrastructure has been constructed to constrain the 100-year flood in flood control systems. (Id., p. 3.10-49) Further, development is subject to specific land use planning regulations pursuant to the National Flood Insurance Program. (Id., pp. 3.10-49, 3.10-50) Therefore, the PEIR concludes that development is not anticipated to occur in a 100-year flood hazard area, and there would be no impact. (Id., p. 3.10-50)

With regard to threshold h), the SCAG PEIR concluded that the Plan would have a potential to result in significant impact in regards to placing structures in a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. (Ibid.) Many of the Plan transportation projects would pass through identified flood hazard zones in the SCAG region. (Id., pp. 3.10-50, 3.10-51) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with MM-HYD-5(b) incorporated due to the regional scale of the proposed Plan. (Id., p. 3.10-62)

With regard to threshold i), the SCAG PEIR concluded that the Plan would result in significant impacts by exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving

flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam. (Id., p. 3.10-51) Several high quality transit areas are also within areas subject to inundation. (Ibid.) While impacts would be reduced with mitigation, this impact would cumulatively remain significant and unavoidable with MM-HYD-5(b) incorporated due to the regional scale of the proposed Plan. (Id., p. 3.10-63)

Under threshold j), the SCAG PEIR concluded that the Plan would result in significant impacts in regards to potential risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, due to its susceptibility to seismic activity, the potential for groundwater overdraft, and petroleum extraction activities. (Id., pp. 3.10-51, 3.10-52) While impacts would be reduced with mitigation, this impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with MM-HYD-5(b) incorporated due to the regional scale of the proposed Plan. (Id., p. 3.10-63)

**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.) Because the Project would have a less than significant impact, SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-1(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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.) Because the Project would have a less than significant impact, SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-2(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) Because the Project

has less than significant impacts, SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-1(b) and MM-HYD-5(b) do not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-5(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) Because there is no impact, SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-5(b) does not apply.

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). While the SCAG PEIR does not anticipate development in 100-year flood plain areas, Roquet Ranch MMs 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 would result in revision of maps to exclude the Project site from said areas. Under threshold g), the Project would have a New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR, but implementation of Roquet Ranch MMs 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Under threshold h), the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

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.) While the SCAG PEIR concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable for the entire region, the Project EIR thoroughly studied impacts for the site specifically, and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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. Because the Project would have a less than significant impact, SCAG PEIR MM-HYD-5(b) does not apply. The Project would have Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **11. Land Use and Planning**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Potential to physically divide an established community. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-LU-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects regarding the potential to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of local jurisdictions and Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans within the SCAG region to avoid conflicts with zoning and ordinance codes, general plans, land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Where an inconsistency with the adopted general plan is identified at the proposed project location, determine if the environmental, social, economic, and engineering benefits of the project warrant a variance from adopted zoning or an amendment to the general plan.

**MM-LU-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects related to the physical division of an established community in a project area within the jurisdiction

and responsibility of local jurisdictions and Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans within the SCAG region to avoid the creation of barriers that physically divide such communities, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Consider alignments within or adjacent to existing public rights-of-way.
- Consider designs to include sections above- or below-grade to maintain viable vehicular, cycling, and pedestrian connections between portions of communities where existing connections are disrupted by the transportation project.
- Wherever feasible incorporate direct crossings, overcrossings, or undercrossings at regular intervals for multiple modes of travel (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles).
- Consider realigning roadway or interchange improvements to avoid the affected area of residential communities or cohesive neighborhoods.
- Where it has been determined that it is infeasible to avoid creating a barrier in an established community, consider other measures to reduce impacts, including but not limited to:
    - Alignment shifts to minimize the area affected.
    - Reduction of the proposed right-of-way take to minimize the overall area of impact.
    - Provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle access across improved roadways.
    - Design new transportation facilities that consider access to existing community facilities. Identify and consider during the design phase of the project, community amenities and facilities in the design of the project.
    - Design roadway improvements that minimize barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists. Determine during the design phase, pedestrian and bicycle routes that permit connections to nearby community facilities.

**See MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-BIO-4(b), MM-BIO-5(b), and MM-BIO-6(b).**

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the implementation of major transportation projects and land use strategies included in the 2016 RTP/SCS has the potential to conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations, constituting a significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.11-24) As a result of a comprehensive, bottom-up planning approach and process, the transportation projects and land use strategies included in the Plan are generally compatible with the county and regional level general plan data available to SCAG. (Id., p. 3.11-25) However, local general plans are not updated on a consistent basis and are not required to be consistent with the Plan. (Ibid.) Further, SCAG has no authority to adopt, approve, implement, or otherwise regulate local land use plans or projects that would implement the Plan, and cities and counties are not required to change their land use plans and policies, including general plans, to be consistent with the Plan. (Ibid.) Therefore, there would be potential for inconsistencies with general plans, which is a potentially significant impact. This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-LU-1(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.11-34)

With regard to threshold b), the construction and operation of major transportation projects in the Plan and anticipated community development have the potential to physically divide established communities as a result of creating real or perceived barriers to pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists, which is a potentially significant impact. (Id., p. 3.11-26) Providing new transit track and expanded facilities for light rail, high speed rail, commuter rail, new lanes on existing freeway routes, and new freeway segments all have the potential to divide existing communities. (Ibid.) Short-term impacts due to construction would also occur. (Id., p. 3.11-27) SCAG's Plan focuses

the majority of new housing and job growth in high quality transit areas and other opportunity areas in existing urbanized settings, resulting in an improved jobs-housing balance and more opportunity for infill, mixed-used, and transit-oriented development; this land use pattern generally supports and compliments proposed transportation improvements to emphasize system preservation, active transportation, and transportation demand management. (Ibid.) However, construction and operation of proposed transportation improvements and anticipated development under the Plan could divide established communities; this impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-LU-2(b) incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.11-27, 3.11-34)

Under threshold c), the transportation projects included in the Plan would result in conflicts with the provisions of applicable adopted HCPs and NCCPs due to proposed transportation project development in lands that are protected under these HCPs and NCCPs. (Id., p. 3.11-28) These potential impacts would include direct impacts to lands protected under these HCPs and NCCPs as well as potential direct and indirect impacts to plant and animal species and their habitats afforded protection under these HCPs and NCCPs through conversion of habitat and introduction of lighting and noise during construction and operation. (Id., p. 3.11-29) These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-BIO-4(b), MM-BIO-5(b), and MM-BIO-6(b). (Id., p. 3.11-35)

**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, and therefore SCAG PEIR MM-LU-2(b) does not apply.

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 the 2016 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. Because impacts would be less than significant, SCAG PEIR MM-LU-2(b) does not apply, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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, and the SCAG PEIR mitigation measures do not apply.

| **12. Mineral Resources**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Potential to result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-MIN-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the California Department of Conservation, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with SMARA, California Department of Conservation regulations, local general plans, specific plans, and other laws and regulation governing mineral or aggregate resources, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Provide for the efficient use of known aggregate and mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites, by ensuring that the consumptive use of aggregate resources is minimized and that access to recoverable sources of aggregate is not precluded, as a result of construction, operation and maintenance of projects.
- Where avoidance is infeasible, minimize impacts to the efficient and effective use of recoverable sources of aggregate through measures that have been identified in county and city general plans, or other comparable measures:
    - Recycle and reuse building materials resulting from demolition, particularly aggregate resources, to the maximum extent practicable.
    - Identify and use building materials, particularly aggregate materials, resulting from demolition at other construction sites in the SCAG region, or within a reasonable hauling distance of the project site.
    - Design transportation network improvements in a manner (such as buffer zones or the use of screening) that does not preclude adjacent or nearby extraction of

known mineral and aggregate resources following completion of the improvement and during long-term operations.

- Avoid or reduce impacts on known aggregate and mineral resources and mineral resource recovery sites through the evaluation and selection of project sites and design features (e.g., buffers) that minimize impacts on land suitable for aggregate and mineral resource extraction by maintaining portions of MRZ-2 areas in open space or other general plan land use categories and zoning that allow for mining of mineral resources.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects and anticipated development patterns influenced by land use strategies in the Plan would require a substantial amount of aggregate resources to construct, constituting a significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.12-5) With incorporation of mitigation, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. (Id., p. 3.12-10)

With regard to threshold b), the Plan may also have significant impacts by locating transportation projects in previously undisturbed areas, and allowing development patterns to occur in mineral resource zones, constituting a potentially significant impacts. (Id., p. 3.12.06) With incorporation of mitigation, this impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable. (Id., p. 3.12-10)

**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. (Id, p. 5-10). Because the Proposed Project does not have the potential for significant impacts to occur, consideration of the SCAG PEIR MM-MIN-1(b) is not required. No Impact would occur.

| **13. Noise**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-NOISE-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects of noise impacts that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure consistency with the Federal Noise Control Act, California Government Code Section 65302, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research Noise Element Guidelines, and the noise ordinances and general plan noise elements for the counties or cities where projects are undertaken, Federal Highway Administration and Caltrans guidance documents and other health and safety standards set forth by federal, state, and local authorities that regulate noise levels, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Install temporary noise barriers during construction.
- Include permanent noise barriers and sound-attenuating features as part of the project design.
- Schedule construction activities consistent with the allowable hours pursuant to applicable general plan noise element or noise ordinance Where construction activities are authorized outside the limits established by the noise element of the general plan or noise ordinance; notify affected sensitive noise receptors and all parties who will experience noise levels in excess of the allowable limits for the specified land use, of the level of exceedance and duration of exceedance; and provide a list of protective measures that can be undertaken by the individual, including temporary relocation or use of hearing protective devices.
- Limit speed and/or hours of operation of rail and transit systems during the selected periods of time to reduce duration and frequency of conflict with adopted limits on noise levels.
- Post procedures and phone numbers at the construction site for notifying the Lead Agency staff, local Police Department, and construction contractor (during regular construction hours and off-hours), along with permitted construction days and hours, complaint procedures, and who to notify in the event of a problem.
- Notify neighbors and occupants within 300 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of anticipated times when noise levels are expected to exceed limits established in the noise element of the general plan or noise ordinance.
- Hold a preconstruction meeting with the job inspectors and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise measures and practices (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.) are completed.
- Designate an on-site construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project.
- Ensure that construction equipment are properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (e.g., mufflers, silencers, wraps). All intake and exhaust ports on power equipment shall be muffled or shielded.
- Ensure that impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction are hydraulically or electrically powered to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust can and should be used. External jackets on the tools themselves can and should be used, if such jackets are commercially available and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA.

Quieter procedures can and should be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever such procedures are available and consistent with construction procedures.

- Ensure that construction equipment are not idle for an extended time in the vicinity of noise-sensitive receptors.
- Locate fixed/stationary equipment (such as generators, compressors, rock crushers, and cement mixers) as far as possible from noise-sensitive receptors.
- Locate new roadway lanes, roadways, rail lines, transit-related passenger station and related facilities, park-and-ride lots, and other new noise-generating facilities away from sensitive receptors to the maximum extent feasible.
- Where feasible, eliminate noise-sensitive receptors by acquiring freeway and rail rights-of-way.
- Use noise barriers to protect sensitive receptors from excessive noise levels during construction.
- Construct sound-reducing barriers between noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors to minimize exposure to excessive noise during operation of transportation improvement projects, including but not limited to earth-berms or sound walls.
- Where feasible, design projects so that they are depressed below the grade of the existing noise-sensitive receptor, creating an effective barrier between the roadway and sensitive receptors**.**
- Where feasible, improve the acoustical insulation of dwelling units where setbacks and sound barriers do not provide sufficient noise reduction.
- Monitor the effectiveness of noise reduction measures by taking noise measurements and installing adaptive mitigation measures to achieve the standards for ambient noise levels established by the noise element of the general plan or noise ordinance.

**MM-NOISE-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects of vibration impacts that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the Federal Transportation Authority and Caltrans guidance documents, county or city transportation commission, noise and vibration ordinances and general plan noise elements for the counties and cities where projects are undertaken and other health and safety regulations set forth by federal state, and local authorities that regulate vibration levels, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- For projects that require pile driving or other construction techniques that result in excessive vibration, such as blasting, determine the potential vibration impacts to the structural integrity of the adjacent buildings within 50 feet of pile driving locations.
- For projects that require pile driving or other construction techniques that result in excessive vibration, such as blasting, determine the threshold levels of vibration and cracking that could damage adjacent historic or other structure, and design means and construction methods to not exceed the thresholds.
- For projects where pile driving would be necessary for construction due to geological conditions, utilize quiet pile driving techniques such as predrilling the piles to the maximum feasible depth, where feasible. Predrilling pile holes will reduce the number of blows required to completely seat the pile and will concentrate the pile driving activity closer to the ground where pile driving noise can be shielded more effectively by a noise barrier/curtain.

- For projects where pile driving would be necessary for construction due to geological conditions, utilize quiet pile driving techniques such as the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects and land use strategies under the Plan would result in exposure of people to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in local general plans or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies, particularly during construction and operation for residents of high quality transit areas where the Plan encourages development, and for sensitive receptors within 500 feet of major transportation and development projects. (SCAG PEIR, pp. 3.13-27, 3.13-28) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-NOISE-1(b), because it may not reduce noise below applicable standards in all cases. (Id., p. 3.13-39)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that both construction and operation of transportation projects and development permitted under the Plan would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, which constitutes a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.13-28) Operating pile drivers during construction can generate vibrations in excess of 0.5 PPV at a distance of 25 feet, resulting in damage to even reinforced concrete. (Ibid.) Operation-related vibration would also be a source of annoyance to sensitive receptors and other individuals who live or work near new infrastructure associated with heavy truck and bus traffic along roadways and train traffic along rail lines. (Id., p. 3.13-29) These impacts would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-NOISE-1(b) incorporated, because it may not reduce noise below applicable standards in all cases. (Id., p. 3.13-39)

With regard to threshold c), the PEIR concludes that operational activities associated with transportation projects and land use strategies in the Plan would generate permanent increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.13-30) This is true of noise near highway projects, transit, freight and passenger rail, and due to more compact and densified development encouraged under the Plan. (Id., pp. 3.13-30, 3.13-31) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-NOISE-1(b) incorporated, because it may not reduce noise below applicable standards in all cases. (Id., p. 3.13-39)

Under threshold d), the PEIR concludes that both construction and operation of transportation projects in the Plan and the associated changes in development patterns influenced by land use strategies would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project above levels existing without the project, which constitutes a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.13-31) Construction noise levels would fluctuate depending on how construction is phased, the equipment mix, the distance between construction and sensitive receptors, and the presence of intervening objects. (Id., pp. 3.13-31, 3.13-32) While mitigation would be identified as feasible during environmental review for individual projects, this impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-NOISE-2(b) incorporated, because it may not reduce noise below applicable standards in all cases. (Id., pp. 3.13-31, 3.13-32, 3.13-40)

Under thresholds e) and f), implementation of the Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip that would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. (Id., pp. 3.13-32, 3.13-

33) While the SCAG region contains 57 airports, including 12 major commercial airports, and 14 private airstrips, airport land use plans would provide guidance on noise levels and land use in adjacent areas, resulting in avoidance of significant impacts. (Id., p. 3.13-32) Further, the Plan would have a regional travel demand forecast of 136.2 MAP in 2040, which is a decrease of approximately 7 percent. (Id., pp. 3.13-32, 3.13-33) These impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., pp. 3.13-32, 3.13-33, 3.13-35)

**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., pp. 4.10-18, 4.10-21) Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) Because no mitigation is required, SCAG PEIR MM-NOISE-1(b) and MM-NOISE-2(b) do not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR analysis, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.)

| **14. Population, Housing, and Employment**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to displace substantial amounts of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c. Potential to displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures**:

**MM-PHE-2(b).** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects related to displacement that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to minimize the displacement of existing housing and people and to ensure compliance with local jurisdiction's housing elements of their general plans, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Evaluate alternate route alignments and transportation facilities that minimize the displacement of homes and businesses. Use an iterative design and impact analysis where impacts to homes or businesses are involved to minimize the potential of impacts on housing and displacement of people.
- Prioritize the use existing ROWs, wherever feasible.
- Develop a construction schedule that minimizes potential neighborhood deterioration from protracted waiting periods between right-of-way acquisition and construction.

**See MM-LU-1(b).**

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that the Plan has the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.14-20) The Plan's land use strategies would accommodate new growth within existing urbanized areas, high quality transit areas, underutilized urban areas, and existing suburban town centers; the SCAG region population is expected to increase by 3.8 million people by 2040. (Ibid.) Of the 1,521,000 new housing units expected in 2040, 14 percent are anticipated to be large-lot single family units, 19 percent small-lot single-family units, 11 percent townhome units, and 56 percent multifamily units. (Ibid.) Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(ii) requires that the Plan must accommodate all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan, and the above-described projected housing mix would help the region accommodate the projected housing needs over the life of the 2016 Plan, especially housing at the lower income categories. (Ibid.) The Plan would also result in improved accessibility and connectivity from transportation investments in the Plan, so the Plan could further facilitate population and economic growth to areas of the region that are currently not developed or underdeveloped. (Id., p. 3.14-21) This impact is considered cumulatively significant unavoidable, even with SCAG PEIR MM-LU-1(b) incorporated, because SCAG ultimately has no control over the amount of growth in the region. (Id., pp. 3.14-25, p. 3.14-27)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that construction of transportation projects that require expansion of existing or designation of new rights or way have the potential to displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.14-21) The Plan's land use policies could also result in more desirable, unaffordable housing being located in high quality transit areas, which could displace lower income residents if new development brings higher-income residents into a neighborhood. (Id., pp. 3.14-22, 3.14-23) The impact would remain significant and unavoidable even with SCAG PEIR MM-PHE-2(b) incorporated, because not all projects in the Plan would be constructed in existing rights or way, thereby likely displacing housing. (Id., p. 3.14-27)

With regard to threshold c), the SCAG PEIR concludes that as discussed under threshold b), the Plan could result in the potential to displace a substantial number of people, including potentially displacing affordable housing that may not be replaced by affordable housing elsewhere. (Id, p. 3.14-23) This impact would remain significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-PHE-2(b) incorporated, because not all projects in the Plan would be constructed in existing rights or way, thereby likely displacing people. (Id., p. 3.14-27)

**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. Because no mitigation is required, SCAG PEIR MM-LU-1(b) does not apply under this threshold. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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.) Since there would be no impact and no mitigation is required, SCAG PEIR MM-PHE-2(b) does not apply.

| **15. Public Services**<br><br>Would the project result in: Potential to cause substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the 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: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. fire protection and emergency response services. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. public protective security services. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. schools services. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures**:

**MM-PS-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects from the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable response times for fire protection and emergency response services that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of fire departments, law enforcement agencies, and local jurisdictions. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures consistent with the Community Facilities Act of 1982, the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans and the performance objectives established in the adopted county and city general plans, to provide sufficient structures and buildings to accommodate fire and emergency response, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency, taking into account project and site-specific considerations as applicable and feasible:

- Where the project has the potential to generate the need for expanded emergency response services which exceed the capacity of existing facilities, provide for the construction of new facilities directly as an element of the project or through dedicated fair share contributions toward infrastructure improvements.
- During project-level review of government facilities projects, require implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-

2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b) to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts associated with the construction or expansion of such facilities, through the imposition of conditions required to be followed to avoid or reduce impacts associated with air quality, noise, traffic, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, and others that apply to specific construction or expansion of new or expanded public service facilities.

**MM-PS-2(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects from the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios for police protection services that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of law enforcement agencies and local jurisdictions. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures consistent with the Community Facilities Act of 1982, the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans and the standards established in the safety elements of county and city general plans to maintain police response performance objectives, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency, taking in to account project and site-specific considerations as applicable and feasible, including:

- Coordinate with public security agencies to ensure that there are adequate governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public protective security services and that any required additional construction of buildings is incorporated in to the project description.
- Where current levels of services at the project site are found to be inadequate, provide fair share contributions towards infrastructure improvements and/or personnel.
- During project-level review of government facilities projects, require implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b) to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts associated with the construction or expansion of such facilities, through the imposition of conditions required to be followed to avoid or reduce impacts associated with air quality, noise, traffic, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, and others that apply to specific construction or expansion of new or expanded public service facilities.

**MM-PS-3(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects from the 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 that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of school districts and local jurisdictions. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures consistent with Community Facilities Act of 1982, the California Education Code, and the goals and policies established within the applicable adopted county and city general plans to ensure that the appropriate school district fees are paid in accordance with state law, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by

the Lead Agency, taking in to account project and site-specific considerations as applicable and feasible:

- Where construction or expansion of school facilities is required to meet public school service ratios, require school district fees, as applicable.
- During project-level review of government facilities projects, require implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b) to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts associated with the construction or expansion of such facilities, through the imposition of conditions required to be followed to avoid or reduce impacts associated with air quality, noise, traffic, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, and others that apply to specific construction or expansion of new or expanded public service facilities.

**See MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b)**.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that implementation of the transportation projects and land use strategies reflected in the Plan would result in the potential to cause substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire stations that would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios and response time for fire protective services, constituting a significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.15-23) Transportation projects and growth anticipated under the Plan would result in approximately 3.8 million new residents and 2.4 million new jobs by 2040, and additional fire protection and emergency services would be required, especially in higher density areas. (Ibid.) This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b). (Id., p. 3.15-33)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that implementation of the transportation projects and land use strategies reflected in in the 2016 RTP/SCS would have a potential to cause substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public protective security services (including sheriff, police, CHP, and OES) that would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios and response time for public protective security services, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.15-24) This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS- 6(b). (Id., p. 3.15-33)

With regard to threshold c), the PEIR concludes that implementation of the transportation projects and land use strategies with the related development patterns reflected in the 2016 RTP/SCS would result in potential to cause substantial physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools that would be required to maintain acceptable service ratios and response time for school services, constituting a significant effect. (Id., p. 3.15-26) This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-PS-3(a),

MM-PS-3(b), MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b). (Id., p. 3.15-34)

**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 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) Because no mitigation is required, SCAG PEIR mitigation measures do not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 polices 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.) Because no mitigation is necessary, SCAG PEIR mitigation measures do not apply. The Project would have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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.) Because no mitigation is necessary, SCAG PEIR mitigation measures do not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **16. Recreation**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to 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. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**MM-REC-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on the integrity of recreation facilities, particularly neighborhood parks in the vicinity of HQTAs and other applicable development projects, that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of other public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing significant impacts on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities to ensure compliance with county and city general plans and the Quimby Act, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following, or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Prior to the issuance of permits, where projects require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities or the payment of equivalent Quimby fees, consider increasing the accessibility to natural areas and lands for outdoor recreation from the proposed project area, in coordination with local and regional open space planning and/or responsible management agencies.
- Prior to the issuance of permits, where projects require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities or the payment of equivalent Quimby fees, encourage patterns of urban development and land use which reduce costs on infrastructure and make better use of existing facilities, using strategies such as:
    - Increasing the accessibility to natural areas for outdoor recreation

    - Promoting infill development and redevelopment to revitalize existing communities
    - Utilizing “green” development techniques
    - Promoting water-efficient land use and development
    - Encouraging multiple uses
    - Including trail systems and trail segments in General Plan recreation standards
- Prior to the issuance of permits, where construction and operation of projects would require the acquisition or development of protected open space or recreation lands, demonstrate that existing neighborhood parks should be expanded or new neighborhood parks developed such that there is no net decrease in acres of neighborhood park area available per capita in the HQTA.
- Where construction or expansion of recreational facilities is included in the project or required to meet public park service ratios, require implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AES-1(b), MM-AES-3(b), MM-AES-4(b), MM-AF-1(b), MM-AF-2(b), MM-BIO-1(b), MM-BIO-2(b), MM-BIO-3(b), MM-CUL-1(b), MM-CUL-2(b), MM-CUL-3(b), MM-CUL-4(b), MMGEO-1(b), MM-GEO-1(b), MM-HYD-1(b), MM-USS-3(b), MM-USS-4(b), and MM-USS-6(b) to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts associated with the construction or expansion of such facilities, through the imposition of conditions required to be followed to avoid or reduce impacts associated with air quality, noise, traffic, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, and others that apply to specific construction or expansion of new or expanded public service facilities.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), implementation of the transportation projects and land use patterns anticipated by the strategies in the Plan could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated, constituting a potentially significant impact. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.16-16) Construction of transportation projects as well as development in underutilized urban (opportunity) areas and edges of the existing urbanized areas that would be anticipated as a result of land use strategies of the Plan would have a potential to impact open spaces and recreational lands (and possibly recreational facilities), through the acquisition of land and development of transportation projects and urban uses. These activities would have the potential to further increase the use at remaining facilities and reduce the ratio of parks-to-people in these areas. (Id., p. 3.16-18) Many of the urbanized areas in the SCAG region are currently deficient in local park space, and although land use strategies in the Plan would encourage additional parks, many of the areas where density would be expected to increase would be areas without sufficient park space, resulting in increased use and deterioration of existing facilities. (Id., p. 3.16-19) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with the implementation of feasible mitigation. (Id., p. 3.16-23)

With regard to threshold b), implementation of the transportation projects and land use patterns anticipated by the strategies in the 2016 RTP/SCS would also have the potential to include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, constituting a potentially significant impact. (Id., p. 3.16-20) This impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable with mitigation incorporated. (Id., p. 3.16-23)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion**: With regard to threshold a), 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). (Id., p. 4.13-4) 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. (Id., p. 4.13-4) The Project's impacts to existing recreational facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

With regard to threshold b), 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 SCAG PEIR MM-REC-1(b) is not required. The Proposed Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **17. Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to conflict with the established measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, by increasing the daily VMT, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| b. Potential to conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, VMT and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Potential to result in a significant change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| 17. **Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Potential to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections), increased volumes or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e. Potential to result in inadequate emergency access. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f. Potential to result in conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures**

**MM-TRA-1(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the potential for conflicts with the established measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system that are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of Lead Agencies. This measure need only be considered where it is found by the Lead Agency to be appropriate and consistent with local transportation priorities. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the adopted Congestion Management Plan, and other adopted local plans and policies, as applicable and feasible. Compliance can be achieved through adopting transportation mitigation measures as set forth below, or through other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Institute teleconferencing, telecommute and/or flexible work hour programs to reduce unnecessary employee transportation.

- Create a ride-sharing program by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading for ride sharing vehicles, and providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides.
- Provide a vanpool for employees.

- Fund capital improvement projects to accommodate future traffic demand in the area.
- Provide a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan containing strategies to reduce on-site parking demand and single occupancy vehicle travel. The TDM shall include strategies to increase bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and carpools/vanpool use, including:
    - Inclusion of additional bicycle parking, shower, and locker facilities that exceed the requirement
    - Construction of bike lanes per the prevailing Bicycle Master Plan (or other similar document)
    - Signage and striping onsite to encourage bike safety
    - Installation of pedestrian safety elements (such as cross walk striping, curb ramps, countdown signals, bulb outs, etc.) to encourage convenient crossing at arterials
    - Installation of amenities such as lighting, street trees, trash and any applicable streetscape plan.
    - Direct transit sales or subsidized transit passes
    - Guaranteed ride home program
    - Pre-tax commuter benefits (checks)
    - On-site car-sharing program (such as City Car Share, Zip Car, etc.)
    - On-site carpooling program
    - Distribution of information concerning alternative transportation options
    - Parking spaces sold/leased separately
    - Parking management strategies; including attendant/valet parking and shared parking spaces.

- Promote ride sharing programs e.g., by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for high-occupancy vehicles, providing larger parking spaces to accommodate vans used for ridesharing, and designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas.
- Encourage bicycling to transit facilities by providing additional bicycle parking, locker facilities, and bike lane access to transit facilities when feasible.
- Encourage the use of public transit systems by enhancing safety and cleanliness on vehicles and in and around stations, providing shuttle service to public transit, offering public transit incentives and providing public education and publicity about public transportation services.
- Encourage bicycling and walking by incorporating bicycle lanes into street systems in regional transportation plans, new subdivisions, and large developments, creating bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools and other logical points of destination and provide adequate bicycle parking, and encouraging commercial projects to include facilities on-site to encourage employees to bicycle or walk to work.
- Build or fund a major transit stop within or near transit development upon consultation with applicable CTCs.
- Work with the school districts to improve pedestrian and bike access to schools and to restore or expand school bus service using lower-emitting vehicles.
- Provide information on alternative transportation options for consumers, residents, tenants and employees to reduce transportation-related emissions.
- Educate consumers, residents, tenants and the public about options for reducing motor vehicle-related greenhouse gas emissions. Include information on trip reduction; trip linking; vehicle performance and efficiency (e.g., keeping tires inflated); and low or zero-emission vehicles.
- Purchase, or create incentives for purchasing, low or zero-emission vehicles.

- Create local “light vehicle” networks, such as neighborhood electric vehicle systems.
- Enforce and follow limits idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.
- Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles.
- Reduce VMT-related emissions by encouraging the use of public transit through adoption of new development standards that would require improvements to the transit system and infrastructure, increase safety and accessibility, and provide other incentives.
- Project Selection:
    - Give priority to transportation projects that would contribute to a reduction in vehicle miles traveled per capita, while maintaining economic vitality and sustainability.
    - Separate sidewalks whenever possible, on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints.
- Public Involvement:
    - Carry out a comprehensive public involvement and input process that provides information about transportation issues, projects, and processes to community members and other stakeholders, especially to those traditionally underserved by transportation services.
- Transit and Multimodal Impact Fees:
    - Assess transit and multimodal impact fees on new developments to fund public transportation infrastructure, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian infrastructure and other multimodal accommodations.
    - Implement traffic and roadway management strategies to improve mobility and efficiency, and reduce associated emissions.
- System Monitoring:
    - Monitor traffic and congestion to determine when and where new transportation facilities are needed in order to increase access and efficiency.
- Arterial Traffic Management:
    - Modify arterial roadways to allow more efficient bus operation, including bus lanes and signal priority/preemption where necessary.
- Signal Synchronization:
    - Expand signal timing programs where emissions reduction benefits can be demonstrated, including maintenance of the synchronization system, and will coordinate with adjoining jurisdictions as needed to optimize transit operation while maintaining a free flow of traffic.
- HOV Lanes:
    - Encourage the construction of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes or similar mechanisms whenever necessary to relieve congestion and reduce emissions.
- Delivery Schedules:
    - Establish ordinances or land use permit conditions limiting the hours when deliveries can be made to off-peak hours in high traffic areas.
    - Implement and supporting trip reduction programs.
    - Support bicycle use as a mode of transportation by enhancing infrastructure to accommodate bicycles and riders, and providing incentives.
    - Establish standards for new development and redevelopment projects to support bicycle use, including amending the Development Code to include standards for safe pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations, and require new development and

redevelopment projects to include bicycle facilities, as appropriate with the new land use are as follows:

- Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails:
    - Establish a network of multi-use trails to facilitate safe and direct off-street bicycle and pedestrian travel, and will provide bike racks along these trails at secure, lighted locations.
- Bicycle Safety Program:
    - Develop and implement a bicycle safety educational program to teach drivers and riders the laws, riding protocols, routes, safety tips, and emergency maneuvers.
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Funding: Pursue and provide enhanced funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and access projects.
- Bicycle Parking:
    - Adopt bicycle parking standards that ensure bicycle parking sufficient to accommodate 5 to 10 percent of projected use at all public and commercial facilities, and at a rate of at least one per residential unit in multiple-family developments (suggestion: check language with League of American Bicyclists).
- Adopt a comprehensive parking policy to discourage private vehicle use and encourage the use of alternative transportation by incorporating the following:
    - Reduce the available parking spaces for private vehicles while increasing parking spaces for shared vehicles, bicycles, and other alternative modes of transportation;
    - Eliminate or reduce minimum parking requirements for new buildings;
    - "Unbundle" parking (require that parking is paid for separately and is not included in the base rent for residential and commercial space);
    - Use parking pricing to discourage private vehicle use, especially at peak times;
    - Create parking benefit districts, which invest meter revenues in pedestrian infrastructure and other public amenities;
    - Establish performance pricing of street parking, so that it is expensive enough to promote frequent turnover and keep 15 percent of spaces empty at all times;
    - Encourage shared parking programs in mixed-use and transit-oriented development areas.
- Establish policies and programs to reduce onsite parking demand and promote ride-sharing and public transit at large events, including:
    - Promote the use of peripheral parking by increasing on-site parking rates and offering reduced rates for peripheral parking;
    - Encourage special event center operators to advertise and offer discounted transit passes with event tickets;
    - Encourage special event center operators to advertise and offer discount parking incentives to carpooling patrons, with four or more persons per vehicle for on-site parking;
    - Promote the use of bicycles by providing space for the operation of valet bicycle parking service.
- Parking "Cash-out" Program:
    - Require new office developments with more than 50 employees to offer a Parking "Cash-out" Program to discourage private vehicle use.
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Promotion:
    - Work with local community groups and downtown business associations to organize and publicize walking tours and bicycle events, and to encourage pedestrian and bicycle modes of transportation.
- Fleet Replacement:

- Establish a replacement policy and schedule to replace fleet vehicles and equipment with the most fuel efficient vehicles practical, including gasoline hybrid and alternative fuel or electric models.

**MM-TRA--2(b).** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures, capable of avoiding conflict with an applicable congestion management program that are within the jurisdictions of the lead agencies, including, but not limited to, VMT, VHD and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. This measure need only be considered where it is found by the Lead Agency to be appropriate and consistent with local transportation priorities. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the adopted Congestion Management Plan, and other adopted local plans and policies, as applicable and feasible. Compliance can be achieved through adopting transportation mitigation measures such as those set forth below, or through other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency. Not all measures and/or options within each measure may apply to all jurisdictions:

- Encourage a comprehensive parking policy that prioritizes system management, increase rideshare, and telecommute opportunities, including investment in non-motorized transportation and discouragement against private vehicle use, and encouragement to maximize the use of alternative transportation:
- Advocate for a regional, market-based system to price or charge for auto trips during peak hours.
- Ensure that new developments incorporate both local and regional transit measures into the project design that promote the use of alternative modes of transportation.
- Coordinate controlled intersections so that traffic passes more efficiently through congested areas. Where traffic signals or streetlights are installed, require the use of Light Emitting Diode (LED) technology or similar technology.
- Encourage the use of car-sharing programs. Accommodations for such programs include providing parking spaces for the car-share vehicles at convenient locations accessible by public transportation.
- Reduce VHDs, especially daily heavy-duty truck vehicle hours of delay, through goods movement capacity enhancements, system management, increasing rideshare and work-at-home opportunities to reduce demand on the transportation system, investments in non-motorized transportation, maximizing the benefits of the land use-transportation connection and key transportation investments targeted to reduce heavy-duty truck delay.
- Determine traffic management strategies to reduce, to the maximum extent feasible, traffic congestion and the effects of parking demand by construction workers during construction of this project and other nearby projects that could be simultaneously under construction. Develop a construction management plan that include at least the following items and requirements, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency:
    - A set of comprehensive traffic control measures, including scheduling of major truck trips and deliveries to avoid peak traffic hours, detour signs if required, lane closure procedures, signs, cones for drivers, and designated construction access routes.
    - Notification procedures for adjacent property owners and public safety personnel regarding when major deliveries, detours, and lane closures will occur.
    - Location of construction staging areas for materials, equipment, and vehicles at an approved location.

- A process for responding to, and tracking, complaints pertaining to construction activity, including identification of an onsite complaint manager. The manager shall determine the cause of the complaints and shall take prompt action to correct the problem. The Lead Agency shall be informed who the Manager is prior to the issuance of the first permit.
- Provision for accommodation of pedestrian flow.
- As necessary, provision for parking management and spaces for all construction workers to ensure that construction workers do not park in on street spaces.
- Any damage to the street caused by heavy equipment, or as a result of this construction, shall be repaired, at the project sponsor's expense, within one week of the occurrence of the damage (or excessive wear), unless further damage/excessive wear may continue; in such case, repair shall occur prior to issuance of a final inspection of the building permit. All damage that is a threat to public health or safety shall be repaired immediately. The street shall be restored to its condition prior to the new construction as established by the Lead Agency (or other appropriate government agency) and/or photo documentation, at the sponsor's expense, before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- Any heavy equipment brought to the construction site shall be transported by truck, where feasible.
- No materials or equipment shall be stored on the traveled roadway at any time.
- Prior to construction, a portable toilet facility and a debris box shall be installed on the site, and properly maintained through project completion.
- All equipment shall be equipped with mufflers.
- Prior to the end of each work-day during construction, the contractor or contractors shall pick up and properly dispose of all litter resulting from or related to the project, whether located on the property, within the public rights-of-way, or properties of adjacent or nearby neighbors.
- Promote “least polluting” ways to connect people and goods to their destinations.

- Create an interconnected transportation system that allows a shift in travel from private passenger vehicles to alternative modes, including public transit, ride sharing, car sharing, bicycling and walking, by incorporating the following, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency:
  - Ensure transportation centers are multi-modal to allow transportation modes to intersect;
  - Provide adequate and affordable public transportation choices, including expanded bus routes and service, as well as other transit choices such as shuttles, light rail, and rail;
  - To the extent feasible, extend service and hours of operation to underserved arterials and population centers or destinations such as colleges;
  - Focus transit resources on high-volume corridors and high-boarding destinations such as colleges, employment centers and regional destinations;
  - Coordinate schedules and routes across service lines with neighboring transit authorities;
  - Support programs to provide “station cars” for short trips to and from transit nodes (e.g., neighborhood electric vehicles);
  - Study the feasibility of providing free transit to areas with residential densities of 15 dwelling units per acre or more, including options such as removing service from less dense, underutilized areas to do so;
  - Employ transit-preferential measures, such as signal priority and bypass lanes. Where compatible with adjacent land use designations, right-of-way acquisition or parking removal may occur to accommodate transit-preferential measures or

improve access to transit. The use of access management shall be considered where needed to reduce conflicts between transit vehicles and other vehicles;
    - Provide safe and convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists to, across, and along major transit priority streets;
    - Use park-and-ride facilities to access transit stations only at ends of regional transit ways or where adequate feeder bus service is not feasible.
- Upgrade and maintain transit system infrastructure to enhance public use, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency, including:
    - Ensure transit stops and bus lanes are safe, convenient, clean and efficient;
    - Ensure transit stops have clearly marked street-level designation, and are accessible;
    - Ensure transit stops are safe, sheltered, benches are clean, and lighting is adequate;
    - Place transit stations along transit corridors within mixed-use or transit-oriented development areas at intervals of three to four blocks, or no less than one-half mile.
- Enhance customer service and system ease-of-use, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency, including:
    - Develop a Regional Pass system to reduce the number of different passes and tickets required of system users;
    - Implement “Smart Bus” technology, using GPS and electronic displays at transit stops to provide customers with “real-time” arrival and departure time information (and to allow the system operator to respond more quickly and effectively to disruptions in service);
    - Investigate the feasibility of an on-line trip-planning program.
- Prioritize transportation funding to support a shift from private passenger vehicles to transit and other modes of transportation, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency, including:
    - Give funding preference to improvements in public transit over other new infrastructure for private automobile traffic;
    - Before funding transportation improvements that increase roadway capacity and VMT, evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of funding projects that support alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT, including transit, and bicycle and pedestrian access.
- Promote ride sharing programs, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency, including:
    - Designate a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride-sharing vehicles;
    - Designate adequate passenger loading, unloading, and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles;
    - Provide a web site or message board for coordinating shared rides;
    - Encourage private, for-profit community car-sharing, including parking spaces for car share vehicles at convenient locations accessible by public transit;
    - Hire or designate a rideshare coordinator to develop and implement ridesharing programs.
- Support voluntary, employer-based trip reduction programs, if determined feasible and applicable by the Lead Agency, including:
    - Provide assistance to regional and local ridesharing organizations;
    - Advocate for legislation to maintain and expand incentives for employer ridesharing programs;

    - Require the development of Transportation Management Associations for large employers and commercial/ industrial complexes;
    - Provide public recognition of effective programs through awards, top ten lists, and other mechanisms.
- Implement a "guaranteed ride home" program for those who commute by public transit, ride-sharing, or other modes of transportation, and encourage employers to subscribe to or support the program.
- Encourage and utilize shuttles to serve neighborhoods, employment centers and major destinations.
- Create a free or low-cost local area shuttle system that includes a fixed route to popular tourist destinations or shopping and business centers.
- Work with existing shuttle service providers to coordinate their services.
- Facilitate employment opportunities that minimize the need for private vehicle trips, including:
    - Amend zoning ordinances and the Development Code to include live/work sites and satellite work centers in appropriate locations;
    - Encourage telecommuting options with new and existing employers, through project review and incentives, as appropriate.
- Enforce State idling laws for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.
- Organize events and workshops to promote GHG-reducing activities.
- Implement a Parking Management Program to discourage private vehicle use, including:
    - Encouraging carpools and vanpools with preferential parking and a reduced parking fee;
    - Institute a parking cash-out program;
    - Renegotiate employee contracts, where possible, to eliminate parking subsidies;
    - Install on-street parking meters with fee structures designed to discourage private vehicle use;
    - Establish a parking fee for all single-occupant vehicles.

**MM-TRA-5(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing impacts to emergency access that are in the jurisdiction and responsibility of fire departments, local enforcement agencies, and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider improving emergency access and ensuring compliance with the provisions of the county and city general plan, Emergency Evacuation Plan, and other regional and local plans establishing access during emergencies, as applicable and feasible. Compliance can be achieved through adopting transportation mitigation measures as set forth below, or through other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Prior to construction, project implementation agencies can and should ensure that all necessary local and state road and railroad encroachment permits are obtained. The project implementation agency can and should also comply with all applicable conditions of approval. As deemed necessary by the governing jurisdiction, the road encroachment permits may require the contractor to prepare a traffic control plan in accordance with professional engineering standards prior to construction. Traffic control plans can and should include the following requirements:

    - Identification of all roadway locations where special construction techniques (e.g., directional drilling or night construction) would be used to minimize impacts to traffic flow.
    - Development of circulation and detour plans to minimize impacts to local street circulation. This may include the use of signing and flagging to guide vehicles through and/or around the construction zone.
    - Scheduling of truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours.
    - Limiting of lane closures during peak hours to the extent possible.
    - Usage of haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible.
    - Inclusion of detours for bicycles and pedestrians in all areas potentially affected by project construction.
    - Installation of traffic control devices as specified in the California Department of Transportation Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones.
    - Development and implementation of access plans for highly sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, transit stations, hospitals, and schools. The access plans would be developed with the facility owner or administrator. To minimize disruption of emergency vehicle access, affected jurisdictions can and should be asked to identify detours for emergency vehicles, which will then be posted by the contractor. Notify in advance the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities and the locations of detours and lane closures.
    - Storage of construction materials only in designated areas.
    - Coordination with local transit agencies for temporary relocation of routes or bus stops in work zones, as necessary.
- Ensure the rapid repair of transportation infrastructure in the event of an emergency through cooperation among public agencies and by identifying critical infrastructure needs necessary for: a) emergency responders to enter the region, b) evacuation of affected facilities, and c) restoration of utilities.
- Enhance emergency preparedness awareness among public agencies and with the public at large.
- Provision for collaboration in planning, communication, and information sharing before, during, or after a regional emergency through the following:
    - Incorporate strategies and actions pertaining to response and prevention of security incidents and events as part of the on-going regional planning activities.
    - Provide a regional repository of GIS data for use by local agencies in emergency planning, and response, in a standardized format.
    - Enter into mutual aid agreements with other local jurisdictions, in coordination with the California OES, in the event that an event disrupts the jurisdiction's ability to function.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a), the SCAG PEIR concludes that the Plan has the potential to conflict with the established measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, by increasing per capita VMT and increase delay over the baseline condition, constituting a significant impact despite the host of improvement projects in the Plan and planned by local agencies. (SCAG PEIR, pp. 3.17-38, 3.17-39) While the Plan's multimodal strategy aims to reduce per capita VMT over the next 25 years, total demand to move people and goods would continue to grow due to the region's population increase. (Id., p. 3.17-39) The Plan calls for a substantial expansion of transit facilities and service over the next 25 years. (Id., p. 3.17-40) While these capital projects would provide the SCAG region with a much

more mature public transportation system, operational improvements and new transit programs and policies would also contribute greatly to attracting more trips to transit and away from single-occupant vehicle travel. (Ibid.) Another emphasis on transit network improvements includes transit priority facilities, such as bus lanes and traffic signal priority, because the region has a minimal amount of bus lanes, when compared to other major metropolitan areas. (Ibid.) Biking and walking are also essential parts of the Plan. (Idi, p. 3.17-41) Based on the transportation data provided by SCAG and based on forecasts developed using the RTDM and validated to standards in the California Transportation Commission RTP Guidelines, the Plan would decrease overall VMT compared to the No Project scenario, by 36,000 VMT. (Id., p. 3.17-41) Nevertheless, the expected increase in VMT would constitute a significant impact requiring the consideration of mitigation measures. (Ibid.) While impacts would be reduced by implementation of SCAG PEIR MM-TRA-1(b), VMT would still be substantially greater than existing, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively significant. (Id., p. 3.17-63)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that the transportation projects and land use strategies considered in the 2016 RTP/SCS have the potential to conflict with the established measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system due to the increase in VMT, potentially constituting a conflict with the adopted County CMPs, within the SCAG Region, and their respective measures, constituting a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.17-42) While the Plan would result in less vehicle hours driven, due to the substantial growth and large number of projects anticipated in the Plan, the impact would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable and cumulatively significant with SCAG PEIR MM-TRA-2(b) incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.17-42, 3.17-43, 3.17-63)

With regard to threshold c), The Plan would also recommend strategies which would support the regionalization of air demand; support regional and inter-regional projects that facilitate airport ground access; local land use efforts; development and use of transit access to the region's airports; encourage use of modes with high average vehicle occupancy; and discourage use of modes that require "deadhead" trips to/from airports. (Ibid.) Implementation of these recommendations would avoid public safety issues associated with flight paths and safety issues as a result of collisions and congestion. (Ibid.) Impacts would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively significant. (Id., pp. 3.17-46, 3.17-50)

Under threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that in accordance with the provisions governing hazard designs from the Southern California ITS, the Plan would not result in and overall increase hazards due to design features or increase conflicts between incompatible uses. (Id., p. 3.17-46) Plan strategies would focus growth away from high speed facilities where potential hazards are located, and development in high quality transit areas would place many residents in close proximity to transit and good opportunities for walking and biking, where improvements for those uses will be incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.17-46, 3.17-47.) Impacts are less than significant and would not be cumulatively significant. (Id., pp. 3.17-47, 3.17-50)

Under threshold e), the SCAG PEIR concludes that during construction activities, vital lanes could be closed. (Id., pp. 3.17-47, 3.17-48) Closure of lanes could potentially cause traffic delays and ultimately prevent access to calls for service, and coordination within local jurisdictions can and should be done to maintain adequate emergency access for ambulance services and other public safety services in the design of projects entailed by the Plan. (Id., p. 3.17-48) Construction and operation of the transportation projects, and related development projects associated with the land use strategies considered in the Plan would have the potential to conflict with emergency access plans, constituting a significant impact, requiring the consideration of mitigation measures. (Ibid.) Because of substantial growth and the large number of projects anticipated in the Plan,

impacts would be still be cumulatively significant and unavoidable with SCAG PEIR MM-TRA-5(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.17-63)

Under threshold f), the SCAG PEIR concludes that with all the measures included in the Plan to improve public access to transit, improve safety, and encourage Active Transportation, the Plan would reduce impacts related to transportation fatality. (Id. p. 3.17-48) The Plan would also promote active modes of transportation and would be in congruence with the performance requirements of the public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. (Ibid.) transportation projects and land use measures considered in the Plan encourage the adoption of policies to encourage public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and would be expected to result in less than significant impact. (Id., pp. 3.17-48, 3.17-51)

**Project Analysis and Conclusion:** The Project EIR studies potential impacts to local roadway intersections and roadway segments, based on acceptable Level of Service (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
- Intersection #29 – South Iowa Avenue / I-215 northbound ramps) for Existing Plus Project conditions.

(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 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-descried 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) Although the Project EIR has increased the level of detail regarding Project's potential to conflict with established measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation and to contribute to localized traffic congestion, the SCAG PEIR and Project EIR both determined that this impact would be significant and unavoidable, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) Although the Project EIR has increased the level of detail regarding the Project's potential to conflict with applicable congestion management standards, the SCAG PEIR and Project EIR both determined

that this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Accordingly, the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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.) Because impacts would be less than significant, SCAG PEIR MM-TRA-5(b) does not apply. The Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

Under threshold f), 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, sideways, and integrated bike lanes, and would not impede existing bus service. (Id., pp. 4.14-31, 4.14-32) This is consistent with SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

| **18. Utilities and Service Systems**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Potential to require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Require or result in construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or will require new or expanded entitlements. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's commitments. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| 18. **Utilities and Service Systems**<br><br>Would the project result in: | **New Potentially Significant Impact Not Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **Substantial Increase in Severity of Previously Identified Impact in SCAG PEIR** | **Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR** | **No Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| g. Potential to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**PEIR Mitigation Measures**

**MM-USS-3(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects on utilities and service systems, particularly for construction of storm water drainage facilities including new transportation and land use projects that are within the responsibility of local jurisdictions including the Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Ventura, and Orange Counties Flood Control District, and County of Imperial. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures, as applicable and feasible. These mitigation measures are within the responsibility of the Lead Agencies and Regional Water Quality Control Boards of (Regions 4, 6, 8, and 9) pursuant to the provisions of the National Flood Insurance Act, stormwater permitting requirements for stormwater discharges for new constructions, the flood control act, and Urban Waste Management Plan.

**MM-USS-6(b):** Consistent with the provisions of Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, SCAG has identified mitigation measures capable of avoiding or reducing the significant effects to serve landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste disposal needs, in which 75 percent of the waste stream be recycled and waste reduction goal by 50 percent that are within the responsibility of public agencies and/or Lead Agencies. Where the Lead Agency has identified that a project that has the potential for significant effects, the Lead Agency can and should consider mitigation measures to ensure compliance pursuant to the provisions of the Solid Waste Diversion Goals and Integrated Waste Management Plan, as applicable and feasible. Such measures may include the following or other comparable measures identified by the Lead Agency:

- Encourage project sponsors to integrate green building measures into project design such as those identified in the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, CALGreen (California Building Code Title 24), energy Star Homes, Green Point Rated Homes, and the California Green Builder Program. These measures could include the following:

    - Reuse and minimization of construction and demolition (C&D) debris and diversion of C&D waste from landfills to recycling facilities.

    - Inclusion of a waste management plan that promotes maximum C&D diversion.

- Source reduction through (1) use of materials that are more durable and easier to repair and maintain, (2) design to generate less scrap material through dimensional planning, (3) increased recycled content, (4) use of reclaimed materials, and (5) use of structural materials in a dual role as finish material (e.g., stained concrete flooring, unfinished ceilings, etc.).

- Reuse of existing structure and shell in renovation projects.

- Design for deconstruction without compromising safety.

- Design for flexibility through the use of moveable walls, raised floors, modular furniture, moveable task lighting and other reusable building components.

- Development of indoor recycling program and space.

- Discourage the siting of new landfills unless all other waste reduction and prevention actions have been fully explored. If landfill siting or expansion is necessary, site landfills with an adequate landfill-owned, undeveloped land buffer to minimize the potential adverse impacts of the landfill in neighboring communities.

- Locally generated waste should be disposed of regionally, considering distance to disposal site. Encourage disposal near where the waste originates as much as possible. Green technologies for long-distance transport of waste (e.g., clean engines and clean locomotives or electric rail for waste-by-rail disposal systems) and consistency with SCAQMD and 2016 RTP/SCS policies can and should be required.

- Encourage waste reduction goals and practices and look for opportunities for voluntary actions to exceed the 50 percent waste diversion target.

- Encourage the development of local markets for waste prevention, reduction, and recycling practices by supporting recycled content and green procurement policies, as well as other waste prevention, reduction and recycling practices.

- Develop ordinances that promote waste prevention and recycling activities such as: requiring waste prevention and recycling efforts at all large events and venues; implementing recycled content procurement programs; and developing opportunities to divert food waste away from landfills and toward food banks and composting facilities.

- Develop alternative waste management strategies such as composting, recycling, and conversion technologies.

- Develop and site composting, recycling, and conversion technology facilities that have minimum environmental and health impacts.

- Require the reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).

- Integrate reuse and recycling into residential industrial, institutional and commercial projects.

- Provide recycling opportunities for residents, the public, and tenant businesses.

- Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.

- Continue to adopt programs to comply with state solid waste diversion rate mandates and, where possible, encourage further recycling to exceed these rates.

- Implement or expand city or county-wide recycling and composting programs for residents and businesses. This could include extending the types of recycling services offered (e.g., to include food and green waste recycling) and providing public education and publicity about recycling services.

**SCAG PEIR Analysis and Conclusion:** With regard to threshold a, the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects or development encouraged by land use strategies included in the Plan would result in less than significant impacts in relation to wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB, because there is adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated growth in population over the planning horizon. (SCAG PEIR, p. 3.18-27) Additionally, water conservation practices and compliance with BMPs are likely to substantially reduce wastewater. (Ibid.) The impact is less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., pp. 3.18-27, 3.18-35)

With regard to threshold b), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects or development encouraged by land use strategies included in the Plan would result in less than significant impacts in relation to construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities effects, because although wastewater generation will increase over the planning horizon for the Plan, it will not exceed the wastewater treatment capacity or the RWQCB standards for treatment of wastewater in the SCAG region. (Id., p. 3.18-28) Further, water conservation is likely to substantially reduce increases in wastewater. (Ibid.) Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Id., p. 3.18-28, 3.18-35)

With regard to threshold c), the SCAG PEIR concludes that transportation projects or development encouraged by land use strategies included in the 2016 RTP/SCS would require or result in construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects without mitigation incorporated. (Ibid.) Projects that increase impervious surface areas and construction projects more generally, including new development, may increase urban and stormwater runoff, which could result in greater quantities of contaminants to receiving waters that may currently be impaired, and would require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing ones. (Ibid.) This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with SCAG PEIR MM-USS-3(b) and MM-HYD-1(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.18-42)

Under threshold d), the SCAG PEIR concludes that the Plan could result in insufficient water supplies available to serve the transportation projects and anticipated development from existing entitlements and resources or would require new or expanded entitlements, resulting in significant impacts requiring the consideration of mitigation measures. (Id., p. 3.18-31) Under then-existing UWMPs in the region, existing water supplies and infrastructure would not be sufficient to meet demand in 2040. (Ibid.) Each water district develops its own policy for determining its planning horizon and for acquiring and building water facilities, and water districts would provide water for the growth planned and authorized by the appropriate land use authority. (Id., p. 3.18-32) However, given the challenges to imported water supplies, meeting future demand is difficult, and impacts would be significant, requiring the consideration of mitigation measures. (Ibid.) This impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with SCAG PEIR MM-USS-4(b) incorporated. (Id., p. 3.18-42)

Under threshold e), the SCAG PEIR concludes that without mitigation, Plan would result in potentially significant impacts in relation to a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the future population demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments. (Id., p. 3.18-33) In less developed areas of the region, new housing and employment developments would require additional wastewater infrastructure and control measures to minimize additional; higher density development proposed as part of the 2016 RTP/SCS would also require construction of wastewater infrastructure with greater conveyance capacity, which would result in a significant impact. (Id., p. 3.18-34) However, proposed development projects would either be accommodated by existing infrastructure, or project proponents would be required, by local ordinances and state regulations, to make wastewater infrastructure improvements. (Id., p. 3.18-33) This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Under threshold f), the construction and operation of transportation projects and the land use development that would result from the strategies considered in the 2016 RTP/SCS would have the potential to result in significant impacts, on a case-by-case basis, where there is insufficient capacity in the landfill designated for the project area to accommodate the r solid waste disposal needs. (Id., p. 3.18-34) The potential to exceed capacity over the planning horizon remains significant, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable and cumulatively considerable with SCAG PEIR MM-USS-6(b) incorporated. (Id., pp. 3.18-42, 3.18-37)

With regard to threshold g), the SCAG PEIR concludes that construction and operation of transportation projects and development encouraged by land use strategies identified in the 2016 RTP/SCS would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulation related to solid waste, including County and City General Plan also include goals and policies for recycling and diversion of solid waste to ensure compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 9393), the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act, and the Solid Waste Diversion Rule (AB 341). (Id., p. 3.18-35) Data provides this compliance to be effective, and the impact is therefore less than significant with no mitigation required. (Id., pp. 3.18-35, 3.18-37)

**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. This is consistent with SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

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 measures beyond those already identified to address physical environmental impacts in other areas of the Project EIR are not 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 SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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, and no mitigation is required. Because no mitigation is required, SCAG PEIR MM-USS-3(b) and MM-HYD-1(b) would not apply, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.

Under threshold d), the Project EIR concludes that supported by information in the San Bernardino Valley 2010 UWMP, 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.) Because the Project would not require mitigation, SCAG PEIR MM-USS-4(b) would not apply, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 CWRF. (Id., pp. 4.15-12, 4.15-13) Accordingly, the CWRF 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 CWRF to serve the Project's projected sewer demand, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. (Ibid.) This is consistent with SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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) Because the Project would not require mitigation, SCAG PEIR MM-USS-6(b) does not apply, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG 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 SCAG PEIR analysis, and the Project would have an Equal or Less Severe Impact Than Previously Identified in SCAG PEIR.