



**CEQA Findings of Fact and
Statement of Overriding Considerations
City of Colton Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and
General Plan Amendment
City of Colton, San Bernardino County, California
State Clearinghouse Number 2025010520**

Prepared for:

City of Colton

659 North La Cadena Drive
Colton, CA 92324
909.370.5523

Contact: Mario Suarez, Planning Manager

Prepared by:

FirstCarbon Solutions

967 Kendall Drive, #A-537
San Bernardino, CA 92407
714.508.4100

Contact: Cecilia So, Project Director

Date: December 30, 2025

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement Overriding Considerations	1
1.1 - Introduction.....	1
1.2 - Statement of Findings	1
1.3 - Project Summary	2
1.4 - Background.....	4
1.5 - Potential Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Less than Significant	5
1.6 - Potential Environmental Effects Which Can Be Mitigated Below a Level of Significance.....	30
1.7 - Impacts Identified in the EIR as Being Significant and Unavoidable Even After the Incorporation of All Feasible Mitigation Measures	57
1.8 - Findings Regarding Alternatives	67
1.9 - Findings Regarding Cumulative Impacts.....	73
1.10 - Findings Regarding Growth Inducement	74
1.11 - Findings Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	75
1.12 - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan	76
1.13 - Findings Regarding Recirculation	76
1.14 - Statement of Overriding Considerations.....	77
1.15 - Custodian of Record; Scope and Content of Record	79

Appendix A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 - Introduction

The State Guidelines (Guidelines) promulgated pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provide:

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been completed which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

- (a) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
- (b) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (c) Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

The required findings shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record (CEQA Guidelines § 15091).

1.2 - Statement of Findings

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to CEQA has been prepared by City of Colton (Lead Agency). The Draft Program EIR for the Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment (proposed project) identifies significant effects on the environment, which may occur as a result of the proposed project. As discussed above, the City is required to make certain findings with respect to these impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. Accordingly, the City hereby makes these required findings, as set forth in this document (“Findings”).

For these Findings, the “EIR” shall consist of the Draft Program EIR, all appendices attached to the Draft Program EIR, and the Final EIR (consisting of the Introduction and Responses to Comments). All acronyms used within this document shall have the same meaning as defined in the Draft Program EIR.

The following sets forth all significant effects of the proposed project and, with respect to each effect, makes one or more of the findings set forth above in above in Section 1.1., and provides facts in support of such findings. These Findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the EIR. Instead, the Findings provide a summary description of each impact, identify the applicable mitigation measures set forth in the EIR and adopted by the City, and state Findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental Findings and conclusions is in the EIR, and these Findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in those documents supporting the EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the proposed project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. The facts supporting these Findings are found in the record as a whole for the proposed project.

In making these Findings, the City ratifies, adopts and incorporates into these Findings the analysis and explanation in the EIR, and ratifies, adopts and incorporates into these Findings the determination and conclusions of the EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent that any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these Findings. In the event of any inconsistency between these Findings and the EIR, the language in these Findings shall control.

The following sets forth all significant effects of the proposed project and with respect to each effect, makes one or more findings set forth in Section 1.1, Introduction, and provides facts in support of such findings.

1.3 - Project Summary

1.3.1 - Project Description

The City of Colton Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment (Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA, proposed project) is a citywide planning initiative designed to implement the 2021–2029 Housing Element and ensure compliance with State Housing Element Law. The proposed project encompasses amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and related text changes to increase residential development capacity. Approximately 89.9 acres across six areas have been identified for rezoning to allow higher-density residential and mixed-use development. These changes include up-zoning the Mixed-Use Downtown (M-U/D) zone to permit up to 40 dwelling units per acre and revising the R3/R4 zone to allow up to 30 dwelling units per acre (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, pages 1-11 to 1-12; Executive Summary, page ES-2).

The proposed project responds to the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which assigns Colton a total of 5,434 housing units for the 2021–2029 planning period. This allocation includes 1,318 very low-income units, 668 low-income units, 906 moderate-income units, and 2,542 above moderate-income units (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, pages 1-9; Chapter 3.13, page 3.13-4 and Table 3.13-4). To meet this requirement, the City's Housing Element identifies a shortfall of sites suitable for lower-income housing, necessitating rezoning actions under Program 10/11. The Draft Program EIR demonstrates that the proposed rezoning strategy will provide sufficient capacity to meet the RHNA allocation with

a surplus of approximately 1,500 units (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, page 1-9; Executive Summary, page ES-2).

The rezoning program focuses on vacant and underutilized parcels located primarily along South La Cadena Drive and within the Fairway Drive/Crossroads Drive corridor. These areas currently include a mix of commercial, industrial, and low-density residential uses. Future development on these sites is anticipated to consist of multi-family residential projects and mixed-use developments with ground-floor commercial and upper-level residential units. The proposed changes will also implement recommendations from the South Colton Livable Corridor Plan, which seeks to revitalize South Colton through infill development and improved land use patterns (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, pages 1-1 to 1-2; 1-12 to 1-13).

In addition to rezoning, the project includes General Plan amendments to ensure consistency between the Land Use Element and the Housing Element. These amendments will update land use designations, density ranges, and zoning standards to reflect the proposed changes. The Zoning Ordinance will also be revised to align with the updated General Plan, including provisions for by-right approval of qualifying housing projects that include at least 20 percent lower-income units, as required by Government Code Section 65583.2(h) (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, page 1-31; Executive Summary, page ES-2).

Overall, the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA represents a comprehensive strategy to expand housing opportunities in Colton, promote mixed-use development, and accommodate projected population growth. While no specific development projects are proposed at this time, the program establishes the regulatory framework necessary to facilitate future residential construction consistent with State law and regional planning objectives. Subsequent projects will undergo site-specific review and may tier from this Program EIR under CEQA streamlining provisions (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, pages 1-32 to 1-33; Executive Summary, page ES-2).

1.3.2 - Project Objectives

The underlying purpose of the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA is to accommodate the RHNA and increase the inventory of land available for the development of housing compliant with State law and consistent with the General Plan. The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Rezone parcels with sufficient area and development standards to accommodate the City's RHNA allocation throughout the planning period.
- Promote infill development and encourage efficient development patterns.
- Meet housing needs by encouraging a variety of housing development affordable at all income levels, including construction of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).
- Reduce, remove, and/or mitigate potential constraints to housing development and incorporate best practices related to land use.

1.3.3 - Required Approvals

Discretionary approvals and permits are required for implementation of the proposed project. The proposed project would require the following discretionary approvals and actions, including:

- Certify the City of Colton 2023–2031 (6th Cycle) Housing Element Update Program EIR.
- Approve amendments to the General Plan Land Use Element, including modifying the General Plan Land Use Map to indicate applicable designations for each housing site along with rezoning of land consistent with the programs contained in the Housing Element Update to expand the inventory of land available for the development of housing. Pursuant to State law, the City has up to 3 years following adoption of the Housing Element Update to rezone sites.

Additional subsequent actions listed below that may be taken by the City with respect to the Housing Element Update would each require additional review for environmental compliance at the time development applications are received by the City. These subsequent actions may include:

- Approval of subsequent development applications for residential and mixed-use development, such as Planned Unit Development approval, and project-related approvals such as growth management approval, design review approval, tentative map approval, final map approval, and grading and building permit approval.
- Implementation of the programs set forth in the Housing Element Update.
- Approval of subsequent public facility and roadway improvement projects in support of such residential and mixed-use development.

Subsequent ministerial actions and actions from local, regional, State, and federal agencies, would be required for the implementation of the proposed project and are discussed throughout the EIR. (See e.g., Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, page 1-34.)

1.4 - Background

The City of Colton released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for public review from January 17, 2025, to February 21, 2025 (35-day review period). The NOP and copies of comments received are included as Appendix A to the Draft Program EIR.

On February 11, 2025, a scoping meeting was held at the Colton City Council Chambers to solicit written and oral comments regarding the scope and content of the Draft Program EIR from public agencies and interested parties or persons.

The Draft Program EIR was circulated for a public review period between October 8, 2025 and November 21, 2025 for a 45-day review period. The Draft Program EIR was publicly available at City of Colton Development Services Department at 659 North La Cadena Drive Colton, CA 92324; the Colton Public Library—Main Branch at 656 North 9th Street Colton, CA 92324; and at the City Hall Information Booth at 650 North La Cadena Drive Colton, CA 92324. In addition, the Draft Program EIR was posted on the City of Colton website at: <https://www.coltonca.gov/779/Environmental-Documents> during the public review period. The Planning Commission held a study session at the November 25, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting.

After the close of the public comment period, the City prepared a Final EIR, consisting of the comments received on significant environmental issues during the public review and comment period on the Draft Program EIR and written responses to those comments.

Subsequently, a public meeting was held on January 13, 2026, at the Planning Commission, during which individuals and organizations/agency representatives were invited to provide oral comments on the Final EIR.

The City of Colton subsequently considered all oral and written comments regarding environmental issues in the Final EIR and determined, based on all of the evidence presented, including but not limited to the EIR, written and oral testimony given at public meetings and hearings in connection therewith, and the submission of comments from the public, organizations and regulatory agencies, as well as all other relevant information in the administrative record, the following environmental impacts associated with the proposed project are: (1) less than significant and do not require mitigation; or (2) potentially significant but will be avoided or reduced to a level of insignificance through the identified mitigation measures; or (3) significant and cannot be fully mitigated to a level of less than significant but will be substantially lessened to the extent feasible by the identified mitigation measures.

The City of Colton concludes that implementation of the proposed project could result in potentially significant and significant adverse environmental impacts as discussed in Section 1.7. Accordingly, the Lead Agency hereby certifies that its Findings and determinations are based on all of the evidence contained in the EIR, as well as the evidence and other information in the record addressing the environmental impacts of the proposed project, and hereby elects to rely on the analysis and evidence set forth in the EIR.

1.5 - Potential Environmental Effects Which are Not Significant or Less than Significant

The City of Colton has heard, been presented with, reviewed, and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including the Draft and Final EIR, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings. The EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of Colton and is deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the proposed project.

Consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21002.1 and Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR focused its analysis on potentially significant impacts, and limited discussion of other impacts for which it can be seen with certainty there is no potential for significant adverse environmental impacts. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 does not require specific findings to address environmental effects that an EIR identifies as “no impact” or a “less than significant” impact and for which no mitigation is necessary.

The City of Colton agrees with the characterization in the EIR of all project-specific impacts identified as “no impact” or “less than significant” and finds that those impacts have been described accurately and either have no impact on the physical environment or a less than significant impact,

as described in the EIR. The City of Colton further finds that no substantial evidence was submitted or identified during the public comment period indicating that the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact with respect to the environmental impacts or topical categories listed below.

Therefore, based on its independent judgment and the entire administrative record before it, the City of Colton has determined and finds that the following environmental impacts will not exceed any established thresholds, will have either no impact or less than significant effects and no mitigation is necessary.

1.5.1 - Aesthetics

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

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the proposed sites for rezoning under the proposed project are located directly on, or in proximity to, a scenic vista, and foreseeable future development would be required to undergo architectural and site plan review to ensure compliance with the General Plan and Municipal Code. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas. All future individual development projects from the implementation of the proposed project would be required to undergo project-specific environmental review, which may require site- and project-specific measures to reduce potential impacts to scenic vistas and would ensure impacts are less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, pages 3.1-11 to 3.1-13).

Impact AES-2: The proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: No mitigation measures are required because compliance with existing City regulations and design standards ensures that scenic quality will be maintained (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, pages 3.1-14 to 3.1-15). The project consists of rezoning and land use amendments for infill sites within an urbanized setting. None of the proposed sites are located within designated scenic corridors or areas subject to special scenic resource protections. The City's design review process (Municipal Code Chapter 18.58.030) and General Plan policies (e.g., LU-2.3 and Open Space and Conservation Element Principle 7) require that development be visually compatible and avoid adverse effects on scenic quality. Because these requirements apply to all future development, the potential for conflict with scenic regulations is minimized, and impacts remain less than significant without mitigation (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, pages 3.1-14 to 3.1-15).

Impact AES-3: The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: New development would be required to comply with Title 24 Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, which provides mandatory requirements for indoor and outdoor lighting for multi-family buildings and nonresidential uses, and local regulations such as Municipal Code Sections 18.42.090 and 18.42.100, which require new sources of light and glare from development to be arranged and designed in a manner to prevent intrusion onto adjacent properties and the surrounding area. Future specific projects as a result of the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be subject to architectural and site plan review and approval by either the Development Services Director or Planning Commission prior to construction, which would include reviewing compliance with Municipal Code Sections 18.42.090 and 18.42.100. Since any new development after the approval of the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be required to abide by State and local rules and regulations such as Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations and the Municipal Code and would undergo architectural and site plan review prior to approval, impacts related to generating a substantial new source of light or glare would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, pages 3.1-16 to 3.1-17).

Impact: The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway.

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Caltrans manages the State Scenic Highway Program to protect scenic corridors, but there are no officially designated or eligible State Scenic Highways within the City of Colton’s planning area. The nearest eligible scenic highway, State Route 38, is about 6.3 miles away. All development under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would occur on vacant or underutilized infill sites already surrounded by urban uses, so no scenic resources along a State Scenic Highway would be affected. Therefore, there would be no impact. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 4, page 4-1).

Cumulative Aesthetics

The proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact on aesthetics, light, and glare.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The cumulative analysis concludes that, because all foreseeable development would be subject to similar design review and regulatory safeguards, the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA’s incremental contribution to any potential cumulative impact on scenic vistas would not be cumulatively considerable and the cumulative impact would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, page 3.1-14). Cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, including scenic vistas, scenic resources, and light and glare, would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, pages 3.1-14, 3.1-16, 3.1-17). No mitigation measures are required. The Draft Program EIR’s cumulative analysis evaluates whether the Housing Element Update Program, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in significant cumulative aesthetic impacts. The proposed project involves rezoning and land use amendments for infill

development within an already urbanized setting. Scenic vistas and resources in the City of Colton (e.g., San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains, Jurupa Hills, La Loma Hills, and Slover Mountain) are largely preserved through existing General Plan policies and Municipal Code requirements, which apply to all future development. Additional sources of light and glare introduced by future development would be typical of residential and mixed-use projects and subject to Title 24 and City lighting standards, minimizing spillover and glare. No designated State Scenic Highways or other formally protected scenic corridors occur within the planning area. Because regulatory safeguards apply to all cumulative development and the project does not introduce unique or large-scale visual changes, cumulative aesthetic impacts would remain less than significant without mitigation (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.1, pages 3.1-10 to 3.1-18).

1.5.2 - Air Quality

Impact AIR-4: The proposed project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project does not include specific development. However, during construction, development consistent with the proposed project would be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality District (South Coast AQMD) Rule 1113 standards for paint applications and Rule 1108 standards regarding application of asphalt as a matter of regulatory policy. Thus, the proposed project would not introduce a new odor source near existing receptors. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts during construction.

Land uses generally associated with long-term (i.e., operational) objectionable odors include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, landfills, dairies, and/or various heavy industrial uses. As previously stated, residential and commercial land uses have not been identified as being as sources of objectionable odors. The proposed project would result in the addition of mobile source emissions from vehicles associated with residential and/or commercial uses. Minor sources of odors, such as exhaust from mobile sources, are not typically associated with odor complaints, but potential odors would be temporary and insignificant. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant odor impacts during operation. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-34 to 3.2-35).

1.5.3 - Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Impact: The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland).

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Most of the City is mapped as “Urban and Built-up Land” by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, and there is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local importance on the project site or within any of the potential rezoning sites. In addition, development

consistent with Program 10/11 of the Housing Element Update would not convert any farmland to nonagricultural use since none of the potential rezoning areas are designated for agricultural uses. Therefore, no impact would occur. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 4, page 4-2).

Impact: **The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.**

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the potential sites for rezoning are zoned for agricultural use and none are under a Williamson Act Contract. Accordingly, no impact would occur. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 4, page 4-2).

Impact: **The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g)).**

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the areas for potential rezoning are zoned for forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned for production. Therefore, there would be no impact. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 4, page 4-2).

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

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the potential rezoning sites contain any forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for production. Development consistent with the Housing Element Update would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, there would be no impact. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 4, page 4-2).

Impact: **The proposed project would not 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.**

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the potential sites for rezoning or surrounding areas contains Farmland or forest land. Therefore, development consistent with the Housing Element Update would not result in the conversion of Farmland or forest land from agricultural or timberland uses to nonagricultural or non-forest land uses. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 4, page 4-2).

1.5.4 - Biological

Impact BIO-5: The proposed project could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Development consistent with the proposed project may contain trees protected under the City of Colton Municipal Code Chapter 12.20.041. All departments, agencies and personnel of the City shall consult with the Public Works Director prior to engaging in any action that would require the removal of, or which would otherwise substantially affect or seriously jeopardize the health of any existing public tree. Future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be subject to these applicable local policies and regulations related to the protection of trees. Compliance with these goals, programs, and State and federal requirements would reduce impacts to less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-53 to 3.3-53).

Impact BIO-6: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Impact BIO-6 evaluates whether the Housing Element Update Program would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or State Habitat Conservation Plan. The Draft Program EIR concludes that the City of Colton is not located within the boundaries of any adopted HCP or NCCP, nor are the proposed rezoning areas subject to any regional habitat conservation planning requirements. The project consists of rezoning and land use amendments for infill development within an urbanized setting, which does not include or affect lands under conservation planning. Future development will remain subject to standard biological resource regulations and project-level CEQA review, ensuring consistency with applicable State and federal requirements. Because there are no adopted habitat conservation plans applicable to the planning area, and the project does not introduce conflicts with regional conservation efforts, impacts would remain less than significant without mitigation (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, page 3.3-54; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-18).

1.5.5 - Energy

Impact ENER-1: The proposed project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction, new development would be subject to energy conservation requirements in the California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings)

and CALGreen (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations). The construction of housing, public infrastructure, and mixed-use development would require the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. However, this equipment is required to comply with applicable California Air Resources Board (ARB) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) engine emissions standards, which improve combustion efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption. None of the future developments anticipated as a result of implementation of the proposed project would be expected to require an unusual or extraordinary amount of energy consumption during construction, as could occur with large industrial facilities such as power plants or large infrastructure facilities such as highway projects or dams. Furthermore, construction activities for future development would be temporary in nature and would not result in a long-term demand on energy resources. Compared to large-scale industrial or infrastructure projects, the type of development envisioned by the proposed project (primarily residential and neighborhood-serving mixed-use) would not involve energy-intensive construction methods. In addition, the operation of construction equipment would be required to comply with the latest EPA and ARB engine emissions standards. These emissions standards require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption. Construction activities would also be required to comply with anti-idling regulations, which will reduce fuel use.

MM GHG-1b would prohibit the use of natural gas and future development within the proposed project area and development as a result of the rezone would be all-electric, thereby eliminating the use of natural gas-fueled appliances or building features. Furthermore, all future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the most recent Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, as well as CALGreen provisions under the California Building Code. Electricity would be provided by CE, which in 2023 (the most recently available Power Content Label published by the California Energy Commission) delivered 64.6 percent of its power from eligible renewable sources, including solar, wind, geothermal, and small hydro. CE is also required to meet California's Renewable Portfolio Standard. Operational transportation energy use would also be consistent with federal and State fuel economy standards. Infill development and mixed-use zones enabled by the zoning amendments of the proposed project may reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by allowing future residents to live closer to commercial, transit, and community amenities. In addition, the proposed project supports California's long-term climate goals established under AB 32 and SB 32 by promoting infill housing, compact development, and land use patterns that encourage energy efficiency and reduced VMT.

All future development under the Housing Element Update would be subject to State and local energy efficiency requirements.

Because the proposed project is a policy-level planning document that does not directly permit development, specific operational-related energy consumption impacts would be addressed as part of subsequent project-level environmental review consistent with CEQA. Future development would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations. As such, future development facilitated by the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy use during operation. Impacts from operation would be less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.5, pages 3.5-9 to 3.5-11).

Impact ENER-2: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The project supports State and local energy goals by facilitating infill development and reducing VMT compared to sprawl development. Compliance with Title 24, CALGreen, and the City’s General Plan Energy Conservation policies ensures consistency with renewable energy and energy efficiency plans. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct any adopted energy plan, and impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.5, page 3.5-4; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-24).

Cumulative Energy Impact

The proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact related to energy.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed in Section 3.5 (Energy) of the Draft Program EIR, the Housing Element Update Program would incrementally increase energy demand through construction and operation of new housing units. However, all future development under the program must comply with California Building Standards Code (Title 24) and CALGreen, which mandate energy-efficient building design, lighting, and appliance standards. Moreover, construction energy use would be temporary and typical of urban infill projects, and operational energy demand would be consistent with residential and mixed-use development patterns.

Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company have sufficient capacity to serve anticipated growth, and the project would not require new energy infrastructure or result in wasteful or inefficient energy use. Cumulatively, other regional projects are subject to the same State and local energy efficiency regulations, ensuring that overall energy consumption remains efficient and consistent with adopted plans. These regulatory requirements ensure that cumulative energy impacts remain less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-24).

Therefore, cumulative energy impacts would remain less than significant without mitigation (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.5, pages 3.5-1 to 3.5-4)

1.5.6 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Impact GEO-1: The proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking.
- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
- iv) Landslides.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The project involves rezoning and land use amendments for infill development within an urbanized area. While the planning area is located in a seismically active region, future development will be required to comply with the California Building Standards Code (CBC) and the City of Colton Municipal Code, which include structural design standards to minimize seismic risks. No development is proposed on active fault traces, and site-specific geotechnical investigations will be conducted at the project level. Therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-17 to 3.6-18; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-24).

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

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The Draft Program EIR finds that development consistent with the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Construction activities such as grading, excavation, and paving could disturb soils, but all projects disturbing one or more acres are required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit, which mandates preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion and sedimentation. The City's Municipal Code also requires landscape and grading design plans to minimize erosion, and mandates BMPs for all construction sites. Compliance with these regulatory requirements ensures that potential impacts related to soil erosion and topsoil loss would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-18 to 3.6-19; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-24).

Impact GEO-3: Development consistent with the proposed project would not 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.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The planning area is generally flat and urbanized, with no steep slopes or landslide-prone areas. While liquefaction potential exists in some areas, compliance with CBC seismic design standards and site-specific geotechnical studies will ensure structural stability. No unique geologic hazards beyond those addressed by existing regulations are present. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-20 to 3.6-21; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-25).

Impact GEO-4: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The planning area consists of urbanized infill sites where expansive soils may occur in isolated locations. However, future development will be required to comply with the CBC and the City of Colton Municipal Code, which mandate geotechnical investigations and appropriate engineering design to address soil conditions. These regulatory requirements ensure that any potential risks associated with expansive soils are minimized. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, page 3.6-22; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-25).

Impact GEO-5: The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The proposed Housing Element Update Program does not include or require the use of septic systems or alternative wastewater disposal systems. All future development will connect to the existing municipal sewer system, which has adequate capacity to serve anticipated growth. Because septic systems are not proposed or permitted, there is no potential for impacts related to soil suitability for wastewater disposal. Therefore, the project would result in no impact (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, page 3.6-23; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-25).

1.5.7 - Hazardous and Hazardous Materials

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

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. While construction and operation of new development may involve the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, solvents, and paints, these activities are typical for residential and commercial projects and are regulated by federal, State, and local laws. All handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials must comply with applicable laws, policies, and programs set forth by various federal, State, and local agencies and regulations. Development consistent with the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations for management of hazardous materials during construction. Demolition and construction activities associated with future housing development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA could require transport of hazardous materials (e.g., ACM, lead-based paint, and/or contaminated soils). This transport would be limited in duration and would be required to comply with numerous federal, State, and local regulations that establish specific guidelines regarding the use, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials.

Hazardous materials used as part of development may vary but would likely be limited to small quantities of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, solvents, cleaning agents, and similar materials used for daily residential and commercial operations and maintenance activities. These types of materials are common for residential and commercial developments and represent a low risk to people and

the environment when used as intended. Further, compliance with federal, State, and local law and applicable plans and regulations, including General Plan goals and policies—including Policy S-6.5 of the Safety Element, which requires due diligence studies for new developments in sensitive areas or areas of heavy industrial use—would provide public protection from hazards associated with the use, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous substances. The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA, as a policy document, would not significantly increase impacts related to the exposure of hazardous materials to the public and the environment. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous materials transport, use, or disposal during construction or operation would be less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, pages 3.8-13 to 3.8-14).

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

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The planning area is urbanized and not near high-risk facilities. Program 10/11 of the Housing Element Update itself, as a policy document, would not significantly increase the exposure of hazardous materials to the public or the environment. Additionally, compliance with applicable federal, State, and local laws, and plans and regulations as described above, would provide public protection from hazards associated with the use, transport, treatment, and disposal of hazardous substances during construction and operation of future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, pages 3.8-16 to 3.8-17; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-27).

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

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: Although some rezoning areas are near schools, residential and mixed-use development does not involve substantial hazardous emissions. Compliance with Health and Safety Code and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) oversight ensures safety. Additionally, approval of the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA itself, as a policy document update, would not significantly increase the risk of the release of hazardous materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, page 3.8-18; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-28).

Impact HAZ-4: The proposed project would not 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.

Findings: No impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: None of the proposed rezoning sites are listed on the Cortese List or similar databases. Because the proposed project would not directly result in development of the sites, and because the sites are not included on a list of hazardous materials sites, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment. Therefore, there would be no impact (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, page 3.8-20; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-28).

Impact HAZ-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working the project area.

Findings: No impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The planning area is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, no safety hazard would occur (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, page 3.8-20; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-28).

Impact HAZ-6: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: Future development will comply with City emergency access requirements and will not obstruct evacuation routes. Development that is consistent with Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be required to comply with the City of Colton Street Improvement Requirements pertaining to traffic flow and emergency access. The City's Municipal Code Chapter

12.12, Street Improvements, requires an application to be submitted to the City Engineer for review and issuance of a permit for any construction within a public street. Additionally, approval of the proposed project itself, as a policy document update, would not significantly impact any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. With adherence to applicable plans and policies, operational impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, pages 3.8-20 to 3.8-21; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-28).

Impact HAZ-7: The proposed project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The planning area is urbanized and none of the proposed rezoning sites are located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Additionally, none of the rezoning sites are within a Wildfire Hazard Zone as designated within the General Plan's Safety Element. The sites proposed for rezoning have not had any history of wildfires according to CAL FIRE data. Furthermore, the proposed project promotes infill development; as such, the sites proposed for rezoning are surrounded by urban development and are not located in the Wildland Urban Interface. Compliance with City fire codes and General Plan safety policies ensures minimal risk. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8, pages 3.8-22 to 3.8-23; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-28).

Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact

The proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Findings: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: As discussed in Section 3.8 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials) of the Draft Program EIR, the Housing Element Update Program would not result in cumulatively considerable hazards impacts when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, because the planning area consists of infill sites within an existing urban environment, which limits exposure to wildland fire hazards and reduces the potential for large-scale hazardous materials use. Additionally, all future development will comply with federal, State, and local regulations governing hazardous materials handling, storage, and disposal, including oversight by the DTSC and the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Development will adhere to City emergency access requirements and will not interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. The planning area is not located within an airport land use plan or near a public airport, eliminating cumulative aviation-related hazards. Moreover, the planning area is outside of Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, and compliance with City fire codes and General Plan safety policies ensures minimal cumulative wildfire risk.

Because these regulatory safeguards apply to all cumulative development and the project does not introduce unique hazards beyond those addressed by existing regulations, cumulative hazards and

hazardous materials impacts would remain less than significant without mitigation (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.8; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-28).

1.5.8 - Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact HYD-1: The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: Future development under the Housing Element Update Program would occur on urban infill sites and be subject to NPDES permit requirements, City grading regulations, and BMPs during construction to control erosion and sedimentation. Operationally, stormwater runoff would be managed through compliance with the City’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit and Low Impact Development (LID) standards, preventing degradation of water quality. Therefore, the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.9, pages 3.9-11 to 3.9-13; Executive Summary Table ES-1, page ES-28).

Impact HYD-2: The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The project does not involve direct groundwater extraction or large-scale impervious surface expansion beyond what is typical for urban infill development. Future projects will comply with City water conservation requirements and State efficiency standards, minimizing water demand. Therefore, impacts on groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.9, pages 3.9-13 to 3.9-14; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-29).

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

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: Development would occur on previously disturbed sites and would not alter natural streams or rivers. Compliance with City grading and drainage regulations, NPDES permit requirements, and BMPs will prevent erosion and siltation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.9, pages 3.9-14 to 3.9-15; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-29).

Impact HYD-4: The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The project does not involve alteration of streams or rivers. Future development will comply with City stormwater management standards and LID requirements, ensuring that post-development runoff does not exceed pre-development conditions. Therefore, impacts related to flooding would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.9, pages 3.9-15 to 3.9-16; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-29).

Impact HYD-5: The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Findings: The project will comply with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan, NPDES permit requirements, and City water quality regulations, ensuring consistency with applicable water quality and groundwater management plans. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.9, page 3.9-16; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-29).

Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impact

The proposed project would have less than significant cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in Section 3.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft Program EIR, the Housing Element Update Program would not result in cumulatively considerable hydrology or water quality impacts when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, because the planning area consists of urban infill sites that do not involve alteration of streams, rivers, or floodplains, and future development will comply with City drainage regulations and LID standards. All construction activities will be subject to NPDES permit requirements and BMPs to control erosion and sedimentation. Operational stormwater runoff will be managed through compliance with the City's MS4 permit and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan, ensuring consistency with water quality objectives.

Additionally, the project does not involve groundwater extraction and will not impede sustainable groundwater management; future development will comply with State water efficiency standards.

These regulatory safeguards apply to all cumulative development, ensuring that cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts remain less than significant without mitigation.

Therefore, cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts would remain less than significant and no mitigation is necessary for the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.9, pages 3.9-11 to 3.9-16; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-29).

1.5.9 - Land Use and Planning

Impact LAND-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community.

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Housing Element Update Program involves rezoning and land use amendments for infill development within an already urbanized setting. No new roads, barriers, or physical features would be introduced that could divide existing neighborhoods. Future development will occur on vacant or underutilized parcels and will be subject to City design review to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.10, pages 3.10-11 to 3.10-12; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-29).

Impact LAND-2: The proposed project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project is intended to implement the City's Housing Element and comply with State Housing Element Law. The rezoning and General Plan amendments will maintain consistency between the Land Use Element and Housing Element. Future development will be subject to City zoning, design standards, and General Plan policies, ensuring consistency with applicable land use plans and regulations. Therefore, the project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.10, pages 3.10-12 to 3.10-13; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-30).

Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impact

The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to land use and planning.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in Section 3.10 the Draft Program EIR, the Housing Element Update Program would not result in cumulatively considerable land use impacts when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects because the project promotes infill development consistent with regional planning objectives and State housing law. The project does not introduce conflicts with SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy or other applicable plans. Compliance with City zoning and General Plan policies ensures that

cumulative land use and planning impacts remain less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.10, pages 3.10-13 to 3.10-14; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-30).

1.5.10 - Mineral Resources

Impact MIN-1: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The planning area does not contain any known mineral resource zones designated by the California Geological Survey or identified in the City’s General Plan. The proposed Housing Element Update Program involves rezoning and land use amendments for urban infill development and does not include or affect areas used for mineral resource extraction. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of regional or Statewide value (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.11, page 3.11-5; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-30).

Impact MIN-2: The proposed project would not 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.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City of Colton General Plan does not identify any locally important mineral resource recovery sites within the proposed rezoning areas. The project consists of land use changes for residential and mixed-use development on previously disturbed parcels and does not conflict with any designated mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.11, page 3.11-5; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-30).

Cumulative Mineral Resources Impact

The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to mineral resources.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in Section 3.11 of the Draft Program EIR, the planning area does not contain any known mineral resource zones or locally important mineral resource recovery sites. The Housing Element Update Program involves infill development and does not introduce conflicts with mineral resource availability. Other cumulative projects in the region are similarly located in urbanized areas and subject to local land use plans that avoid mineral resource conflicts. Therefore, cumulative mineral resource impacts would remain less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.11, pages 3.11-3-3.11-6; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-30).

1.5.11 - Noise

Impact NOI-3: The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels for a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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.

Finding: No impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: As analyzed in Section 3.12 of the Draft Program EIR, the planning area is not located within an airport land use plan, nor is it within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Additionally, there are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning areas. Because the project does not introduce development near airports or airstrips, there is no potential for exposing people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with aircraft operations. Therefore, the project would result in no impact (Draft Program EIR, page 3.12-25; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-33).

1.5.12 - Population and Housing

Impact POP-1: Development consistent with the proposed project would not induce substantial unplanned 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).

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Housing Element Update is a policy-level planning document that accommodates the City's RHNA allocation and guides growth through 2029. Development would occur on infill sites with existing infrastructure and would be consistent with long-range planning objectives. The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would not result in unplanned direct or indirect population growth because it implements General Plan and Housing Element policies and complies with Title 18 of the Municipal Code. Future development will undergo site-specific review to ensure consistency with these policies. Therefore, impacts related to unplanned population growth would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.13, pages 3.13-17 to 3.13-19).

Impact POP-2: Development consistent with the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Five potential rezoning sites include existing housing, which could result in demolition of single-family homes housing approximately 17 residents. However, the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would facilitate development of additional housing units at all affordability levels, consistent with RHNA requirements, on infill sites with access to infrastructure and services. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing and would not

necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.13, pages 3.13-20 to 3.13-21).

Cumulative Population and Housing Impact

The proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to population and housing.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative development in Colton and surrounding jurisdictions would comply with State law and local planning documents, which require adequate housing to accommodate forecasted population growth. The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would not induce substantial unplanned growth or cause displacement requiring replacement housing. Instead, it would increase housing supply consistent with RHNA and General Plan objectives. Therefore, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any cumulative impact, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.13, pages 3.13-19 to 3.13-21).

1.5.13 - Public Services

Impact PUB-1: **The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection.**

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would rezone approximately 89.66 acres for mixed-use or residential overlay. The nearest fire stations—Station 213, Station 211, and Station 214—are located within 1 mile of the proposed rezone areas and provide adequate coverage. The Colton Fire Department currently operates four stations with sufficient staffing and equipment to maintain service ratios and response times. Future development would comply with the CBC and City Fire Code requirements, ensuring fire safety standards are met. Therefore, impacts related to fire protection would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, pages 3.14-11 to 3.14-12).

Impact PUB-2: **The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection.**

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: If built to maximum density, the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would increase the population by approximately 3,260 people (6.06 percent). The current ratio of 935

residents per sworn officer would shift to 992 residents per officer without additional hires. To maintain current ratios, four additional officers would be needed; however, no new or expanded police facilities would be required because the proposed rezone areas are within existing service areas. Compliance with General Plan policies and payment of capital facilities fees would ensure adequate police services. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, pages 3.14-13 to 3.14-14).

Impact PUB-3: The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA could generate approximately 1,040 students based on projected population growth. This increase would bring total enrollment to 18,048 students, which is below historic peak enrollment levels. Existing school facilities can accommodate this growth, and school districts will continue to collect development impact fees under Government Code Section 65996, which provides full mitigation for school facility impacts. Therefore, impacts related to school facilities would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, pages 3.14-15 to 3.14-16).

1.5.14 - Recreation

Impact REC-1: Development consistent with the proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Draft Program EIR assumes a maximum population increase of 3,260 residents, resulting in a projected population of approximately 57,017 by 2029. While the City currently does not meet its parkland standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents, future development under Program 10/11 would be required to pay park dedication fees in accordance with Chapter 16.36.030 of the Municipal Code. These fees mitigate impacts by funding improvements and expansions to maintain service levels. Additionally, many proposed sites are within walking distance of existing parks, and the City has plans for new park development and renovations. Therefore, impacts related to increased use of parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.15, pages 3.15-6 to 3.15-7; 3.15-11).

Impact REC-2: Development consistent with the proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Although increased demand for parks and recreational facilities may occur, the project does not propose new recreational facilities and does not require construction or expansion of such facilities at this time. Any future park projects would undergo separate environmental review and comply with General Plan policies and Municipal Code requirements. Therefore, the physical effects on the environment from construction of new or expanded recreational facilities would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.15, pages 3.15-12 to 3.15-13).

Cumulative Recreation Impact

The proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to recreation.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative development within the City and its Sphere of Influence would be subject to City ordinances and General Plan policies requiring parkland dedication or payment of in lieu fees. These measures ensure that recreational facilities keep pace with growth. The incremental contribution of Program 10/11 to cumulative recreation impacts would not be cumulatively considerable because future park projects will be reviewed for compliance with applicable regulations. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to recreation would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.15, pages 3.15-11 to 3.15-13; Executive Summary, page ES-36).

1.5.15 - Transportation

Impact TRANS-1: The proposed project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy of the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Program 10/11 Housing Element Update Rezone/GPA would generate new demand for public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; however, development consistent with the program would be required to comply with all applicable General Plan goals, policies, and programs. Future projects would also adhere to City standards and specifications for circulation systems, including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Any modifications or new facilities would be designed in accordance with federal, State, and local policies. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans or policies related to the circulation system (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, page 3.16-34).

Impact TRANS-3: The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project is a program-level action that does not include or entitle specific development and would have no direct impacts related to roadway hazards or

incompatible uses. Future development would be subject to City review and compliance with design standards and safety regulations, including the CBC and City Municipal Code requirements. Therefore, impacts related to geometric design hazards or incompatible uses would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, page 3.16-40).

Impact TRANS-4: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The Program 10/11 Housing Element Update Rezone/GPA does not include specific development proposals and would not alter existing emergency access routes. All future development under the program would be required to comply with City Fire Department standards and California Fire Code requirements for emergency access, including roadway width, turning radii, and unobstructed access for emergency vehicles. The Draft Program EIR concludes that adequate emergency access would be maintained and impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, page 3.16-42).

1.5.16 - Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources

Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impact

The proposed project would not result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to transportation.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The likelihood and extent of cumulative impacts related to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) depend on the type of resource and the reasons for its significance. Since there are no known TCRs that would be impacted by the proposed project, the appropriate area for assessing cumulative impacts is the immediate project vicinity, defined as the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA site and the surrounding area within a 0.5-mile radius. The analysis considers whether the combined effects of the proposed project and other cumulative development would result in a significant cumulative impact on TCRs, and whether the project's incremental contribution would be considerable. While future development could have cumulative impacts on known or previously unidentified TCRs, all such development must comply with federal, State, and local laws and policies—including SB 18, AB 52, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, the California Health and Safety Code, and the Public Resources Code—which require consultation, evaluation, and inadvertent discovery procedures. These requirements ensure that any potential impacts to TCRs are identified and addressed through project-specific analysis and consultation. As a result, cumulative impacts to TCRs would be less than significant, and the proposed project would not make a considerable incremental contribution to cumulative impacts. The General Plan also contains policies to protect TCRs, and all future development would be required to comply with these regulations, further ensuring that cumulative impacts remain less than significant (Draft Program EIR, page 3.17-16 and page 3.17-18).

1.5.17 - Utilities and Service Systems

Impact UTIL-1: Development consistent with the proposed project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Future development under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would increase demand for utilities and may require extensions or upgrades to water, wastewater, storm drainage, and energy infrastructure. However, these improvements would occur within existing rights-of-way and easements and be subject to City standards, General Plan policies, and Municipal Code requirements. Development impact fees and compliance with applicable regulations would ensure that any necessary improvements are planned and funded without causing significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.18, pages 3.18-9 to 3.18-12; 3.18-20 to 3.18-21).

Impact UTIL-2: Development consistent with the proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City of Colton relies on groundwater from the San Bernardino Basin Area and other subbasins and is included in the 2020 Upper Santa Ana River Watershed Integrated Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The UWMP demonstrates that adequate water supplies exist to meet projected demand through 2045 under normal, single dry, and multiple dry year conditions. Additionally, the City enforces water conservation measures under Municipal Code Chapter 13.28 and CALGreen requirements. Therefore, impacts related to water supply availability would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.18, pages 3.18-2 to 3.18-3; 3.18-17 to 3.18-18).

Impact UTIL-3: Development consistent with the proposed project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City's Sewer System Management Plan identifies sufficient capacity in existing wastewater treatment facilities to accommodate projected growth. Future development would be subject to City ordinances and General Plan policies requiring compliance with wastewater standards and payment of development impact fees for infrastructure improvements. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.18, pages 3.18-9 to 3.18-11; 3.18-20).

Impact UTIL-4: Development consistent with the proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Solid waste generated by future development would be collected by CR&R Incorporated and disposed of at regional landfills with substantial remaining capacity, including El Sobrante, San Timoteo, and Mid Valley. The City enforces AB 939 diversion requirements and requires site-specific recycling plans under Municipal Code Chapter 15.58. Given compliance with State and local regulations and available landfill capacity, impacts related to solid waste generation would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.18, pages 3.18-20 to 3.18-21).

Impact UTIL-5: Development consistent with the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: Future development would be required to comply with all applicable solid waste regulations, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939), CALGreen building standards, and City Municipal Code requirements for recycling and waste reduction. Compliance with these regulations ensures that impacts related to solid waste management would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.18, pages 3.18-22 to 3.18-23).

Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impact

The proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to utilities and service systems.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in Section 3.18 (Utilities and Service Systems) of the Draft Program EIR, cumulative development in Colton and surrounding jurisdictions would increase demand for water supply, wastewater treatment, storm drainage, solid waste disposal, and energy. However, all future development—including the Program 10/11 Housing Element Update Rezone/GPA—must comply with applicable State and local regulations, including the UWMP, Sewer System Management Plan, and solid waste diversion requirements under AB 939 and CALGreen. Regional service providers have sufficient capacity to accommodate projected growth, and any necessary infrastructure improvements would occur within existing rights-of-way and be subject to environmental review. Therefore, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to any cumulative utilities and service systems impact, and cumulative impacts would remain less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.18).

1.5.18 - Wildfire

Impact WILD-1: Development consistent with the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the proposed rezoning sites are located within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). All sites are within urbanized areas and near established emergency routes (I-215 and I-10). Future development would comply with General Plan policies (e.g., Policies S-3.2, S-3.3, S-3.5) and Municipal Code Chapter 15.16, which adopt the California Fire Code and require emergency access standards. The Colton Fire Department reviews all new development for compliance with fire protection and emergency access requirements. Therefore, the project would not impair emergency response or evacuation plans (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.19, pages 3.19-10 to 3.19-12).

Impact WILD-2: Development consistent with the proposed project would not, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the proposed rezoning sites are located within a High or VHFHSZ; the closest High FHSZ is approximately 0.27 mile away. Development would occur primarily as infill in urbanized areas and would comply with General Plan wildfire prevention policies and Municipal Code requirements, including hazardous vegetation management and defensible space standards. Compliance with the CBC and Fire Code ensures fire-resistant construction and site design. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.19, pages 3.19-13 to 3.19-14).

Impact WILD-3: Development consistent with the proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project does not include new infrastructure that would increase wildfire risk. Future development would occur on existing urbanized sites with established utilities and roads. Any necessary utility upgrades would comply with City standards and State fire safety regulations, including the California Fire Code and Public Resources Code requirements for spark arrestors and fire suppression equipment. Therefore, impacts related to infrastructure that could exacerbate fire risk would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.19, pages 3.19-15 to 3.19-16).

Impact WILD-4: Development consistent with the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: None of the proposed rezoning sites are located within or immediately adjacent to VHFHSZs. Future development would comply with General Plan policies and Municipal Code requirements addressing hillside setbacks, geotechnical investigations, and stormwater management to prevent flooding and landslide hazards. These measures ensure that post-fire slope instability or drainage changes would not expose people or structures to significant risks (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.19, pages 3.19-17 to 3.19-18).

Cumulative Wildfire Impact

The proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to wildfire.

Finding: Less than significant impact.

Facts in Support of Finding: The cumulative analysis considers development in Colton and surrounding cities. Most areas are urbanized and outside State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) and VHFHSZs. All cumulative projects must comply with State and local fire safety regulations, including the California Fire Code and General Plan policies. Program 10/11's incremental contribution would not be cumulatively considerable because it does not increase wildfire hazard and requires compliance with fire protection standards. Therefore, cumulative wildfire impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.19, pages 3.19-16 to 3.19-18).

1.6 - Potential Environmental Effects Which Can Be Mitigated Below a Level of Significance

The City of Colton hereby finds that feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR that will avoid or substantially lessen the following potentially significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. The potentially significant impacts, and the mitigation measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level, are as follows:

1.6.1 - Impact BIO-1

Impact BIO-1: The proposed project could 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 United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, page 3.3-44). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1 Biological Resources Assessment

Prior to the issuance of entitlements for any site in Areas 4, 4A, 5, and 6, which have potential to support sensitive biological resources such as special-status species, nesting native or migratory birds, jurisdictional features, or other sensitive resource, the project applicant or sponsor shall retain a qualified Biologist to prepare a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA). The BRA shall include a project-specific analysis of potential impacts on sensitive and regulated biological resources, including impacts on special-status species and their habitat, migratory birds and other protected nesting birds, roosting bats, rare plants, sensitive communities and riparian habitats, protected waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, and shall identify thresholds of significance with a significance conclusion and measures to reduce potential project impact(s) to less than significant level(s). These measures shall be included as conditions of approval for building and grading permits issued for demolition and/or construction. The project applicant or sponsor shall implement these measures, as identified in the BRA, to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potential project impacts. Future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA may be required to undergo additional environmental review and incorporate additional mitigation depending on results of future biological studies. This may include acquisition of take permits if any project proponent proposes take of federal or State-listed or candidate species. If take is proposed, the project proponent shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and/or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), as applicable, regarding an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) pursuant to Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Sections 7 or 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act. Other measures may include focused surveys, regulatory permits, avoidance measures, and on-site mitigation. If on-site mitigation is not feasible in the City's discretion, off-site mitigation shall be implemented within the City of Colton Planning Area whenever possible, with a priority given to existing habitat mitigation banks. Habitat mitigation shall be accompanied by a long-term management plan and monitoring program prepared by a qualified Biologist and include provisions for protection of mitigation lands in perpetuity through the establishment of easements and adequate funding for maintenance and monitoring; the time frame for the funding shall be detailed in the long-term management plan and monitoring program completed prior to disturbance of occupied habitat or water feature. If a water feature is found to be jurisdictional or potentially jurisdictional, the applicant shall comply with the appropriate permitting process with each agency claiming jurisdiction prior to disturbance of the feature.

Facts in Support of Finding: Projects in Areas 4, 4A, 5, and 6 of the Study Area may occur near habitats that could support special-status species, creating potential for significant impacts. Such impacts would be significant under CEQA if construction or operations result in (1) direct harm

(injury or death) or (2) substantial adverse changes to physical conditions, including habitat loss or modification.

To address these risks, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires preparation of a project-specific Biological Resources Analysis by a qualified Biologist prior to grading permits. This analysis will evaluate potential impacts on biological resources, including special-status species and their habitats, migratory birds, roosting bats, rare plants, sensitive communities, wetlands, wildlife corridors, and nursery sites.

Section 3.3.2 identifies six special-status species with low potential to occur in these areas: Santa Ana River woollystar, burrowing owl, Santa Ana sucker, arroyo chub, San Bernardino kangaroo rat, southern California legless lizard. Potential impacts include unauthorized “take” under the federal Endangered Species Act, CESA, Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and California Fish and Game Code. Implementation of MM BIO-1 will reduce these impacts to less than significant under CEQA.

Projects in Areas 1, 2, and 3 are not anticipated to affect special-status species and will not require related mitigation.

The Lead Agency finds that MM BIO-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to Biological Resources. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.2 - Impact BIO-2

Impact BIO-2: The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, page 3.3-46). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM BIO-1.

Facts in Support of Finding: Riparian habitat and sensitive natural communities may occur adjacent to Lytle Creek, the Santa Ana River, and unnamed drainages near Areas 4, 4A, 5, and 6. Construction activities in these areas could result in habitat disturbance or removal, which would be considered a significant impact under CEQA. Implementation of MM BIO-1 requires preparation of a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) to identify and mitigate potential impacts, including avoidance measures, permitting, and habitat restoration if necessary. These measures ensure impacts are

reduced to less than significant levels under CEQA (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-45 to 3.3-46).

The Lead Agency finds that MM BIO-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to riparian habitat and sensitive communities. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.3 - Impact BIO-3

Impact BIO-3: The proposed project could 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, and coastal wetlands) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, page 3.3-48). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM BIO-1.

Facts in Support of Finding: Jurisdictional waters and wetlands may occur adjacent to Lytle Creek, the Santa Ana River, and unnamed drainages near Areas 4, 4A, 5, and 6. Construction activities in these areas could result in direct removal or hydrological changes, which would be considered a significant impact under CEQA. Implementation of MM BIO-1 ensures identification of jurisdictional features and compliance with permitting requirements, as well as avoidance or mitigation measures such as habitat restoration or off-site mitigation if necessary. These measures reduce impacts to less than significant levels under CEQA (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-45 to 3.3-46).

The Lead Agency finds that MM BIO-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to wetlands and jurisdictional waters. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.4 - Impact BIO-4

Impact BIO-4: The proposed project could 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.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, page 3.3-52). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measure

Implement MM BIO-1 (Areas 4, 5, and 6); and

MM BIO-2 Nesting Bird Protection

MM BIO-2 shall be implemented as a condition of approval for all future development implemented in Areas 1, 2, and 3 consistent with the program 10/11 rezone.

Prior to the issuance of entitlements for projects implemented in Areas 1, 2, or 3, the project applicant or sponsor shall retain a qualified Biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds if project construction activities will be initiated during the avian nesting season (generally, raptor nesting season is January 1 through September 15; and passerine bird nesting season is February 1 through September 1). Pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5, to prevent impacts to birds and their nests by the proposed project, the pre-construction survey will be conducted no more than 3 days prior to commencement of project activities in all suitable areas including trees, shrubs, bare ground, buildings, burrows, cavities, and structures, at the appropriate time of day/night, during appropriate weather conditions to verify the absence of active nests. Pre-construction surveys should focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior (e.g., copulation, carrying of food or nest materials, nestbuilding, removal of fecal sacks, flushing suddenly from atypically close range, agitation, aggressive interactions, feigning injury or distraction displays, or other behaviors).

If an active nest is located during a pre-construction survey, the City shall be notified about the status of the nest and the qualified Biologist shall immediately establish a conservative buffer surrounding the nest, as indicated below. Construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the nest until it has been determined by a qualified Biologist that the juveniles have fledged or are independent of the nest.

Restrictions shall include the establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 100-foot radius around an active bird nest), or at a distance determined by the qualified Biologist that will prevent project-related disturbances. The buffer zone will be maintained around the active nest site(s) until the young have fledged and are foraging independently, as confirmed by the qualified Biologist.

Facts in Support of Finding: Portions of the Study Area contain or are adjacent to the Santa Ana River, Lytle Creek, and an unnamed tributary of the Santa Ana River, which could contain wildlife movement corridors (Exhibit 3.3-1). Additionally, trees, shrubs, ground surfaces, and built structures or surfaces throughout the Study Area could provide nesting habitat for bird species protected under the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code sections pertaining to the protection of nesting native or migratory birds and raptors. Therefore, future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA could result in impacts to wildlife movement corridors or nursery sites and has the potential to interfere with the movement of native resident migratory fish or wildlife species. Future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would comply with adopted State, federal, and local regulations for the protection of fish and wildlife movement corridors and wildlife nurseries, including protected nesting birds. Compliance with these goals, policies, programs, and State and federal requirements would reduce impacts; however, the potential for impacts to fish and wildlife movement corridors and nursery (nesting) sites remains potentially significant due to the need for project-specific general biological surveys to confirm wildlife movement corridors and nursery sites (including avian nests) within each site. Accordingly, prior to the issuance of grading permits for each project implemented within Area 4, 4A, 5, and 6, a qualified Biologist would conduct a site investigation and assessment to assess whether the proposed project would impact wildlife movement corridors and/or nursery sites present on-site during implementation of MM BIO-1. MM BIO-1 requires that a qualified Biologist prepare a BRA that shall include a project-specific analysis of potential impacts on sensitive and regulated biological resources, including impacts on special-status species and their habitat, migratory birds and other protected nesting birds, roosting bats, rare plants, sensitive communities and riparian habitats, protected waters and wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, and shall identify thresholds of significance with a significance conclusion and identify measures to reduce potential project impact(s) to less than significant level(s). Future development implemented in Areas 4, 4A, 5, and 6 shall be required to incorporate these measures into project design documents as conditions of approval. Therefore, future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would not result in significant adverse effects to wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife species to drop below self-sustaining levels, eliminate a plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a species and impacts would be less than significant.

In addition to MM BIO-1, prior to the issuance of grading permits for each project implemented within Areas 1, 1-A, 1-B, 2, and 3, the project applicant shall contract a qualified Biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds, as described in MM BIO-2. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-46 to 3.3-47 and 3.3-52).

The Lead Agency finds that MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to wildlife movement and nesting birds. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.5 - Cumulative Biological Resources Impact

Cumulative Biological Resources Impact

The proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact related to biological resources.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-46 to 3.3-47, 3.3-49, 3.3-52, 3.3-54; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-18). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measure

Implement MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2.

Facts In Support of Finding: The cumulative analysis considers development in Colton and surrounding jurisdictions that could affect biological resources, including special-status species, sensitive habitats, wetlands, and wildlife movement corridors. While cumulative projects may result in habitat loss or fragmentation, the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA is a policy-level action focused on infill development within an urbanized setting. Future development under the program must comply with State and federal regulations and implement adopted mitigation measures, including MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2, which require site-specific biological evaluations and protective measures prior to grading. These measures ensure identification and mitigation of potential impacts, reducing the project's contribution to cumulative biological resource impacts to less than significant levels (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-50 to 3.3-52).

The Lead Agency finds that MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to biological resources. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.6 - Impact CUL-2

Impact CUL-2: Development consistent with the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, page 3.4-32; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-20). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measure

MM CUL-2 Archaeological Resources Assessment. To determine the archaeological sensitivity for individual development projects within the City, an archaeological resources assessment shall be performed under the supervision of an Archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s (SOI) Professional Qualified Standards for their role. The assessment shall include a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) and a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The records searches shall determine if the proposed project has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. A Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in areas that are developed and undeveloped to locate any surface cultural materials.

If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified through an archaeological resources assessment, and impacts to these resources cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an Archaeologist who meets SOI Standards prior to any construction-related ground-disturbing activities to determine significance. If resources determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, a Phase III data recovery program shall be implemented by a qualified Archaeologist and performed in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation’s (OHP) Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR). The Archaeologist must then prepare an archaeological data recovery plan to be reviewed and approved by the Lead Agency prior to the excavation of resources.

If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources within the proposed project area but indicated the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, this shall be followed by monitoring of all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil by a qualified Archaeologist. The Archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in

conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities within 100 feet of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an Archaeologist who meets SOI Standards. If the discovery proves to be significant, the qualified Archaeologist shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency (City of Colton) on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but indicates the area to be of medium to low sensitivity for archaeological resources, an Archaeologist who meets the Professional Qualified Standards shall be retained on an on-call basis. The Archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities within 100 feet of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call Archaeologist is contacted. If the discovery proves to be significant, the qualified Archaeologist shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency (City of Colton) on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project site should be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA Guidelines. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency (City of Colton) approves the measures to protect these resources. The excavation, study, curation, and/or repatriation of archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be undertaken in close consultation with the Lead Agency (City of Colton) and representatives from consulting Native American Tribes, as appropriate. All Reports and DPR forms shall be submitted to the Lead Agency (City of Colton), the SCCIC, and the OHP, as required.

Facts In Support of Finding: The City of Colton contains significant archaeological resources, particularly near the Santa Ana River and other areas. While a comprehensive record search has not been completed, project-specific surveys have identified numerous sites. Despite prior disturbance, undiscovered archaeological resources may still exist within potential rezoning areas.

Development under the Housing Element Update could affect known or previously unidentified archaeological resources. The General Plan includes multiple policies (1.A, 1.B, 2.A, 2.B, 3.A, 3.B, 4.A, 4.B, and 5.A) aimed at conserving and reducing impacts, including identification and documentation of significant sites. Future development applications will be reviewed for compliance with these policies, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, and Mitigation Measure CUL-2. Compliance with federal, State, and local laws, General Plan policies, and MM CUL-2 will ensure appropriate review and design to avoid or minimize impacts. Individual projects will undergo site-specific environmental review, which may require additional measures. With these requirements, impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, page 3.4-32.)

The Lead Agency finds that MM CUL-2 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to cultural resources. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.7 - Impact CUL-3

Impact CUL-3: Development consistent with Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, page 3.4-35 to page 3.4-36; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-22). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measure

MM CUL-3 Discovery or Recognition of Any Human Remains.

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and Section 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of any future development project there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken.

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance within 100 feet of the remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine whether the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If

the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for appropriate treatment and disposition of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the MLD or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:
 - The NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission.
 - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.
 - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

Additionally, California Public Resources Code Section 15064.5 requires the following relative to Native American Remains:

When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood of, Native American Remains within a project site, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop a plan for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any items associated with Native American Burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC.

Facts in Support of Finding: Excavation and construction activities associated with Program 10/11 of the Housing Element Update could inadvertently uncover human remains, including Native American Remains, in areas outside formal burial sites. Such discoveries would constitute a potentially significant impact under CEQA. To address this, Mitigation Measure CUL-3, together with compliance with applicable State and local regulations, including Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, requires immediate cessation of work within 100 feet of the discovery and notification of the County Coroner to determine whether the remains are Native American. If Native American Remains are confirmed, the Coroner must notify the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC will identify the MLD to provide recommendations for appropriate treatment and disposition within 48 hours. If no recommendation is provided or accepted, the remains must be reburied with dignity on-site or as directed by law. These procedures ensure respectful treatment and legal compliance, reducing potential impacts to human remains to less than significant.

The Lead Agency finds that MM CUL-3 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to human remains. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.8 - Impact GEO-6

Impact GEO-6: Development consistent with the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, page 3.6-25 to page 3.6-26; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-25). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measure

MM GEO-1 Paleontological Resources Survey

A professional Paleontologist, approved by the City of Colton, shall conduct a site-specific paleontological resources survey on the potential sites for rezoning.

If any of the potential sites for rezoning are found to be underlain by any other soil with the potential to contain vertebrate fossils due to their high paleontological sensitivity for significant resources, applicants, owners and/or sponsors of all future development or construction projects shall be required to perform or provide paleontological monitoring, if recommended by the qualified Paleontologist. Should significant paleontological resources (e.g., bones, teeth, well-preserved plant elements) be unearthed by a future project construction crew, project activities shall be diverted at least 15 feet from the discovered paleontological resources until a professional Paleontologist has assessed such discovered resources and, if deemed significant, such resources shall be salvaged in a timely manner. The applicant/owner/sponsor of said project shall be responsible for diverting project work and providing the assessment including retaining a professional Paleontologist for such purpose. Collected fossils shall be deposited by the applicant/owner/sponsor in an appropriate repository (e.g., University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), California Academy of Sciences) where the collection shall be properly curated and made available for future research.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City of Colton is underlain by Quaternary Older Fan Deposits, which have the potential to contain vertebrate fossils. While shallow grading is unlikely to uncover paleontological resources, deeper excavation into older sediments could result in inadvertent discovery and disturbance of significant fossils. Construction and earthmoving activities associated with Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA therefore present a potentially significant impact on

paleontological resources. Compliance with applicable federal and State laws, including Public Resources Code Section 5097, would minimize impacts by requiring procedures for unexpected discoveries. In addition, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires a site-specific paleontological resources survey by a qualified Paleontologist prior to development. If a site is determined to have high paleontological sensitivity, monitoring during excavation will be required. Should significant fossils be unearthed, work must be diverted at least 15 feet from the discovery until assessment and salvage occur. Collected specimens will be curated in an appropriate repository for future research. Implementation of MM GEO-1 and compliance with applicable regulations would reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, page 3.6-25.)

The Lead Agency finds that MM GEO-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to paleontological resources. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.9 - Cumulative Geology, Soils, and Seismicity Impact

Cumulative Geology, Soils, and Seismicity Impact

The proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact related to geology.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, page 3.6-24 to page 3.6-27; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-26). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measure

Implement GEO-1

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential adverse environmental effects associated with seismic hazards, soil erosion, unstable geologic units, and expansive soils are generally site-specific and do not result in cumulative impacts. The Housing Element Update's contribution to cumulative impacts on geology and soils is not cumulatively considerable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-17 to 3.6-25).

However, the EIR identifies that paleontological resources could be inadvertently discovered during grading and excavation in areas underlain by Quaternary Older Fan Deposits (Draft Program EIR, page 3.6-25).

Compliance with Section 5097 of the Public Resources Code and implementation of MM GEO-1 would minimize potential impacts to paleontological resources directly and indirectly within the potential sites for rezoning (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, page 3.6-26). Cumulative impacts associated with paleontological resources are considered less than significant because other cumulative projects would similarly comply with State and local regulations and implement

mitigation measures where necessary. The Housing Element Update’s contribution to cumulative impacts on paleontological resources is not cumulatively considerable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-25 to 3.6-26).

The Lead Agency finds that MM GEO-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to cumulative paleontological resources. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.10 - Impact GHG-1

Impact GHG-1: The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-17 to 3.7-19; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-26). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

MM GHG-1a Implement GHG emission-reduction measures during construction.

The applicant and/or contractor associated with future development of sites within the proposed project area shall implement the following measures during construction and, where specified below, shall submit reports demonstrating compliance to the Planning Division for its review and approval:

- The applicant shall limit all equipment and delivery truck idling times by shutting down equipment when not in use and reducing the maximum idling time to less than 3 minutes. The applicant shall also install clear signage regarding the limitation on idling time at the delivery driveway and loading areas.
- The applicant shall verify that all construction equipment is maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. Prior to the commencement of construction activities using diesel-powered and/or gasoline-powered vehicles or equipment, the applicant shall verify that all vehicles and equipment have been checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to admittance into the delivery driveway and loading areas. The applicant shall submit a report by the certified mechanic of the condition of construction-related vehicles and equipment to the Planning Division.
- The applicant shall use electric equipment where available and feasible.
- The applicant shall implement the use of Tier 4 equipment where available and feasible.

MM GHG-1b Restrict use of natural gas in new development.

Future development of sites within the proposed project area shall be all electric, eliminating the use of any natural gas-fueled appliance or building feature.

MM GHG-1c Implement all-electric landscaping equipment.

All landscaping equipment (e.g., leaf blower) used for property management shall be electric-powered only. The property manager/facility owner shall provide documentation (e.g., purchase, rental, and/or services agreement) to the City's Planning Division to verify, to the City's satisfaction, that all landscaping equipment utilized will be electric-powered.

MM GHG-1d Require EV charging infrastructure that meets CALGreen Tier 2 voluntary requirements.

New residential buildings shall provide electric vehicle (EV) spaces as required by CALGreen Tier 2.

(Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, Table ES-1, pages ES-26; Section 3.7, pages 3.7-17 to 3.7-19).

Facts in Support of Finding: The Draft Program EIR identifies that construction and operation of future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from equipment use, vehicle trips, energy consumption, and landscaping activities. These emissions would incrementally contribute to global climate change, which is a cumulative impact by definition.

Implementation of MM GHG-1a through MM GHG-1d will reduce emissions during construction and operation by requiring idling restrictions, proper equipment maintenance, all-electric building design, electric landscaping equipment, and EV charging infrastructure. These measures align with State and local climate action strategies and ensure consistency with the City's Climate Action Plan and the 2022 Scoping Plan. With mitigation, the project's contribution to GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-17 to 3.7-19).

The Lead Agency finds that MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, and MM GHG-1d are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to GHG emissions. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.11 - Impact GHG-2

Impact GHG-2: The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-20 to 3.7-23; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-27). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM GHG-1d, MM TRANS-1a, and MM TRANS-1b.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project was evaluated for consistency with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, including the ARB’s 2022 Scoping Plan, the Connect SoCal 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), and the City of Colton Climate Action Plan (CAP). Connect SoCal 2024, adopted by SCAG on April 4, 2024, integrates transportation and land use strategies to achieve State GHG reduction goals while promoting housing production, equity, resilience, and efficient resource use. The proposed project is consistent with multiple goals and policies of Connect SoCal 2024 because it facilitates infill housing development in the downtown area of Colton, consistent with RHNA requirements, and promotes growth in areas with existing infrastructure and multimodal transportation options. This approach supports the development of walkable, transit-oriented communities and aligns with regional objectives to reduce VMT and create “15-minute communities” where residents can access daily needs within a short distance (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-20 to 3.7-21).

The project is also consistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan, which establishes a path to carbon neutrality by 2045 and prioritizes building decarbonization, VMT reduction, and transportation electrification. Implementation of MM GHG-1b requires all-electric building design, MM TRANS-1a and MM TRANS-1b reduce VMT through transportation demand management strategies and project-level analyses, and MM GHG-1d mandates CALGreen Tier 2 EV charging infrastructure. These measures ensure that the project supports the Scoping Plan’s priority areas and contributes to Statewide climate goals (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-21 to 3.7-22).

Finally, the project supports the City’s CAP, which includes strategies to reduce emissions from building energy, transportation, and off-road equipment. While many CAP measures apply jurisdiction-wide, the project implements MM GHG-1a through MM GHG-1d, which require construction-related GHG reduction measures, prohibit natural gas, mandate electric landscaping equipment, and provide EV charging infrastructure. These measures align with CAP objectives and assist the City in achieving its GHG reduction targets (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-22 to 3.7-23). With implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would be consistent with the City’s CAP, the regional RTP/SCS, and the State’s 2022 Scoping Plan, and therefore would not

conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

The Lead Agency finds that MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM GHG-1d, MM TRANS-1a, and MM TRANS-1b are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to GHG emissions and consistency with applicable plans. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-20 to 3.7-24).

1.6.12 - Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact

Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact

The proposed project would not have a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to greenhouse gas emissions.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-20 to 3.7-23; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-27). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM GHG-1d, MM TRANS-1a, and MM TRANS-1b.

Facts in Support of Finding: GHG emissions and climate change are inherently cumulative because they contribute to global atmospheric concentrations of GHGs. The Draft Program EIR explains that the proposed Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions or conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-17 to 3.7-24).

Construction and operational emissions from future development would incrementally contribute to global climate change; however, implementation of MM GHG-1a through MM GHG-1d would reduce emissions through construction-related GHG reduction measures, all-electric building design, electric landscaping equipment, and EV charging infrastructure. These measures, combined with compliance with Title 24, CALGreen, and other State regulations, ensure that the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-17 to 3.7-19).

Additionally, the project would not conflict with applicable GHG reduction plans, including the City's CAP, SCAG's Connect SoCal 2024 RTP/SCS, and ARB's 2022 Scoping Plan. With implementation of MM GHG-1a through MM GHG-1d and MM TRANS-1a and MM TRANS-1b, the project supports building

decarbonization, transportation electrification, and VMT reduction strategies identified in these plans. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to plan consistency (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.7, pages 3.7-20 to 3.7-24).

The Lead Agency finds that MM GHG-1a, MM GHG-1b, MM GHG-1c, MM GHG-1d, MM TRANS-1a, and MM TRANS-1b are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to GHG emissions and consistency with applicable plans. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to GHG emissions and plan consistency would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.13 - Impact NOI-1

Impact NOI-1: The proposed project could generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-14 to 3.12-18; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-30). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

MM NOI-1 Construction Noise Reduction Plan

Prior to issuance of construction permits for development projects associated with the City of Colton Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment, the following language shall be included, verbatim, in the general notes section of all the civil plan construction documents.

- The construction contractor shall ensure that all equipment driven by internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (i.e., idling in excess of 5 minutes) is prohibited.
- The construction contractor shall utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- At all times during project grading and construction, the construction contractor shall ensure that stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far as practicable from sensitive receptors and placed so that emitted noise is directed away from adjacent residences.

- The construction contractor shall ensure that the construction staging areas shall be located to create the greatest feasible distance between the staging area and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
- For construction activity that requires the use of heavy construction equipment within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, the construction contractor shall ensure that the operation of heavy construction equipment shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday.
- The construction contractor shall designate a “disturbance coordinator” who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., a bad muffler) and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.
 - For construction activity that requires the use of heavy construction equipment within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, the project applicant shall provide one of the following:
 - A temporary noise barrier shall be installed prior to the onset of construction activities that would require the use of heavy construction equipment. The barrier shall be located between the construction zone and all adjacent sensitive receptor land uses. The temporary sound barrier shall provide a reduction in noise that shall meet the City’s construction noise threshold of 55 A-weighted decibels (dBA) maximum noise level (Lmax) as measured at the façade of the sensitive receptor land uses. The noise barrier shall be a minimum height of 8 feet and be free of gaps and holes and must achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater. The barrier can be either (a) a 0.75-inch-thick plywood wall or (b) a hanging blanket/curtain with a surface density of at least 2 pounds per square foot. For either configuration, the construction side of the barrier shall have an exterior lining of sound absorption material with a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating of 0.7 or higher.
 - A site-specific construction-related groundborne vibration impact assessment shall be conducted by a qualified Technical Specialist that demonstrates that proposed construction activities, along with any applicable project design features, would not result in an exceedance of an exterior threshold of 80 dBA 8-hour equivalent sound level (Leq(8hr)) at residential land uses, or of 85 dBA Leq(8hr) at commercial land uses, and of 90 dBA Leq(8hr) at industrial land uses. Upon approval by the City, any identified construction noise reduction measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents.

Compliance with this measure would ensure that potential construction-related noise impacts associated with development that would occur under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be reduced to less than significant.

MM NOI-2 Stationary Source Noise Impact Reduction Measure

Prior to issuance for entitlements for a project, for any development project on potential sites for housing that would include any noise-producing mechanical systems located within 10 feet of a receiving property line, the project applicant shall retain a Noise Specialist to conduct a site-specific project-level noise analysis to evaluate compliance with Section 18.42.040 of the Municipal Code, which prohibits noise levels in excess of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) equivalent sound level (Leq(h)) when measured at the property line of the parcel generating the noise. If the analysis identifies that proposed mechanical system operations could result in an exceedance of the City's noise performance standards, then specific measures to attenuate the noise impact shall be identified. The analysis shall be submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. The final noise reduction measures shall be included on all final construction and building documents and/or construction management plans and submitted for verification to the City. Specific measures may include, but are not limited to, the following measures or design features:

- The project applicant shall utilize quieter mechanical systems that would not result in an exceedance of the City's operational noise standards.
- The project applicant shall enclose mechanical systems in a sound-attenuating structure or shall install sound barriers adjacent to the proposed system that would reduce operational noise levels to not exceed the City's noise performance standards as measured at a receiving property plane.

Compliance with this measure would ensure that potential stationary source noise impacts associated with development that would occur under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be reduced to less than significant.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City of Colton does not set numeric thresholds for construction noise; therefore, the analysis uses Federal Transit Administration guidelines, which identify 80 dBA Leq(8hr) for residential land uses, 85 dBA Leq(8hr) for commercial land uses, and 90 dBA Leq(8hr) for industrial land uses. Construction noise would vary by phase, with the site preparation phase generating the highest levels due to heavy earthmoving equipment such as bulldozers, graders, and scrapers. Worst-case combined noise levels during site preparation could reach 86 dBA Leq at 50 feet, exceeding the threshold for residential receptors. Short-term traffic noise from construction trips would not double traffic volumes and therefore would not cause a perceptible increase in roadway noise. Without mitigation, temporary construction noise could cause annoyance or sleep disturbance at nearby sensitive receptors. Operational noise impacts from future development would be less than significant. Project-related traffic would not double existing volumes; the largest increase would be about 9 percent in ADT, resulting in less than a 1 dBA increase, which is well below the 3 dBA threshold for significance. Mechanical equipment such as HVAC systems could exceed the City's 65 dBA Leq(h) standard if placed within 6 feet of a property line, but compliance with General Plan policies and mitigation would ensure impacts remain less than significant.

Construction noise impacts are potentially significant before mitigation; however, implementation of MM NOI-1, which includes mufflers, idling restrictions, quieter equipment, staging area placement, time-of-day limits, and temporary noise barriers, would reduce impacts to less than significant. Operational noise impacts from traffic and stationary sources would also be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-15 to 3.12-20).

The Lead Agency finds that MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2 are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to noise. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts related to noise would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.14 - Impact NOI-2

Impact NOI-1: The proposed project could result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-21 to 3.12-23; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-33). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

MM NOI-3 Construction Vibration Reduction Plan

- Prior to the issuance of entitlements for any future development projects that would necessitate the use of any of the following equipment operation conditions, the project sponsor shall retain a Noise Specialist to prepare a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan for submittal to City staff for review and approval that identifies specific techniques (such as the depth and location of temporary trenching) that would reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure. Upon approval by the City, the construction vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents. A note shall be provided on grading and building plans indicating that, during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement these measures to limit construction-related vibration impacts.
- Precipitating equipment operation conditions include:
 - Operation of pile-driving within 55 feet of an off-site structure.
 - Operation of large vibratory rollers within 26 feet of an off-site structure.
 - Operation of any heavy construction equipment within 15 feet of an off-site structure (such equipment includes, but it not limited to, bulldozers, hoe rams, caisson drilling, loaded trucks, or similar, that have reference vibration levels

greater than 0.07 inches per second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25-feet).

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project could result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The City of Colton does not have adopted vibration standards; therefore, the analysis uses Federal Transit Administration (FTA) vibration impact criteria. Construction activities associated with future development under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA could generate groundborne vibration that may affect nearby structures and occupants. Of the equipment typically used during construction, impact pile drivers produce the highest vibration levels, up to 0.644 inch per second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet. This exceeds the FTA damage threshold of 0.2 in/sec PPV for nonengineered timber and masonry structures. Other equipment, such as large vibratory rollers and bulldozers, also generate vibration levels that could exceed thresholds if operated very close to structures. However, vibration levels attenuate with distance; for example, at 55 feet, vibration from an impact pile driver would decrease to 0.19 in/sec PPV, below the threshold. To ensure vibration impacts remain less than significant, MM NOI-3 requires preparation of a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan for any development project involving high-vibration equipment near sensitive receptors. This plan would identify techniques such as alternate equipment, adequate setbacks, or temporary trenches to reduce vibration levels. Operational vibration impacts would be less than significant because residential and mixed-use development would not introduce permanent vibration sources. With implementation of MM NOI-3, construction-related vibration impacts would be reduced to less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-22 to 3.12-24).

The Lead Agency finds that MM NOI-3 is feasible, is adopted, and will further reduce impacts related to noise. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts related to noise would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.15 - Cumulative Noise Impact

Cumulative Noise Impact

The proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact related to noise.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-21 to 3.12-26; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-34). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM NOI-1, MM NOI-2, and MM NOI-3

Facts in Support of Finding: Cumulative noise impacts consider the combined effect of the proposed project and other reasonably foreseeable development in the City of Colton and surrounding areas. Cumulative construction noise would be temporary and localized, and while individual projects could generate high noise levels, these activities would occur at different times and locations. With implementation of MM NOI-1 and similar measures by other projects, cumulative construction noise impacts would be less than significant. Cumulative operational noise impacts from traffic would also be less than significant because the project’s contribution to area-wide traffic noise would be minimal (less than 1 dBA increase), and overall cumulative traffic growth would not cause substantial exceedances of applicable standards (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-25 to 3.12-26).

Cumulative vibration impacts would be less than significant because vibration from construction equipment attenuates rapidly with distance, and simultaneous use of high-vibration equipment by multiple projects in close proximity is unlikely. Implementation of MM NOI-3 and similar measures would ensure that vibration levels remain below thresholds for structural damage and human annoyance (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, page 3.12-26).

Additionally, because the project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and no other cumulative projects would alter this condition, there would be no related cumulative impacts. Therefore, cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated where applicable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.12, pages 3.12-25 to 3.12-26).

The Lead Agency finds that MM NOI-1, MM NOI-2, and MM NOI-3 are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce cumulative impacts related to noise. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to noise would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.16 - Impact TRANS-2

Impact TRANS-2: **The proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).**

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, pages 3.16-34 to 3.16-38; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-36). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

MM TRANS-1a VMT Reduction Strategies

As required by the City Guidelines, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies would be considered for the purpose of reducing potentially significant Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) impacts. California Air Pollution Control Officers

Association (CAPCOA) has published an update to their VMT reduction measure guidance titled Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity (CAPCOA 2024) (Handbook). Consistent with VMT reduction measures described within the Handbook, the following are applicable to future development pursuant to the proposed project:

- Provide pedestrian and bicycle network improvements within the development connecting to existing off-site facilities.
- Where applicable, ensure design of key intersections and roadways to encourage the use of walking, biking, and transit.
- Collaborate with the local transit agencies to determine the feasibility of providing new or re-routing existing transit services to the area.

MM TRANS-1b VMT Analyses

Each individual project shall undergo a project-level VMT analysis to assess potential transportation impacts. If significant VMT impacts are identified, appropriate mitigation measures will be required to reduce these impacts in accordance with City Guidelines, which specify the 15 percent below baseline conditions.

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), which requires evaluation of transportation impacts based on VMT rather than Level of Service. Because the project is a land use plan, it does not qualify for VMT screening criteria; therefore, a full VMT analysis was conducted using the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM), version 3.2. VMT was calculated using the Production/Attraction method, which sums weekday home-based trips generated within the study area. The City's existing VMT per capita is 15.2, and the City's threshold for significance is 13.0 VMT per capita (15 percent below baseline). The proposed project would add approximately 2,279 households and 8,633 residents across multiple Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs). As shown in Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, Table 3.16-5, several TAZs would exceed the City's VMT threshold, with values ranging from 13.7 to 15.6 VMT per capita, while others would remain below the threshold. Overall, the project's addition to baseline conditions exceeds the City's adopted VMT impact threshold, resulting in a potentially significant impact before mitigation. To address this, MM TRANS-1a requires implementation of TDM strategies such as pedestrian and bicycle network improvements, intersection design to encourage walking and transit use, and coordination with transit agencies to provide or reroute services. MM TRANS-1b requires each future development project to prepare a project-level VMT analysis and apply additional mitigation if necessary. With implementation of these measures, VMT per capita would be reduced to below the City's threshold, and impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, the project establishes a framework for future growth rather than specific development; therefore, individual projects will undergo VMT analysis and mitigation as needed. The analysis also notes that Citywide VMT per capita would decrease from 15.2 to 14.9 with the project, indicating improved efficiency. Therefore, with

mitigation, the project would not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and impacts would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, pages 3.16-34 to 3.16-38).

The Lead Agency finds that MM TRANS-1a and MM TRANS-1b are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce traffic impacts. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts related to traffic would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.17 - Cumulative Traffic Impact

Cumulative Traffic Impact

The proposed project would not result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact related to transportation.

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, pages 3.16-33 to 3.16-43; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-37). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM TRANS-1a and MM TRANS-1b.

Facts in Support of Finding: The cumulative transportation analysis evaluates whether the proposed project, in combination with other foreseeable development, would result in significant cumulative impacts. The Program 10/11 Housing Element Update Rezone/GPA does not propose site-specific development but facilitates residential growth already anticipated under the General Plan. As such, cumulative transportation impacts have been previously evaluated in conjunction with the approval of the General Plan, which considered long-range development assumptions and are less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, pages 3.16-33 to 3.16-34). Additionally, the proposed project's contributions would not be cumulatively considerable.

With respect to a potential cumulative conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)), cumulative VMT would increase as a result of regional growth. Any cumulative projects in the City may generate additional VMT, which would be added to the roadway network within the geographic context and could increase the VMT impact to levels that could exceed the City's VMT thresholds. However, all cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local policies and ordinances and General Plan and Specific Plan programs and policies that address VMT, as well as mitigate impacts related to VMT, such as with MM TRANS-1a. However, the application of mitigation measures to individual future cumulative projects is too speculative to evaluate; as such, cumulative impacts to VMT would potentially significant. However, as demonstrated in the Draft Program EIR, the project includes mitigation measures to reduce VMT and improve transportation efficiency. Citywide VMT per capita would

decrease slightly with the project, and future projects would undergo VMT analysis and mitigation as needed. With mitigation, the proposed project would meet the City’s VMT threshold with implementation of TDM reduction strategies or other project-level mitigation, resulting in less than significant impacts. Accordingly, the proposed project would not exceed existing baseline conditions of the City’s adopted VMT impact threshold with VMT reduction strategies. CEQA requires that both a cumulative condition be present and that the project’s incremental contribution be considerable to make a finding of significance. Therefore, the City appropriately finds that potential cumulative impacts are less than significant because the proposed project’s incremental contribution to cumulative VMT impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of MM TRANS-1a and MM TRANS-1b (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, pages 3.16-39 to 3.16-40).

Cumulative development could introduce new access points and roadway modifications, but all projects are required to comply with City design standards and safety requirements. The proposed project does not include specific roadway designs and will be subject to review during future development approvals. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to hazards would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, page 3.16-40).

Cumulative development would increase demand on the roadway network, but emergency access would continue to be governed by City standards and Fire Department requirements. The project does not propose changes that would impede emergency response or evacuation routes. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, page 3.16-40).

In summary, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potential traffic impact and cumulative transportation impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated where applicable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.16, pages 3.16-39 to 3.16-40).

The Lead Agency finds that MM TRANS-1a and MM TRANS-1b are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce cumulative traffic impacts. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to traffic would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.18 - Impact TCR-1

Impact TCR-1: Development consistent with the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.17, pages 3.17-15 to 3.17-16; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-37). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project

which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM CUL-2 and MM CUL-3.

Facts in Support of Finding: On August 28, 2024, the City requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the NAHC for the Housing Element Update area, and on August 30, 2024, the NAHC confirmed that the SLF was negative for known Native American cultural resources. The NAHC provided a list of Tribal representatives for consultation; however, subsurface excavation could still encounter previously undiscovered TCRs that may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). While the proposed project does not directly affect recorded TCRs, future development under Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA could impact unknown resources, creating a potentially significant impact. The General Plan includes policies requiring meaningful AB 52 and SB 18 consultation and identification and conservation of TCRs. Compliance with these policies, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, State and federal laws, and implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 and CUL-3 will ensure appropriate review and treatment of any discovered resources, reducing potential impacts to TCRs to less than significant.

The Lead Agency finds that MM CUL-2 and MM CUL-3 are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts to TCRs. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts related to TCRs would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.6.19 - Impact TCR-2

Impact TCR-2: **Development consistent with the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1.**

Finding: Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.17, pages 3.17-17 to 3.17-18; Executive Summary, Table ES-1, page ES-37). Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM CUL-2 and MM CUL-3.

Facts in Support of Finding: On May 19, 2022, in compliance with AB 52 and SB 18, the City notified Tribal representatives of the proposed Housing Element Update and invited consultation. Responses

were received from the Yurok Serrano Morongo Nation (YSMN), Fort Yuma Quechan Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. The YSMN confirmed the site is within Serrano ancestral territory but expressed no conflict with the proposed zoning changes, noting that future projects may warrant additional consultation. The other Tribes indicated no concerns and deferred to local Tribes. On August 28, 2024, an SLF search was requested from the NAHC, and on August 30, 2024, the NAHC confirmed no known sacred sites within the project area, while providing a list of Tribal contacts for further consultation. At this time, no TCRs meeting the criteria of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 have been identified; however, future development could encounter previously undiscovered TCRs. Compliance with General Plan policies, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, State and federal requirements, and implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-2 and CUL-3 will ensure appropriate consultation and treatment of any discovered resources, reducing potential impacts to TCRs to less than significant.

The Lead Agency finds that MM CUL-2 and MM CUL-3 are feasible, are adopted, and will further reduce impacts to TCRs. Accordingly, the Lead Agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impacts as identified in the EIR. Therefore, impacts related to TCRs would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1.7 - Impacts Identified in the EIR as Being Significant and Unavoidable Even After the Incorporation of All Feasible Mitigation Measures

The Lead Agency hereby finds that, despite the incorporation of mitigation measures outlined in the EIR and the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), the following impacts from the proposed project and related approvals cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is therefore included herein.

1.7.1 - Impact AIR-2

Impact AIR-2: The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-12; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-24 to 3.2-29).

Mitigation Measures

MM AIR-2a Implement measures to reduce construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions.

Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial projects proposed in the areas defined by the proposed project, the applicant shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans or construction drawings) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Building and Safety Division. While specific mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce construction-related emissions would be determined during project-level analysis, potential mitigation could include, but is not limited to:

- Requiring fugitive dust control measures that exceed South Coast AQMD's Rule 403, such as:
 - Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.
 - Applying water every 3 hours to active soil-disturbing activities.
 - Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.
- Using construction equipment rated by EPA as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower.
- Ensuring that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards.
- Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutes
- Limiting on-site vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- Installing wheel washers for all exiting trucks or washing all trucks and equipment leaving the project area.
- Using super-compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible.

MM AIR-2b Implement measures to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions during operation

Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial projects proposed in the areas defined by the proposed project, applicants shall prepare and submit a technical

assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD adopted thresholds of significance, the Planning Division shall require incorporation of mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities, to be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Providing truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with ARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations Chapter 10 § 2485).
- Providing changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).
- Providing bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen.
- Providing preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of CALGreen (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). Encouraging facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen.
- Providing appliances shall be Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star-certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check.
- Equipping landscaped common areas with electrical outlets to enable use of electric landscaping equipment to the extent feasible.

Facts in Support of Findings: Impact AIR-2 addresses whether the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment. The analysis finds that both construction and operation of new residential and nonresidential development under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would generate emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Construction emissions would come from equipment exhaust, vehicle trips, and activities like grading and paving, while operational emissions would result from area sources, energy use, and increased vehicle trips. Modeling shows that, at full buildout, emissions of ROG, NOx, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would exceed South Coast AQMD's daily significance thresholds. Although mitigation measures (MM AIR-2a for construction and MM AIR-2b for operation) are required to reduce emissions through best practices and project design features, these measures are not sufficient to guarantee emissions would fall below significance thresholds. As a result, both construction and operational

emissions would remain significant and unavoidable, and the project would contribute to regional air quality impacts until attainment standards are met (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-24 to 3.2-27).

The Lead Agency finds MM AIR-2a and MM AIR-2b are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated.

1.7.2 - Impact AIR-3

Impact AIR-3: The proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-14; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-30 to 3.2-33).

Mitigation Measures

MM AIR-3 Health Risk Assessment

Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Colton, project applicants for new development projects that (1) have the potential to generate emissions of toxic air contaminants (TAC)s and/or diesel particle matter (DPM) emissions during construction or operation, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes) as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD). If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or non-cancer hazard index exceed the respective thresholds, as established by the South Coast AQMD at the time a project is considered, the project applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACT), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.

Facts in Support of Finding: Impact AIR-3 analyzes whether the proposed project would expose sensitive receptors—such as residents, schools, hospitals, and recreational users—to substantial localized air pollutant concentrations during construction and operation. The analysis finds that, because the timing and intensity of future development is uncertain and some projects may occur close to sensitive receptors, there is potential for construction equipment exhaust and fugitive dust to exceed South Coast AQMD’s Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs), even with implementation of mitigation measure MM AQ-2a (requiring best practices to reduce construction emissions). Similarly, operational emissions from stationary sources (like natural gas combustion) could also exceed LSTs despite MM AQ-2b (requiring operational emission controls). For projects with potential to generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) or diesel particulate matter (DPM), MM AQ-3 requires a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) and use of best available control technologies if risks exceed thresholds. However, due to the programmatic nature of the EIR and uncertainty about specific future uses, the City conservatively concludes that significant and unavoidable impacts to sensitive receptors could occur during both construction and operation, even with mitigation. The analysis also finds that carbon monoxide (CO) “hot spots” are not expected, as local traffic volumes are well below levels of concern, and that asbestos risks from demolition would be less than significant with compliance to South Coast AQMD Rule 1403 (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-30 to 3.2-33).

The Lead Agency finds MM AIR-3 is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated.

1.7.3 - Cumulative Air Quality Impact

Cumulative Air Quality Impact

The proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-15; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-23 to 3.2-36).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM AIR-2a, MM AIR-2b, and MM AIR-3

Facts in Support of Finding: The cumulative impact analysis for Impacts AIR-1, AIR-2, AIR-3, and AIR-4 (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-23 to 3.2-36) finds that the proposed project, together with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region, would contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts. The South Coast Air Basin is already in nonattainment for ozone and particulate matter, and cumulative emissions from construction and operation of new

development—including those facilitated by the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA—would exceed South Coast AQMD’s significance thresholds for criteria pollutants (ROG, NOx, CO, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}). Even with implementation of mitigation measures, these emissions cannot be reduced below significance thresholds, so cumulative impacts for AIR-1 (consistency with air quality plans), AIR-2 (criteria pollutant increases), and AIR-3 (exposure of sensitive receptors) are considered significant and unavoidable. For AIR-4 (odors and other emissions), cumulative impacts are less than significant because the types of land uses proposed are not expected to generate objectionable odors, and any odor impacts would be localized and temporary. Overall, the project’s incremental contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considerable for criteria pollutants and sensitive receptor exposure, but not for odors (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.2, pages 3.2-23 to 3.2-36).

The Lead Agency finds MM AIR-2a, MM AIR-2b and MM AIR-3 are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated.

1.7.4 - Impact CUL-1

Impact CUL-1: Development consistent with the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-18; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, pages 3.4-28 to 3.4-29).

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-1 Project-specific Environmental Review Individual development projects which propose to alter a building or structure greater than 45 years of age at the time an application is submitted would be required to undergo project-specific environmental review, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, in order for the City to determine whether the building or structure may be a historic resource and take appropriate action such as requiring additional site-specific or project-specific measures to reduce any potential impacts. These measures are, but not limited to the following:

Prior to project development that may affect historical resources (i.e., structures 45 years or older), a historical resources assessment shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professionally Qualified Standards in architectural history or history. This shall include a records search to determine whether any resources that may be

potentially affected by the project have been previously recorded, evaluated, and/or designated in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), or a local register. Following the records search, the qualified architectural historian shall conduct a survey in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) guidelines to identify any previously unrecorded potential historical resources that may be potentially affected by the proposed project. The criteria for determining a historically significant building or structure shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, regional, or national history; or
2. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in local, regional, or national history; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a significant architectural style, property type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder who is locally, regionally, nationally significant, or it is a significant visual feature of the City; possess high artistic values, represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Properties identified as historically significant resources, shall contain proper documentation meeting the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Guidelines that shall be prepared and implemented, as approved by the qualified historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. Such documentation shall include drawings, photographs, and written data for each building/structure/element, and provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program, recovery, rehabilitation, redesign, relocation, and/or in situ preservation plan. To ensure that projects requiring the relocation, rehabilitation, or alternation of a historical resource do not impact the resource's significance, the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent possible. The application of the standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Professional Qualified Standards. Prior to any construction activities that may affect the historical resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character-defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City of Colton for review and approval.

If a proposed project would result in the demolition or significant alteration of historical resource, such demolition cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, recordation of the resource prior to construction activities will assist in reducing adverse impacts to the resource to the greatest extent possible. Recordation shall take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic

American Engineering Record, or Historic American Landscape Survey documentation and shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Professional Qualified Standards. Documentation shall include an architectural and historical narrative; medium- or large-format black and white photographs, negatives, and prints; and supplementary information such as building plans and elevations, and/or historical photographs. Documentation shall be reproduced on archival paper and placed in appropriate local, State, or federal institutions. The specific scope and details of documentation are to be developed in coordination with the City of Colton.

Facts in Support of Finding: Development under the Program 10/11 Housing Element Update could result in a substantial adverse change to historical resources, as defined by CEQA, if existing homes or businesses that may be historic are demolished, altered, or relocated. While the General Plan and Historic Preservation Ordinance include robust policies and procedures for identifying, documenting, and protecting historic resources, and all projects affecting structures over 45 years old must undergo project-specific environmental review, there remains the potential for significant and unavoidable impacts if a historic resource is ultimately demolished. As the City receives development applications for subsequent development under the Program 10/11 of the Housing Element Update, those applications will be reviewed by the City for compliance with the goals and policies of the General Plan related to the protection of historical resources. However, to achieve and implement the stated policies and goals outlined in the General Plan, the following mitigation measures with regards to the historic built environment would apply. These measures are intended to minimize adverse effects to the extent feasible. However, due to the potential limitations of mitigation in fully offsetting impacts for certain individual projects, and in accordance with CEQA standards, such impacts may remain significant and unavoidable. Even with implementation of mitigation measures and adherence to City policies, some impacts to historic resources may not be fully avoidable, and the City conservatively concludes that future development could eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory or otherwise materially impair the significance of designated or eligible historic resources (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, pages 3.4-28 to 3.4-29).

The Lead Agency finds MM CUL-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated.

1.7.5 - Cumulative Cultural Impact

Cumulative Cultural Impact

Development consistent with the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of

employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-24; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, pages 3.4-30 to 3.4-32).

Mitigation Measures

Implement MM CUL-1.

Facts in Support of Finding: As the City receives development applications for subsequent development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA, those applications would be reviewed by the City for compliance with the policies of the General Plan, the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance, and other relevant federal, State, and local regulations that protect historical resources, including Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and Sections 5024.1 and 5097 of the Public Resources Code. However, in the event that an individual development project proposed to demolish a property determined to be a historic resource, this would result in a significant and unavoidable impact that could not be mitigated. For these reasons, the City has conservatively concluded that the proposed project’s incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, pages 3.4-30 to 3.4-32.)

For archaeological resources, the cumulative analysis notes that cumulative development could affect known or previously unidentified archaeological sites. Nevertheless, all projects must adhere to CEQA and Public Resources Code requirements for identification, evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to archaeological resources. This includes project-level analysis and consultation, which help ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant and that the proposed project’s contribution is not cumulatively considerable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, page 3.4-34 to 3.4-35).

Regarding human remains, the cumulative analysis explains that construction activities across multiple projects could encounter previously undiscovered human remains. Although the Housing Element Update is designed to encourage and facilitate new housing construction within the City, the Housing Element Update does not propose any specific development projects and therefore would not approve any construction and would not have any direct contribution to any cumulative impacts. Moreover, compliance with federal and State laws, including Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097, requires appropriate procedures for discovery, notification, and treatment of human remains. These requirements ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant and that the project’s incremental contribution is not cumulatively considerable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.4, page 3.4-37).

The Lead Agency finds MM CUL-1 is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce impacts to the greatest extent feasible. However, impacts would still remain significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated.

1.7.6 - Impact PUB-4

Impact PUB-4: The proposed project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, no feasible mitigation is available. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-35; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, pages 3.14-15 to 3.14-17).

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: Future development projects that occur on the sites proposed for rezoning would be required to provide open space or recreational facilities or pay in lieu fees. However, because of the limited size of the parcels, the provision of open space and recreational facilities on these parcels would not be sufficient to alleviate the City's ongoing shortage of parkland. As such, no feasible mitigation is available, and the proposed project's impact on park facilities would be significant and unavoidable. As the City receives development applications for subsequent development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA, those applications would be reviewed by the City for compliance with the policies and program of the General Plan to ensure that parks and recreational facilities are adequate to serve the City's population. In addition, development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be required to pay the capital facilities fee in accordance with the Municipal Code. However, because the City is in an ongoing deficit for parkland, any population increase in the City would exacerbate the existing deficit. Therefore, future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to the provision of parkland consistent with the City's acreage goals. (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, pages 3.14-15 to 3.14-17.)

The Lead Agency did not identify any feasible mitigation applicable to the proposed project and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

1.7.7 - Cumulative Parkland Impact

Cumulative Cultural Impact

The proposed project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in

order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks.

Finding: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(1)). However, no feasible mitigation is available. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measure or project alternatives identified in the EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a)(3); Draft Program EIR, Executive Summary, page ES-35; Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, page 3.14-18).

Mitigation Measures

No feasible mitigation.

Facts in Support of Finding: The City of Colton currently has a significant parkland deficit, providing only about 0.92 acre per 1,000 residents compared to its goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. Although new development, including that facilitated by the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA, is required to pay development impact fees and there are plans for new and renovated parks (such as the proposed 42-acre Colton Habitat Park), these measures are not sufficient to address the existing and projected shortfall. The cumulative effect of population growth from the proposed project and other development would further increase demand on already limited park resources, potentially leading to deterioration of existing parks or the need for new park construction, which could have additional environmental impacts. Because payment of fees does not guarantee new parkland will be provided or that the deficit will be resolved, and because the size of new development parcels limits the ability to provide adequate open space, the cumulative impact on park facilities is considered significant and unavoidable (Draft Program EIR, Section 3.14, pages 3.14-15 to 3.14-18).

The Lead Agency did not identify any feasible mitigation applicable to the proposed project and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

1.8 - Findings Regarding Alternatives

1.8.1 - Introduction

This section presents findings regarding the following alternatives to the proposed project evaluated in the Draft Program EIR:

- **Alternative 1—No Project Alternative:** Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not occur, and no updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, or Zoning Ordinance would be proposed.
- **Alternative 2—Reduced Density Alternative:** Under the Reduced Density Alternative, the same parcels identified for rezoning would be rezoned but at reduced densities as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would reduce the overall housing units that could be accommodated by approximately 497 units while still allowing the City to meet its RHNA.

Updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, and Zoning Ordinance would still be required for the Reduced Density Alternative, the same as for the proposed project.

- **Alternative 3—Inclusionary Park Space Alternative:** Under the Inclusionary Park Space Alternative, all development sites greater than 1 acre in size would be required to include space such as a tot lot, playground, courtyard, or plaza. Recreational space shall be included at a minimum of 10 percent of gross square footage of the individual project. This alternative would require updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, and Zoning Ordinance, similar to the proposed project.
- **Alternative 4—Increased Park Space Alternative:** This alternative would rezone some of the vacant parcels identified for rezone under the proposed project to allow for parks or other recreational space instead of housing. This alternative would include sufficient housing unit potential calculated at a reasonable potential yield to meet the City’s RHNA but would result in a reduction in the total number of dwelling units on the identified parcels. This alternative would require updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, and Zoning Ordinance similar to the proposed project.
- **Alternative 5—Increased Density Alternative:** The proposed project has calculated buildout of 1,953 dwelling units utilizing a reasonable yield ratio of 60 percent residential per site, as described in Chapter 2, Project Description. This alternative would allow the City to permit development on the identified parcels to be rezoned at a reasonable yield ratio of 70 percent residential per site (2,079 dwelling units compared to 1,953 units for the proposed project) and would increase the surplus of dwelling units needed to meet the City’s RHNA. This alternative would require updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, and Zoning Ordinance, similar to the proposed project.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, the EIR contained a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the proposed project. The primary purpose of this analysis is to provide decision-makers and interested agencies, organizations and individuals with information about a reasonable range of potentially feasible project alternatives, which could avoid or reduce any of the project’s significant adverse environmental effects. Important considerations for this alternatives analyses are noted below:

- An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- An EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process;
- Reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
 - Failure to meet most of the basic project objectives identified in Section 1.3.2, above;
 - Infeasibility; and
 - Inability to avoid significant environmental effects.

CEQA does not require that an analysis of alternate sites always be included in an EIR. “[A]n EIR is not ordinarily an occasion for the reconsideration or overhaul of fundamental land use policy”

(*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* [1990] 52 Cal.3d 553, 573). Since the proposed project consists of rezoning of certain parcels within City limits and proposes General Plan Land Use Element and Zoning Ordinance text amendments to provide consistency, the proposed project would achieve consistency with the General Plan’s regional land use policies. The parcels selected for rezoning were carefully chosen for feasibility and land use compatibility aimed at allowing the City to comply with the RHNA. Alternative locations would not reduce the significant impacts of the proposed project. Thus, an alternative location was rejected from further consideration as infeasible.

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Under this alternative, the proposed Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment would not occur. No updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, or Zoning Ordinance would be implemented (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-7).

The primary objective of the proposed project is to rezone parcels to provide sufficient capacity to meet the City’s RHNA allocation of 5,434 units for the 2021–2029 planning period. The No Project Alternative would retain existing zoning and land use designations, which the Housing Element analysis determined are inadequate to meet RHNA requirements (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-7 and 6-13). The proposed project seeks to encourage infill development and efficient development patterns by rezoning underutilized and vacant parcels. Under Alternative 1, and without rezoning, these opportunities would not be realized, and the City would continue to face constraints on housing development (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, pages 1-31 and Chapter 6, page 6-13). The Housing Element requires zoning that supports a variety of housing types, including affordable housing. Under Alternative 1, existing zoning does not allow the densities necessary to accommodate lower-income housing (30 du/acre minimum). Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet State law requirements or the City’s goal to provide housing for all income levels (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, pages 1-31 to 1-32 and Chapter 6, page 6-13). Additionally, one of the City’s objectives is to reduce or remove constraints to housing development. Without rezoning and General Plan amendments, existing regulatory barriers remain, preventing the City from implementing best practices and facilitating streamlined housing approvals (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 1, page 1-32 and Chapter 6, page 6-13). Accordingly, Alternative 1 is rejected.

Alternative 2: Reduced Density Alternative

Under Alternative 2, the same parcels identified for rezoning under the proposed project would still be rezoned, but at reduced residential densities. This would lower the potential number of dwelling units compared to the proposed project, while still exceeding the City’s RHNA requirement.

The proposed project, in combination with other programs and projects in the City, would result in a RHNA surplus of 1,500 units. This alternative would result in a RHNA surplus of only approximately 497 units. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-14). The purpose of this alternative was to address impacts associated with increased growth, such as air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation. While some impacts would be slightly reduced (e.g., aesthetics, air quality, noise, utilities), the overall environmental footprint and site disturbance would remain similar because development would still occur on the same parcels. However, significant unavoidable impacts, such as those related to air quality (regional emissions and Air Quality Management Plan [AQMP] consistency) and

cultural resources, would not be avoided or reduced to less than significant levels (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-14 to 6-20).

Although Alternative 2 would meet most project objectives, it would not meet them as efficiently or to the same extent as the proposed project. While RHNA compliance would still be achieved, the surplus of units would be much smaller (497 vs. 1,500 units), limiting flexibility to accommodate future housing demand and market shifts (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-14). Lower densities reduce opportunities for diverse housing types and efficient land use patterns (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-18). Air quality impacts remain significant and unavoidable due to regional emissions and AQMP inconsistency, even with reduced density (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-15 to 6-16). Cultural resource impacts also remain significant and unavoidable (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-15). The alternative does not maximize housing opportunities, which is a key goal of the Housing Element Update (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-20). Accordingly, because Alternative 2 does not achieve project objectives to the same degree as the proposed project and does not reduce significant unavoidable impacts to less than significant levels, it is considered undesirable under CEQA and rejected (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-20).

Alternative 3: Inclusionary Park Space Alternative

Under Alternative 3, all development sites greater than 1 acre would be required to include common open or recreational space (e.g., tot lot, playground, courtyard, or plaza) at a minimum of 10 percent of the gross square footage of the individual project. This alternative would affect 17 parcels and require updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, and Zoning Ordinance, along with additional modifications to design regulations to mandate the inclusion of recreational space (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-21 to 6-22).

Overall development intensity would remain substantially similar to the proposed project, as reductions in residential space would be offset by decreasing commercial/mixed-use areas on certain parcels to maintain housing capacity. Impacts across most environmental topics—such as aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, transportation, utilities, and wildfire—would be similar to the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-22 to 6-26).

While Alternative 3 could introduce approximately 6.71 acres of additional parkland, the City's parkland ratio deficiency (currently 0.92 acre per 1,000 residents versus the goal of 5 acres) would not be remedied. Therefore, impacts related to public services (parks) would be slightly reduced under this alternative, but would remain significant and unavoidable (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-25).

Although Alternative 3 would meet most project objectives, it would not meet them to the same extent as the proposed project. Alternative 3 offers limited improvement to the City's parkland deficiency. The City's goal is 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, but Alternative 3 would only add approximately 6.71 acres, which is insufficient to address the existing deficit. Thus, significant and unavoidable impacts to park services remain (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-25). Depending on how development applications are filed, this alternative could result in slightly fewer

residential units overall, even though RHNA compliance could still be achieved. This results in an alternative that is less efficient and that may not fully advance the objective of maximizing housing opportunities (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-26 to 6-27). Air quality and cultural resource impacts remain significant and unavoidable under this alternative, similar to the proposed project. The inclusion of park space does not substantially lessen these impacts (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-22 and 6-26). While the alternative promotes community amenities, it does not improve housing capacity or reduce major environmental impacts. Therefore, it does not meet project objectives as efficiently or effectively as the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-26 to 6-27).

Accordingly, Alternative 3 is considered undesirable under CEQA because it does not reduce significant unavoidable impacts and does not meet project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project and is therefore rejected (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-26 to 6-27).

Alternative 4: Increased Park Space Alternative

Alternative 4 would rezone one or more vacant parcels identified under the proposed project to allow for recreational space/parks (e.g., pocket parks, playgrounds, plazas) instead of residential or mixed-use development. While this alternative would reduce the number of dwelling units or commercial space on certain parcels, it would still provide sufficient rezoning to meet the City's RHNA allocation of 5,434 units, though with a smaller surplus compared to the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-27 to 6-36). The purpose of this alternative is to reduce impacts related to park facilities by introducing additional open space.

Although Alternative 4 meets most objectives, it does not meet them as efficiently or to the same extent as the proposed project. Importantly, although Alternative 4 would still allow the City to meet its RHNA, it would do so with a smaller surplus, limiting flexibility to accommodate future housing needs (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-36). Additionally, this Alternative does not reduce significant unavoidable impacts to below a level of significance. Air quality and cultural resource impacts remain significant and unavoidable. Parkland deficiency also remains significant despite added recreational space (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-36).

Alternative 4 introduces park space but reduces housing capacity and does not substantially lessen major environmental impacts. Therefore, it does not achieve project objectives as effectively as the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-36). Accordingly, Alternative 4 is considered undesirable under CEQA because it does not reduce significant unavoidable impacts and does not meet project objectives to the same extent as the proposed project and is therefore rejected (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-36).

Alternative 5: Increased Density Alternative

Alternative 5 proposes increasing the residential yield ratio from 60 percent to 70 percent per site, resulting in approximately 2,079 dwelling units compared to 1,953 units under the proposed project. This alternative would require updates to the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, Land Use Element, and Zoning Ordinance, similar to the proposed project. The purpose of this alternative is to meet project objectives to an even greater extent by providing additional housing units and

increasing the surplus beyond the City’s RHNA allocation of 5,434 units (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-36 to 6-47).

While Alternative 5 would meet all project objectives and even exceed them by providing additional housing units, it is rejected because it does not reduce any significant unavoidable impacts and, in fact, increases several impacts compared to the proposed project. Alternative 5 would generate higher levels of criteria pollutants (ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}) due to increased construction activity, vehicle trips, and energy consumption. These impacts would be significant and unavoidable and are greater than those of the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-37). Higher residential density results in greater VMT, emergency access concerns, and increased demand for public services and utilities. Transportation impacts would be significant and unavoidable (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-43 to 6-45).

Additionally, this alternative would not result in significant reductions to the proposed project’s significant and unavoidable impacts. Similar to the proposed project, cultural resources impacts remain significant and unavoidable. Alternative 5 does not mitigate these impacts to less than significant levels (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-38). Although the physical footprint remains the same, increased density leads to higher energy use, GHG emissions, noise, and utility demand, making overall environmental performance more impactful compared to the proposed project (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, pages 6-39 to 6-45).

Accordingly, Alternative 5 is considered undesirable under CEQA because, despite meeting project objectives to a greater extent, it increases environmental impacts and fails to reduce any significant unavoidable impacts and is therefore rejected (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-46).

Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR.

Each Alternative 1 through 4 would lessen the environmental impacts relative to the proposed project to a certain degree (as described above and further in the EIR). If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative—which is the case here as it avoids all project impacts, but fails to satisfy any of the project objectives—the EIR must also identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. Overall, based on these Findings, Alternative 4 balances environmental performance with partial attainment of project goals, offering modest reductions in significant impacts without introducing new adverse effects. Therefore, Alternative 4 is identified as the environmentally superior alternative among those that feasibly meet most of the project’s objectives, even though it fails to fully implement project objectives. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 6, page 6-49.) Given its failure to fully implement project objectives, Alternative 4, the environmentally superior alternative, is rejected.

1.9 - Findings Regarding Cumulative Impacts

Consistent with CEQA's requirements, the EIR for the proposed project includes an analysis of cumulative impacts. As discussed above, except as to cumulative air quality impacts, cultural resources impacts and parkland impacts, as described below, all other cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project are less than significant or less than significant with the implementation of applicable mitigation and compliance with applicable regulations.

Cumulative air quality impacts remain significant even with incorporation of all feasible mitigation with respect to the following:

- **Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Any Criteria Pollutant for Which the Project Region Is Nonattainment Under an Applicable Federal or State Ambient Air Quality Standard:** As discussed under Impact AIR-1, the proposed project is inconsistent with the current air quality plan and impacts related to consistency with the air quality plan would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the proposed project's incremental contribution would also be cumulatively considerable with regard to consistency with the air quality plan. The proposed project would contribute criteria pollutants to the area during temporary project construction and operation. When combined with the possible impacts of several individual projects in the area possibly under construction simultaneously, the generation of fugitive dust and pollutant emissions during construction could result in substantial short-term increases in air pollutants. However, each project would be required to comply with the South Coast AQMD's standard construction emissions control measures and mitigation measures AIR-2a and AIR-2b. However, as the proposed project would have significant and unavoidable impacts related to the considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard, even after implementation of MMs AIR-2a and AIR-2b, it would also contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.
- **Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentration:** Future development consistent with the proposed project would increase activities that may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. MM AQ-3 would ensure mobile and construction sources of TACs not covered under South Coast AQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review by the City. Implementation of the proposed project would result in land uses that could generate TACs from both permitted and non-permitted (e.g., trucks) sources that could contribute to elevated levels in the Basin. All construction would be required to comply with South Coast AQMD rules regulating construction activities, and implementation of MM AQ-1 would serve to substantially reduce DPM emission from construction activities. While individual projects that are subject to the CEQA process or to South Coast AQMD permitting requirements would be required to comply with South Coast AQMD rules and regulations, the proposed project may introduce uses that could increase TAC emissions that would contribute to the higher levels of risk in the Basin. Therefore, the proposed project's cumulative contribution to health risk is significant and unavoidable.

- **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5:** As the City receives development applications for subsequent development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA, those applications would be reviewed by the City for compliance with the policies of the General Plan, the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance, and other relevant federal, State, and local regulations that protect historical resources, including Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and Sections 5024.1 and 5097 of the Public Resources Code. However, in the event that an individual development project proposes to demolish a property determined to be a historic resource, this would result in a significant and unavoidable impact that could not be mitigated. For these reasons, the City conservatively finds that the proposed project’s incremental contribution to the less than significant cumulative impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable.
- **Park Services:** The City has been operating with a parkland ratio deficiency for several years, and further population growth could increase the deficit. Facilities fees would be collected from development projects in order to collect sufficient funds to construct adequate park facilities and to refurbish and expand existing facilities to maintain existing levels of service. However, given that the City has been operating at a parkland deficit for several years, increased population within the City could exacerbate the existing parks deficit. Potential future impacts to Colton parks could be reduced through the contribution of the capital facilities fee to ensure facilities are adequately maintained and sufficient to accommodate growth associated with cumulative development. However, despite the payment of development impact fees, the proposed project could increase the parks deficit, accelerate deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities, and make a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on parks. Therefore, the proposed project’s cumulative impacts associated with development would be significant and unavoidable.

1.10 - Findings Regarding Growth Inducement

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e) requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Typical growth-inducing factors might be the extension of urban services or transportation infrastructure to a previously unserved or underserved area, or the removal of major barriers to development.

The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA does not approve or entitle specific development projects and cannot predict when development will occur. It identifies sites for future housing to meet RHNA requirements and removes regulatory obstacles to planned growth. At full buildout, the project could accommodate approximately 3,255 net new housing units, increasing the City’s housing stock from 16,632 to 19,887 units. This equates to a population increase of about 3,260 people, which is considered planned growth under the Housing Element and SCAG projections (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, pages 5-8 to 5-9).

The project would not extend infrastructure outside city limits or the Sphere of Influence. Existing services and infrastructure (roads, utilities, public safety) are adequate, and future development would connect locally to existing systems. No substantial infrastructure extensions or removal of

growth barriers would occur. Therefore, the project would not induce unplanned growth (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-8).

The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA accommodates planned growth consistent with the General Plan and Housing Element. It does not result in unplanned direct or indirect population growth. Impacts are considered less than significant (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-9).

The Lead Agency finds that the proposed project would not result in unplanned growth.

1.11 - Findings Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

According to Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Lead Agency must address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the proposed project be implemented. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if any of the following would occur:

- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents; or
- The proposed consumption of resources are not justified.

The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would result in long-term changes to land use patterns by rezoning approximately 89.9 acres for residential and mixed-use development. Once developed, these lands would not likely revert to their previous uses (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-10).

Irretrievable Commitment of Resources: Construction and operation of future housing projects would involve irreversible consumption of nonrenewable resources, including fossil fuels, building materials, and energy. These commitments are typical of urban development and cannot be recovered once used (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-10).

Energy Use and GHG Emissions: Increased energy demand and associated GHG emissions would occur during construction and operation. Although mitigation measures and compliance with State regulations (e.g., Title 24, CALGreen) would reduce impacts, some level of resource use and emissions is unavoidable (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-10).

Infrastructure and Public Services: Development would require long-term use of water, wastewater, and solid waste systems. While these systems have capacity, their use represents an irreversible commitment of resources (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-10).

The proposed project would cause some irreversible environmental changes related to land use conversion, resource consumption, and energy use; however, these changes are considered typical for urban development and are consistent with the City's General Plan and Housing Element

objectives (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-10). While future site-specific development facilitated by the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would increase resource consumption during construction and operation, it would also result in some benefits related to long-term resource consumption in the region. The Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA establishes a long-range planning framework to identify adequate sites for future housing developments to meet the housing needs in the region. Additionally, development consistent with the Housing Element Update would accommodate anticipated growth within existing developed areas. Prioritizing infill development protects natural lands and open space and reduces fossil fuel consumption attributable to longer commuting distances and lack of transit options. For these reasons, the irretrievable commitment of resources attributable to the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would not be considered significant. (Draft Program EIR, Chapter 5, page 5-11).

The Lead Agency finds that the proposed project would cause significant irreversible environmental changes related to land use conversion, resource consumption, and energy use.

1.12 - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d), the Lead Agency adopts the MMRP prepared for the proposed project, attached as Appendix A. Implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the MMRP is hereby made a condition of approval of the proposed project. The MMRP is incorporated by reference in these Findings. In the event of any inconsistencies between the mitigation measures set forth herein and the MMRP, the MMRP shall control.

1.13 - Findings Regarding Recirculation

During the public review period after the Draft Program EIR was published, the Lead Agency received comment letters containing certain additional information. Lead Agency staff and consultants involved in preparing the various studies, reports and analyses included in the Draft Program EIR have also presented additional information since the publication of the Draft Program EIR during the City's public hearings on the proposed project. Some of this information was contained in comments submitted on the Draft Program EIR, and in responses to those comments contained in the Final EIR. Other information was presented at or before public meetings/hearings on the EIR. The EIR incorporates feasible mitigation, additions, clarifications, modifications, and other changes, in response to comments and as determined appropriate by Lead Agency staff and required under CEQA.

Under *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.* (1993) 6 C4th 1112 (Laurel Heights II) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] § 15088.5(a)(3)), when information added to the Final EIR consists of a suggested additional mitigation measure, recirculation is required only if the new mitigation measure meets all of the following criteria (*South County Citizens for Smart Growth v. County of Nevada* (2013) 221 CA4th 316, 330):

- It is feasible;

- It is considerably different from the alternatives or mitigation measures already evaluated in the Draft Program EIR;
- It would clearly lessen the project's significant environmental impacts; and
- It is not adopted.

Recirculation is only required only if each of the above tests is met. (*South County Citizens, supra* at 330). Here, no information was introduced that meets any of these tests.

The Lead Agency has considered all relevant information including the opinions and comments of interested agencies, organizations and individuals. The Lead Agency finds that the additional information received by the City does not meet the test for recirculation. Additionally, the Lead Agency finds that none of the additional information provided during the public comment period demonstrates any of the following situations requiring recirculation identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 have occurred:

- A new significant environmental impact that would result from the project (or any alternative) or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project (or an alternative), but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- The Draft Program EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

Based on the foregoing and as explained in more detail in the Final EIR, and having reviewed all the information in the record of proceedings, the Lead Agency hereby finds that this additional information does not constitute significant new information, nor does it require recirculation of the EIR. The additional information merely clarifies or amplifies an adequate EIR.

1.14 - Statement of Overriding Considerations

CEQA requires that a Lead Agency balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risk in determining whether to approve the proposed project. If the benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a). CEQA requires that a Lead Agency support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b). The Lead Agency’s written reasons are referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

As explained in the above Findings of Fact, most of the project’s impacts on the environment would either be insignificant or, through the incorporation of mitigation measures as conditions of approval

of the proposed project, can be reduced to less than significant. However, as set forth in Section 1.6 above, certain impacts related to air quality, cultural resources and park land provision will remain significant and unavoidable. Further, as set forth in Section 1.7 above, there are no feasible alternatives to the proposed project, which would mitigate or avoid those environmental impacts and which would meet project objectives to the same degree as the proposed project.

Accordingly, as set forth below, the City of Colton hereby declares that the following benefits provided to the public through the approval and implementation of the proposed project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project that cannot be mitigated. The City of Colton finds that each of the project benefits separately and individually outweighs all of the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable.

- The project enables the City to meet its RHNA allocation for the 2021–2029 planning period, providing adequate sites for a range of income levels and ensuring compliance with State Housing Element Law.
- The project would benefit the human environment through cohesive design.
- The project supports efficient land use, reduces sprawl, and leverages existing infrastructure, by prioritizing infill development on vacant and underutilized parcels. Prioritizing infill development also protects natural lands and open space and reduces fossil fuel consumption attributable to longer commuting distances and lack of transit options.
- The project responds to the broad range of housing needs in the City and enables development of an adequate supply of housing for the City’s workforce, residents, and special needs populations by supporting a mix of housing types, densities, affordability levels, and designs. As required by State law, the project follows the principles of planning sustainable communities by meeting both the present and future housing needs of the City.
- The project includes zoning amendments and General Plan updates that reduce or remove constraints to housing development, incorporate best practices, and streamline approvals for affordable housing.
- By increasing the housing supply, especially near employment centers and transit, the project supports local economic development, supports small businesses, helps attract and retain workforce, and improves the jobs-to-housing ratio in the City.
- The project’s focus on infill, mixed-use, and higher-density development near transit and services is consistent with and advances the City’s commitment to greenhouse gas reduction, air quality improvement, and sustainable communities strategies.
- The project encourages the inclusion of open space, recreational facilities, and parkland in new developments, improving community health and livability.
- The project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, the South Colton Livable Corridor Plan, and the Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Connect SoCal 2024, supporting regional goals for housing, transportation, and sustainability.

1.15 - Custodian of Record; Scope and Content of Record

The documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which these Findings are based are located at the City of Colton 659 North La Cadena Drive Colton, CA 92324. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

Various documents, information, testimony, reports, studies, analyses and other materials (both oral and written) constitute the record upon which the City bases these Findings and the basis for the City's approval and/or adoption contained herein. These Findings cite specific pieces of evidence, but none of the City's findings are based solely on those cited pieces of evidence. Rather, these Findings are based upon the entire record, and the Lead Agency intends to rely upon all supporting evidence in the record for each of its conclusions contained herein.

The documents in the record include all items referenced in Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e), and shall not include those items specifically excluded by the Public Resources Code or any other regulation.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Appendix A:
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
for the
City of Colton Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and
General Plan Amendment
City of Colton, San Bernardino County, California
State Clearinghouse Number 2025010520**

Prepared for:
City of Colton
659 North La Cadena Drive
Colton, CA 92324
909.370.5523

Contact: Mario Suarez, Planning Manager

Prepared by:
FirstCarbon Solutions
967 Kendall Drive, #A-537
San Bernardino, CA 92407
714.508.4100

Contact: Cecilia So, Project Director
Alison Rondone, Project Manager

Date: December 30, 2025

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PREFACE

Section 21081.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 require a Lead Agency to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) whenever it adopts a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) in conjunction with a project approval. The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures occurs during project implementation.

The Draft Program EIR prepared for the proposed Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment (proposed project) concluded that project implementation could result in potentially significant effects on the environment and mitigation measures were incorporated into the proposed project or are required as a condition of project approval that reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. This MMRP documents how and when the mitigation measures adopted by the Lead Agency will be implemented and confirms that potential environmental impacts are reduced to less than significant levels as identified in the Draft Program EIR.

This document does not discuss those subjects that the environmental analysis demonstrates would result in less than significant impacts and for which no mitigation was proposed or necessary.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 1: Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
3.1 Air Quality					
<p>MM AIR-2a: Implement measures to reduce construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions. Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial projects proposed in the areas defined by the proposed project, the applicant shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans or construction drawings) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City’s Building and Safety Division. While specific mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce construction-related emissions would be determined during project-level analysis, potential mitigation could include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring fugitive-dust control measures that exceed South Coast AQMD’s Rule 403, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion. – Applying water every 3 hours to active soil-disturbing activities. 	<p>Incorporation into all appropriate project construction documents, including all grading, utility, building, landscaping, and improvement plans. City’s Building and Safety Division shall review construction plans and conduct site inspections.</p>	<p>Prior to project approval</p>	<p>City of Colton Planning Division; City of Colton Building and Safety Division</p>		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials. • Using construction equipment rated by EPA as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. • Ensuring that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer’s standards. • Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutes • Limiting on-site vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. • Installing wheel washers for all exiting trucks or washing all trucks and equipment leaving the project area. • Using super-compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. 					
<p>MM AIR-2b Implement measures to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions during operation. Prior to approval by the City for non-ministerial projects proposed in the areas defined by the proposed project, applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts to the Planning Division for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast AQMD adopted thresholds of significance, the Planning Division shall require incorporation of mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities, to be included as part of the conditions of approval.</p>	<p>Incorporation into all appropriate project construction documents, including all grading, utility, building, landscaping, and improvement plans. City’s Building and Safety Division shall review construction plans and conduct site inspections.</p>	<p>Prior to project approval</p>	<p>City of Colton Planning Division</p>		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>Possible mitigation measures and/or project design features to reduce long-term emissions could include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations Chapter 10 § 2485). • Providing changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). • Providing bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen. • Providing preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of CALGreen (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). Encouraging facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of CALGreen. • Providing appliances shall be Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star-certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check. • Equipping landscaped common areas with electrical outlets to enable use of electric landscaping equipment to the extent feasible 					
<p>MM AIR-3: Prior to discretionary approval by the City, project applicants for new development projects that (1) have the potential to generate emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and/or diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions during construction or operation, and (2) are within 1,000</p>	<p>Preparation of Health Risk Assessment (HRA) by a qualified air quality consultant for individual projects and</p>	<p>The HRA shall be submitted prior to discretionary approval by the City. Mitigation</p>	<p>City of Colton Planning Division</p>		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City for review and approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD). If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk and/or noncancer hazard index exceed the respective thresholds, as established by the South Coast AQMD at the time a project is considered, the project applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACT), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms, are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as Mitigation Measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.	incorporation of appropriate measures recommended by South Coast AQMD during project design and operation, as applicable. Submittal of HRA to City of Colton Planning Division for review and approval.	Measures identified in the HRA shall be incorporated into the environmental document and site plan prior to issuance of grading permit, or issuance of a building permit, whichever is sooner.			
3.3 Biological Resources					
MM BIO-1 Biological Resources Assessment Prior to the issuance of entitlements for any site in Areas 4, 4A, 5, and 6, which have potential to support sensitive biological resources such as special-status species, nesting native or migratory birds, jurisdictional features, or other sensitive resource, the project applicant or sponsor shall retain a qualified Biologist to prepare a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA). The BRA shall include a project-specific analysis of potential impacts on sensitive and regulated biological resources, including impacts on special-status species and their habitat, migratory birds and other protected nesting birds, roosting bats, rare plants, sensitive communities and riparian habitats, protected waters and	Qualified Biologist and/or Wetland Regulatory Specialist preconstruction survey results and submittal of survey documents to the City of Colton Planning Division for review and approval; on-site inspection/monitoring by the qualified biologist if survey results	Prior to the issuance of any site-specific entitlement; ongoing during construction	City of Colton Planning Division;		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>wetlands, wildlife corridors and nursery sites, and shall identify thresholds of significance with a significance conclusion and measures to reduce potential project impact(s) to less than significant level(s). These measures shall be included as conditions of approval for building and grading permits issued for demolition and/or construction. The project applicant or sponsor shall implement these measures, as identified in the BRA, to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potential project impacts.</p> <p>Future development consistent with the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA may be required to undergo additional environmental review and incorporate additional mitigation depending on results of future biological studies. This may include acquisition of take permits if any project proponent proposes take of federal or State-listed or candidate species. If take is proposed, the project proponent shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and/or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), as applicable, regarding an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) pursuant to Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or Sections 7 or 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act. Other measures may include focused surveys, regulatory permits, avoidance measures, and on-site mitigation. If on-site mitigation is not feasible in the City’s discretion, offsite mitigation shall be implemented within the City of Colton Planning Area whenever possible, with a priority given to existing habitat mitigation banks. Habitat mitigation shall be accompanied by a long-term management plan and monitoring program prepared by a qualified Biologist and include provisions for protection of mitigation lands in perpetuity through the establishment of easements and adequate funding for maintenance and monitoring; the time frame for the funding shall be detailed in the long-term management plan and monitoring program completed prior</p>	<p>determine special-status species are present.</p> <p>Notification to appropriate regulatory agency(ies) and habitat mitigation pursuant to long-term management plan and monitoring program to be prepared by a qualified Biologist.</p> <p>Site-specific measures identified in the BRA shall be incorporated as conditions of approval and incorporated in the building and grading permits prior to issuance.</p> <p>Verification of additional environmental review and additional mitigation and permitting, as applicable.</p>				

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
to disturbance of occupied habitat or water feature. If a water feature is found to be jurisdictional or potentially jurisdictional, the applicant shall comply with the appropriate permitting process with each agency claiming jurisdiction prior to disturbance of the feature.					
<p>MM BIO-2: Nesting Bird Protection Prior to the issuance of entitlements for projects implemented in Areas 1, 2, or 3, the project applicant or sponsor shall retain a qualified Biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds if project construction activities will be initiated during the avian nesting season (generally, raptor nesting season is January 1 through September 15; and passerine bird nesting season is February 1 through September 1). Pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 3503 and 3503.5, to prevent impacts to birds and their nests by the proposed project, the preconstruction survey will be conducted no more than 3 days prior to commencement of project activities in all suitable areas including trees, shrubs, bare ground, buildings, burrows, cavities, and structures, at the appropriate time of day/night, during appropriate weather conditions to verify the absence of active nests. Preconstruction surveys should focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior (e.g., copulation, carrying of food or nest materials, nestbuilding, removal of fecal sacks, flushing suddenly from atypically close range, agitation, aggressive interactions, feigning injury or distraction displays, or other behaviors).</p> <p>If an active nest is located during a pre-construction survey, the City shall be notified about the status of the nest and the qualified Biologist shall immediately establish a conservative buffer surrounding the nest, as indicated below. Construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance</p>	Qualified Biologist survey results and submittal of qualified survey results and survey documents to the City of Colton Planning Division for review and approval; on-site inspection/monitoring by the qualified biologist if survey results determine nesting birds are present during the avian nesting season; site inspection	Prior to the issuance in entitlements and no more than 3 days prior to commencement of project activities that occur during avian nesting season	City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>of the nest until it has been determined by a qualified Biologist that the juveniles have fledged or are independent of the nest.</p> <p>Restrictions shall include the establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 100-foot radius around an active bird nest), or at a distance determined by the qualified Biologist that will prevent project-related disturbances. The buffer zone will be maintained around the active nest site(s) until the young have fledged and are foraging independently, as confirmed by the qualified Biologist.</p>					
3.4 Cultural Resources					
<p>MM CUL-1 Individual development projects which propose to alter a building or structure greater than 45 years of age at the time an application is submitted would be required to undergo project-specific environmental review, in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, in order for the City to determine whether the building or structure may be a historic resource and take appropriate action such as requiring additional site-specific or project-specific measures to reduce any potential impacts. These measures are, but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to project development that may affect historical resources (i.e., structures 45 years or older), a historical resources assessment shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professionally Qualified Standards in architectural history or history. This shall include a records search to determine whether any resources that may be potentially affected by the project have been previously recorded, evaluated, and/ or designated in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), 	Retention of professional qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professionally Qualified Standards in architectural history or history by applicant/owner/sponsor (subject to City Planning Division approval) shall perform a historical resources assessment; ongoing monitoring	Prior to issuance of grading permit for individual projects; ongoing during construction activities	City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>or a local register. Following the records search, the qualified architectural historian shall conduct a survey in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) guidelines to identify any previously unrecorded potential historical resources that may be potentially affected by the proposed project. The criteria for determining a historically significant building or structure shall meet one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, regional, or national history; or <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in local, regional, or national history; or 2. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a significant architectural style, property type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder who is locally, regionally, nationally significant, or it is a significant visual feature of the City; possess high artistic values, represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or 3. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. ● Properties identified as historically significant resources, shall contain proper documentation meeting the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Guidelines that shall be prepared and implemented, as approved by the qualified historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. Such documentation shall include drawings, photographs, and written data for each building/structure/element, and provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program, recovery, rehabilitation, redesign, relocation, and/or in situ preservation plan. 					

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that projects requiring the relocation, rehabilitation, or alternation of a historical resource do not impact the resource’s significance, the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties shall be used to the maximum extent possible. The application of the standards shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Professional Qualified Standards. Prior to any construction activities that may affect the historical resource, a report identifying and specifying the treatment of character defining features and construction activities shall be provided to the City of Colton for review and approval. If a proposed project would result in the demolition or significant alteration of historical resource, such demolition cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, recordation of the resource prior to construction activities will assist in reducing adverse impacts to the resource to the greatest extent possible. Recordation shall take the form of Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, or Historic American Landscape Survey documentation, and shall be performed by an architectural historian or historian who meets the Professional Qualified Standards. Documentation shall include an architectural and historical narrative; medium- or large-format black and white photographs, negatives, and prints; and supplementary information such as building plans and elevations, and/or historical photographs. Documentation shall be reproduced on archival paper and placed in appropriate local, State, or federal institutions. The specific scope and details of documentation are to be developed in coordination with the City of Colton. 					

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>MM CUL-2 To determine the archaeological sensitivity for individual development projects within the City, an archaeological resources assessment shall be performed under the supervision of an Archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s (SOI) Professional Qualified Standards for their role. The assessment shall include a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) and a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The records searches shall determine if the proposed project has been previously surveyed for archaeological resources, identify and characterize the results of previous cultural resource surveys, and disclose any cultural resources that have been recorded and/or evaluated. A Phase I pedestrian survey shall be undertaken in areas that are developed and undeveloped to locate any surface cultural materials.</p> <p>If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified through an archaeological resources assessment, and impacts to these resources cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an Archaeologist who meets SOI Standards prior to any construction-related ground disturbing activities to determine significance. If resources determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, a Phase III data recovery program shall be implemented by a qualified Archaeologist and performed in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation’s (OHP) Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR). The Archaeologist must then prepare an archaeological data recovery plan to be reviewed and approved by the lead agency prior to the excavation of resources.</p>	Retention of a professional qualified Archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s (SOI) Professional Qualified Standards to perform archaeological resources assessment; ongoing monitoring	Prior to issuance of grading permit for individual projects ongoing during construction activities	City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources within the proposed project area but indicated the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, this shall be followed by monitoring of all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil by a qualified Archaeologist. The Archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities within 100 feet of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an Archaeologist who meets SOI Standards. If the discovery proves to be significant, the qualified Archaeologist shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency (City of Colton) on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> <p>If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources but indicates the area to be of medium to low sensitivity for archaeological resources, an Archaeologist who meets the Professional Qualified Standards shall be retained on an on-call basis. The Archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities about the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting and shall explain the importance and legal basis for</p>					

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground disturbing activities, construction activities within 100 feet of the discovery shall be halted while the on-call Archaeologist is contacted. If the discovery proves to be significant, the qualified Archaeologist shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency (City of Colton) on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p> <p>Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project site should be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA Guidelines. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency (City of Colton) approves the measures to protect these resources. The excavation, study, curation, and/or repatriation of archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be undertaken in close consultation with the Lead Agency (City of Colton) and representatives from consulting Native American Tribes, as appropriate. All Reports and DPR forms shall be submitted to the Lead Agency (City of Colton), the SCCIC, and the OHP, as required.</p>					
<p>MM CUL-3: In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, CEQA Guidelines Section</p>	<p>If human remains are discovered, confirm</p>	<p>During ground-disturbing activities</p>	<p>City of Colton Planning Divisions</p>		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>15064.5; Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and Section 5097.98 must be followed. If during the course of any future development project there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken.</p> <p>1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance within 100 feet of the remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine whether the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work within 48 hours, for appropriate treatment and disposition of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.</p> <p>2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the MLD or on the project site in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NAHC is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission. • The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation. • The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and mediation 	evidence that the County Coroner has been contracted and recommendations are implemented				

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.</p> <p>Additionally, California Public Resources Code Section 15064.5 requires the following relative to Native American Remains: When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood of, Native American Remains within a project site, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop a plan for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains, and any items associated with Native American Burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC.</p>					
<p>3.6 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</p>					
<p>MM GEO-1: A professional Paleontologist, approved by the City of Colton, shall conduct a site-specific paleontological resources survey on the potential sites for rezoning.</p> <p>If any of the potential sites for rezoning are found to be underlain by any other soil with the potential to contain vertebrate fossils due to their high paleontological sensitivity for significant resources, applicants, owners and/or sponsors of all future development or construction projects shall be required to perform or provide paleontological monitoring, if recommended by the qualified Paleontologist. Should significant paleontological resources (e.g., bones, teeth, well-preserved plant elements) be unearthed by a future project construction crew, project activities shall be diverted at least 15 feet from the discovered paleontological resources until a professional Paleontologist has assessed such discovered resources and, if deemed significant, such resources shall be salvaged in a timely manner. The applicant/owner/sponsor of</p>	Retention of a professional Paleontologist (subject to City of Colton Planning Division approval) to perform site-specific paleontological resources survey; ongoing monitoring	Prior to issuance of grading permit for individual projects; ongoing during construction activities	City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
said project shall be responsible for diverting project work and providing the assessment including retaining a professional Paleontologist for such purpose. Collected fossils shall be deposited by the applicant/owner/sponsor in an appropriate repository (e.g., University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP), California Academy of Sciences) where the collection shall be properly curated and made available for future research.					
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
<p>MM GHG-1a: Implement GHG emission-reduction measures during construction.</p> <p>The applicant and/or contractor associated with future development of sites within the proposed project area shall implement the following measures during construction and, where specified below, shall submit reports demonstrating compliance to the Planning Division for its review and approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant shall limit all equipment and delivery truck idling times by shutting down equipment when not in use and reducing the maximum idling time to less than 3 minutes. The applicant shall also install clear signage regarding the limitation on idling time at the delivery driveway and loading areas. • The applicant shall verify that all construction equipment is maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. Prior to the commencement of construction activities using diesel-powered and/or gasoline powered vehicles or equipment, the applicant shall verify that all vehicles and equipment have been checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to admittance into the delivery driveway and loading areas. The applicant shall submit a report by the certified mechanic of the condition 	Submittal of reports to the City of Colton Planning Division; The City shall inspect the worksite regularly to ensure compliance	Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, whichever is sooner, for individual projects and ongoing monitoring throughout construction	City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>of construction-related vehicles and equipment to the Planning Division prior to commencement of their use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shall use electric equipment where available and feasible. The applicant shall implement the use of Tier 4 equipment where available and feasible. 					
<p>MM GHG-1b: Restrict use of natural gas in new development. Future development of sites within the proposed project area shall be all-electric, eliminating the use of any natural gas-fueled appliance or building feature.</p>	Incorporation into project construction documents, including applicable grading, utility, building, landscaping, and improvement plans	Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, whichever is sooner	City of Colton Planning Division		
<p>MM GHG-1c: Implement all-electric landscaping equipment. All landscaping equipment (e.g., leaf blower) used for property management shall be electric-powered only. The property manager/facility owner shall provide documentation (e.g., purchase, rental, and/or services agreement) to the City's Planning Division to verify, to the City's satisfaction, that all landscaping equipment utilized will be electric powered.</p>	Submittal of purchase, rental, or services agreement for the City's review and approval	Prior to acquisition of landscape equipment	City of Colton Planning Division		
<p>MM GHG-1d: Require EV charging infrastructure that meets CALGreen Tier 2 voluntary requirements. New residential buildings shall provide electric vehicle (EV) spaces as required by CALGreen Tier 2.</p>	Inclusion of EV spaces in all final construction and building documents or plans	Prior to issuance of building permits for individual projects	City of Colton Planning Division		
<p>3.12 Noise</p>					
<p>MM NOI-1: Construction Noise Reduction Plan Prior to issuance of construction permits for development projects associated with the City of Colton Housing Element Update Program 10/11 Rezone and General Plan Amendment, the following language shall be included, verbatim, in the general notes section of all the civil plan construction documents.</p>	Submittal and approval of final site-specific project-level Construction Noise Reduction Plan, and incorporation of measures into	During construction and prior to the issuance of grading permits for individual projects	Construction Contractor; City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction contractor shall ensure that all equipment driven by internal combustion engines shall be equipped with mufflers, which are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. • The construction contractor shall ensure that unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (i.e., idling in excess of 5 minutes) is prohibited. • The construction contractor shall utilize “quiet” models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists. • At all times during project grading and construction, the construction contractor shall ensure that stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far as practicable from sensitive receptors and placed so that emitted noise is directed away from adjacent residences. • The construction contractor shall ensure that the construction staging areas shall be located to create the greatest feasible distance between the staging area and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site. • For construction activity that requires the use of heavy construction equipment within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, the construction contractor shall ensure that the operation of heavy construction equipment shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. • The construction contractor shall designate a “disturbance coordinator” who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., a bad muffler) and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. 	<p>construction documents; implementation of Construction Noise Reduction Plan during construction</p>				

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For construction activity that requires the use of heavy construction equipment within 50 feet of any noise-sensitive receptors, the project applicant shall provide one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A temporary noise barrier shall be installed prior to the onset of construction activities that would require the use of heavy construction equipment. The barrier shall be located between the construction zone and all adjacent sensitive receptor land uses. The temporary sound barrier shall provide a reduction in noise that shall meet the City’s construction noise threshold of 55 A-weighted decibels (dBA) maximum noise level (Lmax) as measured at the façade of the sensitive receptor land uses. The noise barrier shall be a minimum height of 8 feet and be free of gaps and holes and must achieve a Sound Transmission Class (STC) of 35 or greater. The barrier can be either (a) a 0.75-inch-thick plywood wall or (b) a hanging blanket/curtain with a surface density or at least 2 pounds per square foot. For either configuration, the construction side of the barrier shall have an exterior lining of sound absorption material with a Noise Reduction Coefficient (NRC) rating of 0.7 or higher. – A site-specific construction-related groundborne vibration impact assessment shall be conducted by a qualified Technical Specialist that demonstrates that proposed construction activities, along with any applicable project design features, would not result in an exceedance of an exterior threshold of 80 dBA 8-hour equivalent sound level (Leq(8hr)) at residential land uses, or of 85 dBA Leq(8hr) at commercial land uses, and of 90 dBA Leq(8hr) at industrial land uses. Upon approval by the City, any identified construction 					

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<p>noise reduction measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents.</p> <p>Compliance with this measure would ensure that potential construction-related noise impacts associated with development that would occur under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be reduced to less than significant.</p>					
<p>MM NOI-2: Stationary Source Noise Impact Reduction Measure</p> <p>Prior to issuance for entitlements for a project, for any development project on potential sites for housing that would include any noise-producing mechanical systems located within 10 feet of a receiving property line, the project applicant shall retain a Noise Specialist to conduct a site-specific project level noise analysis to evaluate compliance with Section 18.42.040 of the Municipal Code, which prohibits noise levels in excess of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) equivalent sound level (Leq(h)) when measured at the property line of the parcel generating the noise. If the analysis identifies that proposed mechanical system operations could result in an exceedance of the City’s noise performance standards, then specific measures to attenuate the noise impact shall be identified. The analysis shall be submitted to City staff for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits. The final noise reduction measures shall be included on all final construction and building documents and/or construction management plans and submitted for verification to the City. Specific measures may include, but are not limited to, the following measures or design features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant shall utilize quieter mechanical systems that would not result in an exceedance of the City’s operational noise standards. 	<p>Submittal of site-specific project-level noise analysis prior to issuance of entitlements; inclusion of applicable noise reduction measures in all final construction and building documents or plans</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of entitlements for individual projects</p>	<p>City of Colton Planning Division</p>		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project applicant shall enclose mechanical systems in a sound-attenuating structure or shall install sound barriers adjacent to the proposed system that would reduce operational noise levels to not exceed the City's noise performance standards as measured at a receiving property plane. <p>Compliance with this measure would ensure that potential stationary-source noise impacts associated with development that would occur under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be reduced to less than significant.</p>					
<p>MM NOI-3: Construction Vibration Reduction Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to the issuance of entitlements for any future development projects that would necessitate the use of any of the following equipment operation conditions, the project sponsor shall retain a Noise Specialist to prepare a Construction Vibration Reduction Plan for submittal to City staff for review and approval that identifies specific techniques (such as the depth and location of temporary trenching) that would reduce potential vibration impacts to less than significant for the impacted structure. Upon approval by the City, the construction vibration reduction measures shall be incorporated into the construction documents. A note shall be provided on grading and building plans indicating that, during grading and construction, the property owner/developer shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement these measures to limit construction-related vibration impacts. Precipitating equipment operation conditions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operation of pile driving within 55 feet of an off-site structure. Operation of large vibratory rollers within 26 feet of an off-site structure. 	<p>Submittal and approval of final site-specific project-level construction vibration reduction plan, when applicable, and incorporation of measures into construction documents; implementation of construction vibration reduction plan</p>	<p>During construction and prior to the issuance of entitlements for a development project</p>	<p>City of Colton Planning Division</p>		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operation of any heavy construction equipment within 15 feet of an off-site structure (such equipment includes, but it not limited to, bulldozers, hoe rams, caisson drilling, loaded trucks, or similar, that have reference vibration levels greater than 0.07 inch per second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet). <p>Compliance with this measure would ensure that potential construction-related groundborne vibration impacts associated with development that would occur under the Program 10/11 Rezone/GPA would be reduced to less than significant.</p>					
3.16 Transportation					
<p>MM TRANS-1a: VMT Reduction Strategies As required by the City Guidelines, transportation demand management (TDM) strategies would be considered for the purpose of reducing potentially significant Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) impacts. California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) has published an update to their VMT reduction measure guidance titled Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity (CAPCOA 2024) (Handbook). Consistent with VMT reduction measures described within the Handbook, the following are applicable to future development pursuant to the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide pedestrian and bicycle network improvements within the development connecting to existing off-site facilities. Where applicable, ensure design of key intersections and roadways to encourage the use of walking, biking, and transit. 	Implementation of the VMT reduction measures	Prior to the issuance of entitlements and in accordance with the City VMT Guidelines	City of Colton Planning Division		

Mitigation Measures	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible for Verification	Verification of Completion	
				Date	Initial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborate with the local transit agencies to determine the feasibility of providing new or re-routing existing transit services to the area. 					
<p>MM TRANS-1b VMT Analyses Each individual project shall undergo a project-level Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis to assess potential transportation impacts. If significant VMT impacts are identified, appropriate mitigation measures will be required to reduce these impacts in accordance with City Guidelines, which specify the 15 percent below baseline conditions.</p>	Preparation of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis, in accordance with the City VMT Guidelines when applicable, and implementation of VMT reduction measures	Prior to the issuance of entitlements	City of Colton Planning Division		