

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Findings of Fact

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the environmental impacts of a project be examined and disclosed prior to approval of a project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been certified 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 following statement of facts and findings has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21081. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) provides that:

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified 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.

There are three possible finding categories available for the Statement of Facts and Findings pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a).

- 1) 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 EIR [referred to in these Findings as “**CEQA Finding 1**”].
- 2) 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 [referred to in these Findings as “**CEQA Finding 2**”].
- 3) 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 EIR [referred to in these Findings as “**CEQA Finding 3**”].

Having received, reviewed and considered the EIR for the Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan (Project), State Clearinghouse (SCH) # 2021020110, as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the following Findings Regarding the CEQA Documents for the Project are hereby adopted by the City of Grand Terrace (City).

1.2 Document Format

These Findings have been categorized into the following sections:

- 1) Section 1.0 provides an introduction to these Findings.

- 2) Section 2.0 provides a summary of the Project, overview of other discretionary actions required for the Project, and a statement of Project objectives.
- 3) Section 3.0 provides a summary of those activities that have preceded the consideration of the Findings for the Project as part of the environmental review process, and a summary of public participation in the environmental review for the Project.
- 4) Section 4.0 sets forth findings regarding those potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the CEQA Documents which the City has determined to be less than significant with the implementation of Project design features.
- 5) Section 5.0 sets forth findings regarding those significant or potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the CEQA Documents which the City has determined can feasibly be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures included in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project.
- 6) Section 6.0 sets forth findings for significant and unavoidable project impacts.
- 7) Section 7.0 sets forth findings regarding growth-inducing impacts.
- 8) Section 8.0 sets forth findings regarding alternatives to the Project.
- 9) Section 9.0 contains findings regarding the MMRP for the Project.
- 10) Section 10.0 contains other relevant findings adopted by the City with respect to the Project.
- 11) Section 11.0 contains the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project.
- 12) Section 12.0 contains information pertaining to the certification of the Final EIR.

The Findings set forth in each section herein are supported by findings and facts identified in the administrative record of the Project.

1.3 Custodian and Location of Records

Findings:

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the City's actions regarding the Project are located at the City of Grand Terrace Planning and Development Services Department, 22795 Barton Road, Grand Terrace, California 92313. The City is the custodian of the administrative record for the Project. This information is provided in compliance with PRC §21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines §15091 (e).

1.4 Independent Judgement

The City of Grand Terrace retained Kimley-Horn and Associates of Riverside, California to prepare the EIR documents for the proposed Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan project. The EIR was prepared under the supervision and direction of the City of Grand Terrace Community Development Department staff and reflects the independent judgment of the City staff and accordingly, the City Council.

Findings:

The EIR reflects the City's independent judgment exercised in accordance with CEQA Section 21082.1(a)(c) by reviewing, analyzing and revising material prepared by the consultant; circulating the Draft EIR as a City document and certifying that the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

1.5 Findings on EIR

In determining that an EIR was required for the City's consideration of the Project, the City considered whether further environmental review was needed based upon the requirements of CEQA Guidelines §§15162 and 15163. The City evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the proposed components for the proposed Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan project through its use of an Initial Study. The analysis in the Initial Study indicated that the proposed Project could have a significant impact on the environment, and that an EIR would be required.

Finding:

The proposed Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan project has the potential to result in significant impacts on the environment. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is the required environmental documentation for the City's consideration of the Project.

1.6 General Findings on Mitigation Measures

In preparing the Conditions of Approval for this Project, City staff incorporated the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR. In the event that the Conditions of Approval or Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program does not use the exact wording of the mitigation measures recommended in the EIR, in each such instance, the adopted conditions of approval are intended to be identical or substantially similar to the recommended mitigation measure.

Findings:

Unless specifically stated to the contrary in these findings, it is this City Council's intent to adopt all mitigation measures recommended by the EIR. If a measure has, through error, been omitted from the Conditions of Approval, from these Findings or from the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and that measure is not specifically reflected in these Findings, that measure shall be deemed to be adopted pursuant to this paragraph.

In addition, unless specifically stated to the contrary in these Findings, all Conditions of Approval and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program repeating or rewording mitigation measures recommended in the EIR are intended to be substantially similar to the mitigation measures as worded in the EIR and are found to be equally effective in avoiding or lessening the identified environmental impact.

1.7 Findings on Recirculation

The Final EIR incorporates information obtained and produced after the Draft EIR was completed. The Final EIR contains additions, clarifications and modifications related to that new information. The information is provided in the Errata and identified through interlineation of the Draft EIR for clarity and

was provided to the Planning Commission and to the public in the Planning Department staff report dated June 6, 2024.

The minor revisions to the Draft EIR do not include any changes in the Project or the environmental setting in which the Project is undertaken and no additional discretionary approvals are required as a result of the changes. Rather, the new information merely clarifies, amplifies or makes insignificant modifications reflected primarily in the Project Description and Hydrology sections of the Draft EIR related to descriptions of existing drainage facilities.

Findings:

This Commission finds that the changes and modifications made to the EIR after the Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment do not individually or collectively constitute significant new information within the meaning of Public Resources Code § 21092.1 or CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5.

2.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

2.1 Project Description/Location

The Project is generally located east of Interstate 215 (I-215) in the City of Grand Terrace, County of San Bernardino, State of California. The Project site is bounded by Barton Road and vacant land to the north, former Gage Park and industrial uses to the south, Taylor Street and Grand Terrace High School and vacant parcels to the east, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railway and industrial/retail uses to the west. The Project encompasses approximately 112 acres of both developed and undeveloped land, including portions of Van Buren Street, De Berry Street, and Taylor Street and consists of 32 parcels.

The Project includes the future development of commercial, residential, public utilities, and public park and open space uses; as well as associated on- and off-site infrastructure improvements (roadway improvements, sewer, water, storm drain, dry utilities), under the guidance of the proposed Specific Plan.

2.2 Discretionary Actions

The City is the Lead Agency under CEQA and is responsible for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of the EIR for the Project. It is expected that the City, at a minimum, would consider the data and analyses contained in the EIR when making their permit determinations. Prior to development of the Project, discretionary permits and approvals as listed below must be obtained from local, State and federal agencies.

General Plan Amendment No. 17-01 proposes to change the existing General Plan land use designation from Mixed Use to Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan (GSP). The land use designations within the GSP district would include Residential 4 – 20 dwelling units per acre (R 4-20), General Commercial (GC), Park, Open Space, Drainage Facilities, Utilities, Roads. In addition, the Project area would include Utility/R 4-20, Utility/General Commercial, and Open Space Overlays.

Zone Change No. 17-02 proposes to change the existing zones from CM – Commercial Manufacturing, M2 – Industrial, and MR – Restricted Manufacturing to Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan (GSP).

Zoning Code Amendment No. 24-01 is required to amend the Zoning Code (Title 18 of the city of Grand Terrace Municipal Code) to create a new Specific Plan District, the Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan District and its new zoning designations as listed in ZC 17-02 above.

Specific Plan No. 17-01 proposes the adoption of the proposed Gateway at Terrace Specific Plan (Specific Plan) document that establishes the necessary plans, development standards, regulations, zoning, infrastructure requirements, design guidelines and implementation programs on which subsequent project-related development activities (i.e., future implementing development projects) are to be founded. It is intended that Site and Architectural Review, grading permits and building permits, or any other permitting actions applicable to this area be consistent with the Specific Plan.

Tentative Tract Map No. 18-01 is for conveyance purposes and proposes to establish legal parcels for the Planning Areas (PAs) 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, and 22 within the proposed Specific Plan, dedicate right of way for public roadway construction, and establish easements for public utilities and other facilities. Subsequent maps will be required for any future development on all other PAs within the Specific Plan to occur.

Development Agreement and Exchange Agreement – A Development Agreement and Exchange Agreement are proposed to identify parties responsible for the construction of major infrastructure improvements, phasing schedule of development and infrastructure improvements, financial commitments for the construction of the infrastructure improvements, vesting of applicable codes and standards, vesting of development impact fees for a specified term and appropriate extension metrics, and the terms and conditions for the exchange of developer owned land for city property.

2.3 Statement of Objectives

The following objectives have been established for the Project by the City and Project applicant:

- **Objective 1:** Authorize the redevelopment of a blighted and under-utilized property.
- **Objective 2:** Organize a mix of land uses which will provide a variety of housing and businesses, spurring new jobs and services.
- **Objective 3:** Implement development standards and design guidelines establishing a vibrant community.
- **Objective 4:** Provide diversity of high-quality architecture and landscape with appropriate open space areas.
- **Objective 5:** Provide for the distribution, location and extent, and intensity of major components of public and private roads, sewage, water, drainage, dry utilities, and other essential facilities within the Project area and/or needed to support the proposed land uses.
- **Objective 6:** Establish compatibility standards and guidelines to minimize negative impacts on adjacent properties.
- **Objective 7:** Include operational and maintenance plans for financing improvements.
- **Objective 8:** Provide the extension of Commerce Way from its current terminus point southward to Taylor Street and then Main Street.

- **Objective 9:** Provide public recreational facilities to meet the needs of the community by incorporating a public park with a new baseball field and playground.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed for the Project by the City on February 8, 2021, and the State of California Clearinghouse issued project number SCH # 2021020110 for the Project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the NOP was circulated to interested agencies, groups, and individuals for a period of 30 days, during which comments were solicited and received, pertaining to environmental issues/topics that the Draft EIR should evaluate. These NOP responses were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR, which upon release, was made available to all Responsible/Trustee Agencies and interested groups and individuals, as required under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15105 and 15087.

The State-mandated public review of the Draft EIR began on Monday June 26, 2023 and concluded on Monday August 14, 2023 (50 days). The Final EIR was distributed in April 2024. The Final EIR includes a Response to Comments package, which presents all written comments received during the public review period of the Draft EIR and includes responses to these comments and associated changes made to the Draft EIR.

The Final EIR includes any exhibits or appendices thereto, the list of persons, organizations and public agencies which commented on the Draft EIR, the comments which were received by the City regarding the Draft EIR, and the City's written responses to comments raised in the public review and comment process, all of which are incorporated herein and made a part hereof by reference. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15084, the Final EIR has been reviewed and analyzed by the City as the lead agency with respect to the Project. The Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the project on June 6, 2024.

The following findings for the Project and facts in support of each findings are based upon substantial evidence in the record.

4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DETERMINED TO HAVE NO IMPACTS OR BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The City finds, based upon the analysis presented in Sections 4.0 and 7.0 of the EIR (herein EIR collectively refers to the Draft and Final EIR), as the following environmental effects of the Project either have no impact or are less than significant, and, therefore, no mitigation measures are required. The City hereby finds that existing regulatory requirements, policies, and/or Project conditions have been identified and incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the potentially significant effect on the environment to a less than significant level.

4.1 Aesthetics

Impact 4.1-1: *Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

Scenic views from the Project site includes the Blue Mountain to the east as well as views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the north. Although Blue Mountain provides terrain that offers scenic views that attract residents and visitors to the City, it is not officially designated as a scenic vista. Furthermore, the Grand Terrace General Plan (GP) does not officially designate any scenic vistas near the Project site. Due to the lack of officially designated scenic vistas, the Project site is not considered a visually sensitive area. The Project site will not significantly impact views of Blue Mountain due to existing obstructed views. Additionally, all buildings constructed within the Project site would be designed to not exceed maximum height standards for nonresidential and residential development pursuant to the proposed Specific Plan and Grand Terrace Municipal Code (Grand Terrace MC). Adherence to height standards of the Specific Plan and Grand Terrace MC would ensure Project buildout would not substantially degrade views of scenic resources surrounding the Project site, including Blue Mountain or the background ridgelines. For these reasons and the reasons discussed in the EIR, the Project's impact on scenic vistas would be less than significant, and no mitigation relating to this issue is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not significantly affect scenic vistas. Potential aesthetic impacts to scenic views are considered less than significant. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.1-6 through 4.1-7.

Impact 4.1-2: *Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?*

Level of Significance: No Impact

No adopted State of California (State) or San Bernardino County (County) scenic highways exist within the City. Scenic Route 38 (SR-38) is the nearest route eligible to be a State Designated Scenic Highway and is located approximately nine miles northeast of the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not damage or obstruct any scenic resource (e.g., trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings) within a state scenic highway. For these reasons and for the reasons discussed in the EIR, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no mitigation relating to this issue is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not significantly affect scenic highways and corridors. Potential aesthetic impacts to scenic highways and corridors are considered less than significant. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.1-7 through 4.1-8.

Impact 4.1-3: *Would the Project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project would require several entitlements that include a Zone Change and General Plan Amendment, Zone Change Amendment, Specific Plan adoption, Tentative Tract Map, and the Project also includes a Development Agreement. Following approval of these actions, the Project site would be fully zoned as Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan (GSP). Through compliance of development standards, design standards and guidelines, Grand Terrace GP policies, Specific Plan standards, and the City's Zoning Code, the Project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality in an urbanized area. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not significantly affect the visual character of the City. Potential impacts are considered less than significant. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this no impact determination.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages p. 4.1-8 through 4.1-10.

Impact 4.1-4: *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project would consist of residential, commercial, public facilities, and public park land uses, which would create a new source of substantial light to the surrounding areas by converting predominately vacant land to mixed-use development. All future Project development would be subject to Grand Terrace MC §§18.60.040, 18.74.080, and 18.80.140, which establish lighting standards and illumination requirements that would reduce the impacts from light and glare. The Project would comply with the lighting standards presented in the Specific Plan which ensure exterior lighting would be located and designed to minimize direct glare outside of the specific area of use and lighting sources would be shielded, diffused, or directed to avoid glare to pedestrians and motorists. Additionally, all development would be required to prepare a comprehensive lighting plan, in conjunction with other site plans, for City review and approval. Although the Project would create a new source of light and glare in the area, all development within the Project area would be subject to the applicable urban lighting design standards set forth in the Specific Plan and Grand Terrace MC. Therefore, adherence with applicable Specific Plan

and Grand Terrace MC design standards would ensure that the Project's light and glare impacts are less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Potential impacts are considered less than significant. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.1-10 through 4.1-11.

4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Impact 7.1-1: *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

Impact 7.1-2: *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

Impact 7.1-3: *Would the project 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))?*

Impact 7.1-4: *Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

Impact 7.1-5: *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

Level of Significance: No Impact

No Project actions were concluded to be less than significant, but rather determined to not have an impact as the site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, there are no lands within the City that are currently under a Williamson Act contract, and there is no forest or timberland present on the Project site that could be lost from Project implementation.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance as concluded in the EIR; would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Contract; would not conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland; would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; and would not result in the conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or

conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No potential impacts are anticipated to occur. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this no impact determination.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR, pages 7-1 through 7-3.

4.3 Air Quality

Impact 4.2-3: *Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has set forth Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) to determine whether a project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The LST methodology, used in the EIR, assesses localized impacts associated with Project-specific emissions. Here, neither construction nor operation of the Project would result in pollutant concentrations that would exceed the applicable SCAQMD thresholds. The Project's emissions would be well below the SCAQMD's applicable LSTs. For these reasons and the reasons set forth in the EIR, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts which would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.2-30 through 4.2-39.

Impact 4.2-4: *Would the Project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Level of Significance: *No Impact*

The Project does not involve land uses that would result in emissions, such as those leading to odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. The Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, the Project would not create objectionable odors, and no impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from the emissions of other emissions beyond those concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.2-39 through 4.2-40.

4.4 Biological Resources

Impact 4.3-4: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The Project site is surrounded by existing development including commercial manufacturing uses to the north; I-215 to the northwest; residential uses and industrial uses to the south (south of W. Main Street); commercial manufacturing uses, residential uses, manufacturing uses, industrial uses, Veteran's Freedom Park, and Grand Terrace High School, and vacant parcels to the east; and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railway followed by industrial and commercial uses to the west. The Project site does not function as a regional wildlife corridor or habitat linkage due to the existing freeway, railway, and surrounding urbanization. Thus, the Project site does not support regional wildlife movement, and therefore implementation of the Project would not substantially interfere with the movement of native fish or wildlife species.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.3-42.

Impact 4.3-5: *Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

All development facilitated by the Project would be constructed in compliance with the Specific Plan's residential and non-residential development standards pursuant to the Grand Terrace MC. The Project would support the preservation of biological resources pursuant to Grand Terrace GP Policies 4.2.2 and 4.2.5. The City does not have a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The Project proposes streetscape landscaping that includes, but is not limited to, canopy, skyline, understory, and background trees that could host new habitat for special-status species. Within commercially development areas, interior landscaping shall be installed to create shade and visual interest; parking lot screen and shade trees shall be located within landscape planters and perimeter buffers; and residential alleys shall include landscaped areas on both sides of the lane adjacent to selected garages and accent shrubs would be planted to highlight unit entries. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and a less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.3-42 through 4.3-43.

Impact 4.3-6: *Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

Level of Significance: *No Impact*

The Project and off-site improvement areas are not located within the boundaries of a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of such plans and no impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.3-43.

4.5 Energy

Impact 4.5-1: *Would the Project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

All Project buildings will comply with energy and fuel efficiency laws and regulations; thus, the Project would not result in a wasteful or inefficient use of energy. In addition, the estimated Project energy uses are de minimis and not wasteful or inefficient. Therefore, potential impacts are considered less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.5-12 through 4.5-18.

Impact 4.6-2: *Would the Project conflict with or obstruct a state or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

Future development on the Project site would be designed in conformance with Title 24 energy standards and the 2022 Green Building Code. Additionally, the Project would be designed in accordance with Grand Terrace GP and goals, policies, and Grand Terrace MC regulations pertaining to energy efficiency and design standards. Compliance with goals, policies, and design standards would also be verified through the City's design review process. Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) also referred as the Connect SoCal and Connect SoCal's Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction. It is not anticipated that buildout of the Project would conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or efficiency, and therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.5-19.

4.6 Geology and Soils

Impact 4.6-1: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

There are no known active or potentially active faults on or trending toward the Project site and the Project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest active fault is located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the Project site. Due to the Project's close proximity to the San Jacinto Fault Zone, strong ground motion caused by a seismic event is expected to occur during the lifetime of the development; however, buildout of the Project would be designed according to the latest California Building Code (CBC) soil and seismic standards and in conformance with all applicable Grand Terrace MC design standards that aim to minimize or resist structural collapse from strong seismic activity. Therefore, construction of future developments within the Project would not cause potentially substantial

adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. Impacts are less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding fault rupture or strong seismic ground shaking as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-11.

Impact 4.6-2: *Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The Project site is in proximity to the San Jacinto Fault Zone and is expected to experience a strong ground motion seismic event during the lifetime of the development. Large earthquakes could occur on other faults in the Project area but are considered less likely than the San Jacinto fault zone due to lesser anticipated magnitudes and further distances from the Project. All Project development would consist of new construction in accordance with the latest CBC soils and seismic standards and in conformance with all applicable Grand Terrace MC standards to resist the effects of strong seismic ground shaking. In addition, all relevant documents would be submitted to the City's Engineering and Building Department for approval, as part of the City's discretionary review process. Furthermore, the Project would adhere to Grand Terrace Policies PHS 5.1.1, PHS 5.1.2, and PHS 5.1.4 to ensure that impacts concerning strong seismic ground shaking are further reduced. Compliance with the above policies would confirm the Project would be evaluated for impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards, comply with current seismic design standards, and include an approved drainage and erosion control plan to minimize impacts from erosion and sedimentation during grading. Therefore, the Project would not cause potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking and impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding fault rupture or strong seismic ground shaking as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-11 through 4.6-12.

Impact 4.6-3: *Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Level of Significance: Less than Significant

The Project site is not subject to a significant risk associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Notably, the Project site is not located within a zone identified as having a potential for liquefaction by the State or City. A less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts related to seismic ground failure including liquefaction as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-12 through 4.6-13.

Impact 4.6-4: *Would the Project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

iv. Landslides?

Level of Significance: No Impact

Considering the Project site's geologic conditions and distance from Blue Mountain, the potential for mass movement failures such as landslides or debris flows is very low. Furthermore, no loose, un-rooted rock that could fall or topple and roll were noted to be present at elevations above the Project site and therefore there would be no potential for rockfalls. In addition, the County's Geologic Hazard Overlay map for the City was reviewed. The Project site is not within a generalized landslide susceptibility area. The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides, and therefore no impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts related to seismic ground failure including landslides beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-13.

Impact 4.6-8: *Would the Project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

Level of Significance: Less than Significant

The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or an alternative wastewater disposal system. There are various existing sewer pipelines located along Commerce Way, De Berry Street, Van Buren Street, Pico

Street, and Taylor Street which connect flows from the existing off-site residences and businesses. As development is proposed on the Project site, sewer improvements would be designed and sized to tie into the existing sewer system which is adequately sized to accommodate the Project's projected flows. Wastewater collected from the Project would be conveyed through an existing 18-inch diameter sewer pipeline under I-215 to a wastewater treatment plant in the City of Colton. Future development facilitated by the Project would be required to analyze existing sewer capacity and determine if additional sewer facilities are needed to accommodate future wastewater generation rates. All sewer facility improvements would be constructed in accordance with the City of Grand Terrace and City of Colton requirements. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.6-17 through 4.6-18.

4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 4.7-2: *Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The proposed Project would be consistent with the SCAG's Connect SoCal and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Scoping Plan, and would be required to comply with existing regulations, including applicable measures from the City's General Plan. The Project would be directly affected by the outcomes of vehicle trips and energy consumption generating less carbon intensive emissions due to statewide compliance with future low carbon fuel standard amendments and increasingly stringent Renewable Portfolio Standards. As such, the Project would not conflict with any other State-level regulations pertaining to GHGs. The Project would not impede the State's progress towards carbon neutrality by 2045 under the 2022 Scoping Plan. The Project would be required to comply with applicable current and future regulatory requirements promulgated through the 2022 Scoping Plan. The Project does not conflict with the applicable plans and therefore, the Project does not have a significant impact.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Final EIR pages 4.7-24 through 4.7-30.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 4.8-1: *Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The routine transport, handling, or disposal of these hazardous materials would be temporary and adhere to applicable federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials including, but not limited to, those implemented by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), and the California Occupational Safety and Health Act (Cal/OSHA). All future development would adhere to the general Grand Terrace MC Chapter 8.54 general solid waste regulations in order to reduce the risk to life and property from the use, transportation, storage, treatment, or disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. Furthermore, Grand Terrace MC §13.20.150 would require future development projects within the Project site to comply with spill containment requirements which could include, but not be limited to, the installation of infiltration systems, berms, non-absorbent dikes, and absorbent socks. Grand Terrace MC §15.58.060 would also subject future development projects to diversion requirements which requires that 60 percent of the estimated tonnage of construction and demolition material generated from each covered project shall be diverted from disposal. Prior to construction, each project-specific applicant would be required to submit a waste management plan that accurately depicts that the specific project meets the diversion rate. Furthermore, all future development projects that handle hazardous materials in quantities equal to or greater than 55 gallons of a liquid; 500 pounds of a solid; or extremely hazardous substances above the threshold planning quantity; would be required to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) in accordance with §§ 25500–25543.3 of the Health and San Bernardino County Fire Protection District. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that impacts associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials are less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.8-14 through 4.8-15.

Impact 4.8-3: *Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The nearest school to the Project site is Grand Terrace High School located adjacent to the south-southeast of Planning Area (PA) 22. The use of hazardous materials that would be routinely handled on-site would be limited to cleaners, paints, and solvents typical for cleaning and fertilizers and pesticides for landscaping maintenance. These types of hazardous materials are not considered to be significantly

hazardous or acutely hazardous. PA 22, which is the closest PA to the Grand Terrace High School, would be developed with a lighted baseball field with a tot-lot/playground. The PA would be owned and maintained by the City. Hazardous materials used during operations (i.e., fertilizers and pesticides) of the proposed park would be handled in compliance with applicable regulations.

Since future development of the PAs 4, 5, 10 through 22 would handle hazardous materials in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations and the type of hazardous materials are not considered to be significantly hazardous or acutely hazardous, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.8-18 through 4.8-19.

Impact 4.8-4: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

Consistent with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) International E1527-13, DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List (Cortese List) and other data bases were searched during preparation of the Phase I ESAs (see **Appendices G-1** through **G-3**) and did not identify any parcels within the Project site as being on the Cortese List. In addition, the DTSC's EnviroStor Geographic Information System (GIS) Tool shows that there are four sites within half a mile of the Project site that were listed as contamination sites, but all four sites are classified with a "No Further Action" status which indicates that regulatory agencies have conducted or approved a clean-up or closure of the site and no adverse environmental impact is anticipated. A less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Final EIR page 4.8-19.

Impact 4.8-5: *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

Level of Significance: *No Impact*

The Project site is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; therefore, the Project would not result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area. The nearest public airport to the Project site is the San Bernardino International Airport in the City of San Bernardino, located at 1601 E. 3rd Street, #100, San Bernardino, CA 92408, approximately six miles northeast of the northern Project site boundary, and would therefore not subject people or workers to excessive noise impacts. No impact would occur in this regard.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with public or private airports as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.8-20.

Impact 4.8-6: *Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation of the Project, adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles would be maintained along public streets that abut the Project site. Furthermore, the proposed roadways would be designed in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements. In addition, all roads would be maintained during construction activities, and buildout of the Project's on-and off-site circulation improvements would provide additional points of access in the surrounding area. Construction or operations of the Project would not significantly disrupt or interfere with emergency access or impede access to nearby roadways or interfere with the City's emergency management program. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard and mitigation is not required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan as concluded in the Final EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.8-20 through 4.8-21.

Impact 4.8-7: *Would the Project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

Level of Significance: *No Impact*

The Project area is not located in a State Responsibility Area (SRA), or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ). According to CAL FIRE's FHSZ Map Viewer, the Project site is located in a LRA and is classified as a non-Very High FHSZ. Consequently, the Project would not directly, or indirectly expose people or structures significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires and no impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.8-21.

4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact 4.9-1: *Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

With implementation of the Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP), compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements, and implementation of BMPs, construction activities would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Chapter 13.20.260 of the Grand Terrace MC requires all construction projects covered by the NPDES general construction permit as well as construction projects less than one acre to submit SWQMP to the Director of Building & Safety/Public Works. Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP and a development-specific erosion control plan would ensure that future construction activities would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with the NPDES Municipal Permit. In addition to mandatory implementation of a SWQMP, the NPDES program also requires commercial land uses to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for operational activities and to implement a long-term water quality sampling and monitoring program, unless an exemption has been granted. Under the effective NPDES Permit, the Project Applicant (or the Project's occupant(s)) would be required to prepare a SWPPP for all future operational activities and implement a long-term water quality sampling and monitoring program or receive an exemption. Therefore, water quality impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.9-10 and 4.9-12.

Impact 4.9-2: *Would the Project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

Future development within the Project site would not directly extract groundwater and no potable groundwater wells are proposed. The Project-specific Water Supply Assessment (**Appendix K1** of the EIR) concluded that Riverside Highland Water Company (RHWC) has sufficient groundwater to meet existing and future demands. Accordingly, the potential for each future development within the Project site to substantially deplete groundwater supplies through means of groundwater extraction or increasing consumption of potable groundwater is less than significant. Preventative Low Impact Design (LID) BMPs are included in the Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to minimize impervious areas, maximize natural infiltration capacity, preserve existing drainage patterns, and re-vegetate disturbed areas. The Project site would incorporate a basin system to capture, treat, and infiltrate the storm water runoff. Additionally, the site would be designed – per the WQMP – to optimize the pervious surfaces with additional landscaping and park areas. The proposed drainage patterns would be consistent with existing drainage patterns. In addition to these LID Best Management Practices (BMPs), each future development within the Project site would comply with all other NPDES permitting to include BMPs that are required as part of a SWPPP. With these considerations, each future development would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies and impacts to groundwater supplies would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 as concluded in the Final EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.9-13 and 4.9-14.

Impact 4.9-3: *Would the Project 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?

Level of Significance: Less than Significant

All proposed site-specific drainage improvements would be analyzed as future projects are developed, and all site drainage would ultimately discharge to the existing storm drain system located on the low point of the Project site and then under I-215. Furthermore, all proposed improvements would adhere to the requirements of the City and the San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD). The NPDES, SWPPP, and WQMP created for the Project would also minimize potential impacts from erosion and siltation. Further, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan would also be implemented to further minimize potential siltation and erosion effects. The erosion control plan is required as part of the Municipal Stormwater Permitting Program. Implementation of dust control measures along with BMPs included in the NPDES, SWPPP, and WQMP would reduce potential environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 as concluded in the Final EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.9-14 and 4.9-15.

Impact 4.9-4: *Would the Project 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:*

Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Level of Significance: Less than Significant

All proposed site-specific drainage improvements would be analyzed as future projects are developed, and all site drainage would ultimately discharge to the existing storm drain system located on the low point of the Project site and then under I-215. Furthermore, all proposed improvements would adhere to the requirements of the City and the SBCFCD. Flows generated on-site are proposed to be conveyed via a storm drain system and discharged into a proposed basin that would be located within the southwestern portion of the Project site. The local project on-site and regional analyses demonstrated that the proposed development would not have adverse impacts on downstream facilities. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site resides within a Flood Zone Designation X, an area of minimal flood hazard. Therefore, based on the analysis performed, it can be concluded that the proposed drainage improvements would adequately convey flows. The Project would additionally involve the construction of new public roads which would be constructed with appropriate stormwater conveyance facilities such as curb and gutter. These public roads would add new shallow channelized flow paths for run-off to traverse the Project site toward the western drainage

facilities and proposed drainage basin. Curb and gutter would be adequately designed to account for the 100-year, 24-hour storm event without flooding. Additionally, future development within the Project site would be consistent with Grand Terrace GP Policy 4.3.3 which ensures open space would be utilized to protect public health and safety resulting from potential flood hazard conditions. As such, operation impacts as a result of Project implementation would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff or result in flooding on- or off-site as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.9-15 and 4.9-17.

Impact 4.9-5: *Would the Project 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:*

Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

All future development within the Project site would be required to obtain a General Construction Permit. The General Construction Permit requires implementation of a SWPPP, which would include BMPs designed to protect the quality of storm water runoff. Preparation, implementation, and participation with both the NPDES General Permit and the General Construction Permit, including the SWPPP and BMPs, would reduce the potential for storm water flows, and any potential contaminants contained within those flows, to be conveyed off-site during construction of the Project. As a result, short-term construction-related impacts associated with creating or contributing to runoff and additional sources of polluted runoff would be less than significant. Conformance with these requirements would be verified prior to any project approval and included as conditions of approval to any future project. Impacts would, therefore, be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.9-17 and 4.9-18.

Impact 4.9-6: *Would the Project 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:*

Impede or redirect flood flows?

Level of Significance: Less than Significant

The entirety of the Project site is classified as Zone X, an area noted as having a minimal flood hazard. In addition, there are no dams, reservoirs, or large water bodies near the Project site. Furthermore, according to the City's Flood Hazards Map, the City is not within a 100-year or a 500-year flood plain. As previously mentioned, the northern drainage course enters the Project Site at the westerly end of De Berry Street and travels southwesterly before entering the SBCFCD channel that directs flows off-site under I-215. The second drainage course enters the Project site on the north side of Van Buren Street near the easterly edge of PA 11 and storm water flows travel west and join the SBCFCD. The third drainage course enters the Project site along the northern portion of the existing Grand Terrace High School near the southeasterly edge of PA 20 and overflows travel through the existing school site and join the Gage Canal at the western edge of the Project site. Flows generated on-site would be adequately conveyed via a storm drain system, catch basin, and discharged into a proposed basin that would be located within the southwestern portion of the Project site. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact as the Project would not impede or redirect flood flows.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 impede or redirect flood flows as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.9-18.

Impact 4.9-7: *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

Level of Significance: Less than Significant

The Project site is not within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone and the Project site is not listed by the County of San Bernardino as being in any mapped dam inundation hazard zone, and there is no potential for the site to be impacted by a tsunami. Furthermore, the Project site is not downstream of large bodies of water or tanks which potentially could cause flooding and inundate the Project site. The risk of seiche damage following a seismic event at the Project site is considered low. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact and no mitigation is necessary.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.9-18 and 4.9-19.

Impact 4.9-8: *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

Project implementation would not conflict with or obstruct the Santa Ana River Basin Water Quality Control Plan and impacts would be less than significant. The Project site lies within the Upper Santa Ana Valley Riverside-Arlington Subbasin (Basin Number 8-002.03). The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) requires local agencies to form groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) for the high and medium priority basins. The Western Municipal Water District was elected to serve as the GSA for the basin. The Western Municipal Water District developed a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Upper Santa Ana Valley Riverside-Arlington Subbasin. Future development would be required to comply with all applicable aspects of the Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Upper Santa Ana Valley Riverside-Arlington Subbasin. The Project does not propose development at this time. Construction and operations of the Planning Areas would be project-specific and future development would be subject to project-specific City and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) discretionary review and approval. As such, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.9-19.

4.10 Land Use and Planning

Impact 4.10-1: *Would the Project physically divide an established community?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

Buildout of the Project would create an established community in support of Grand Terrace GP Policy LU 2.1.6 by introducing mixed uses to the City. The Project also proposes roadway improvements that would provide points of connection for the surrounding residents and workers. Since the Project would

not divide an established community and would serve to improve existing conditions consistent with the Grand Terrace GP, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not physically divide an established community as concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.10-6 through 4.10-7.

Impact 4.10-2: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. As set forth in the EIR, regionally, the Project would comply with the goals and policies presented in Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Locally, the Project would comply with the City's General Plan and its land use goals and policies, and the City's Development Code. For these reasons and the reasons set forth in the EIR, the Project would have a less than significant impact relating to this issue, and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that 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 as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.10-7 through 4.10-22.

4.11 Mineral Resources

Impact 7.2-1: *Would the project 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?*

Impact 7.2-2: *Would the project 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 plans?*

Level of Significance: *No Impact*

The Project site is located within a State Department of Conservation designated Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3). MRZ 3 is defined as an area containing minerals of undetermined significance. However, according to the City's General Plan EIR, there are no known or identified mineral resources of regional or

statewide importance within the General Plan Area. No mineral resource or mineral resource extraction or processing activity occurs on or adjacent to the Project site. Buildout of the Project would not result in the loss of City or State-identified mineral resources. Therefore, no impacts associated with the loss of mineral resources would occur and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to the loss of mineral resources as concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 7-4.

4.12 Noise

Impact 4.11-3: *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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The closest airport to the Project site is the San Bernardino International Airport located approximately 6 miles to the northeast. The Project is not within 2.0 miles of a public airport or within an airport land use plan. Additionally, there are no private airstrips located within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the Project would not expose people working in the Project area to excessive airport- or airstrip-related noise levels and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts stemming from proximity to airport land use plan areas or private airstrips as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.11-24 and 4.11-25.

4.13 Population and Housing

Impact 4.12-1: *Would the Project 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)?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The Project would generate a residential population of approximately 1,911 persons as well as employment opportunities in

the City. All growth is planned in accordance with the SCAG Connect SoCal Plan and would improve the City's job-housing imbalance. The Project's potential employment would be covered by the regional and local labor force, including the Project's future residents due to the development of up to 695 dwelling units. A less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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) as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.12-9 through 4.12-11.

Impact 4.12-2: *Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant*

The Project proposes up to 695 dwelling units and would increase the population within the City by approximately 1,911 persons. There are three existing, non-conforming occupied residential units within the commercial area that are not currently proposed for redevelopment but could be developed in the future and there are two vacant housing units on the residential portion of the Project that are proposed for residential redevelopment. The Project would provide 690 additional housing beyond the number of units lost. Considering the 2022 vacancy rate of 4.1 percent within the City, there are approximately 203 vacant units that could accommodate the existing residents. To further assist existing residents, the County could provide the existing residents assistance in locating replacement housing through the County's Housing Authority. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from the displacement of individuals or housing as concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.12-11 through 4.12-12.

4.14 Public Services

Impact 4.13-1: *Would the Project 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 any of the public services:*

I) Fire protection?

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

The Project Applicant would be required to pay Development Impact Fees (DIFs) toward new fire facilities. With payment of these fees, the Project would receive adequate fire protection service and would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and would not adversely affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Development of the Project would not conflict with existing fire structures or require modification of fire protection facilities. Compliance with applicable local and state regulations would ensure that Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact to fire protection services.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to fire services beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.13-10 through 4.13-12.

Impact 4.13-1: *Would the Project 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 any of the public services:*

II) Police protection?

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

The Project applicant would pay the required Police Facilities Impact fees, property taxes, and other revenues generated by development that would be available to the City to offset any increased costs for law enforcement services with little or no net effect on the City's budget. Furthermore, the San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department's response to a letter from the City requesting information on the Department's ability to serve build-out of the Specific Plan indicated that the Project would be adequately served. Furthermore, prior to commencement of construction activities, Project plans would be reviewed by applicable local agencies to ensure compliance with the Grand Terrace MC as well as all applicable regulations to ensure adequate site signage, lighting and other crime safety preventative measures are implemented. Construction of the Project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Project would not substantially affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives such that new facilities are required. The Project also would include design elements such as lighting of streets, walkways, and bikeways; visibility of doors and windows from the street; and fencing of the property. These measures would help reduce demands for law enforcement services and impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to police services beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.13-12 through 4.13-13.

Impact 4.13-1: *Would the Project 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 any of the public services:*

III) Schools?

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

The Project would create a direct demand for public school services within the Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD), as the subject property would contain residential uses that would generate increased population likely including school-aged children requiring public education. The Project is expected to bring additional residents to the school district; however, with anticipated increases of population per the City's GP, the CJUSD and the City ensure adequate planning for anticipated increases in population that indirectly impacts school enrollment. As school facilities within the City have been overall declining in enrollment, CJUSD facilities are anticipated to have sufficient capacity for the growth in the Grand Terrace GP and Project area. Additionally, the Project applicant would be required to pay the impact fees levied by the CJUSD, set within the limits of California SB 50 (Greene). Project implementation would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Compliance with applicable local and state regulations would ensure that Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact to school services.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to schools beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Final EIR pages 4.13-13 through 4.13-15.

Impact 4.13-1: *Would the Project 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 any of the public services:*

IV) Other public facilities?

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

Project implementation would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered other public facilities, need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. The Project's forecasted population growth would incrementally increase the demand for library services, specifically at the Grand Terrace Branch Library which is located approximately two miles to the northeast of the Project Site. Although the Project would increase population growth in the area, Grand Terrace GP Policy 7.1.6 ensures that the City will work with the County to evaluate the feasibility for the development of new library facilities within the City, to meet future demands. The County Library system has developed a Strategic Plan that identifies goals and objectives, including financial management and fundraising strategies, to maintain and enhance library facilities to meet future demands. In addition, the Project would pay a development impact fee pursuant to Grand Terrace MC Chapter 4.80 Development Impact Fees, which would require each applicant to pay a development fee determined by the table in Chapter 4.80.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to other public facilities beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Final EIR page 4.13-15.

4.15 Recreation

Impact 4.14-1: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

Although Project buildout of the residential component would create a direct demand for park facilities, the need for parks would be addressed through the Project's provision of open space and recreational uses such as a 4.97-acre neighborhood park and pedestrian and bicycle trails that would provide connectivity between Planning Area 22 and the existing Veterans Freedom Park. With the development of the proposed neighborhood park, pedestrian and bicycle trails, it is anticipated that the Project would not significantly increase the use of other nearby off-site neighborhood parks, regional parks, or

recreational facilities. Therefore, the Project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of planned or existing recreational facilities and a less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 as concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.14-4 through 4.14-5.

Impact 4.14-2: *Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

In addition to providing on-site park and recreational facilities, the Project would pay applicable park impact fees as established by the City, pursuant to the Quimby Act and local City Regulations (provision of on-site park and recreational facilities may be credited against required Quimby Act fees). According to Chapter 4: Open Space Element of the Grand Terrace GP, the City's parkland standard of five acres per 1,000 people is the highest allowed under the Quimby Act. Based on the proposed development plans, the Project's estimated 1,911 residents (assumes an average of 2.75 occupants per residence for this type of community and 695 dwelling units) would equate to a dedication requirement of 9.5 acres. The Project would comply with Quimby Act and City regulations through the dedication of 4.97 acres of parkland within PA 22 and/or payment of in-lieu fees for parks/recreation purposes, as determined by the City. Additionally, the proposed multi-family residential developments would be required to provide amenities for the residents. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction or expansion of facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment and therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate impacts from the construction or expansion of existing park facilities beyond those concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.14-5 through 4.14-6.

4.16 Transportation

Impact 4.15-1: *Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project would provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Project would not result in any disruption to existing transit facilities. Although new transit trips are anticipated to be generated by the Project, the Project does not propose any changes that would modify transit stop locations or transit headways. Additional transit ridership demand could increase boarding and alighting activity at existing bus stops and transit terminals located near the Project site. However, the Project is consistent with the adopted plans regarding transit infrastructure and is not expected to decrease the performance or safety of these facilities. Therefore, the Project is considered to have a less than significant impact on public transit. The Project would adhere to all relevant circulation regulations and applicable policy and planning documents. Adherence with both state and local planning directives would ensure that the Project's impacts to a program, plan, ordinance, or policy pertaining to transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities is less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities as concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.15-14 through 4.15-16.

Impact 4.15-2: *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

As shown in **Table 4.15-3** of the EIR, the Project is forecast to generate 32.9 vehicle miles traveled (VMT)/SP in Baseline (2022) conditions and 28.3 VMT/SP in Cumulative (2040) conditions. The relevant threshold is below the County's baseline VMT, which is 37.6 VMT/SP in the 2022 Baseline condition. Therefore, based on the City's adopted significance criteria, the Project VMT/SP is below the applicable threshold for project-generated VMT.

For the Project's effect on VMT, as shown in **Table 4.15-3** of the EIR, both the 10-mile and 27-mile radius boundaries reflect a modest decrease in VMT/SP when compared to the No Project condition, indicating that the Project would either reduce trips on a per-person basis or would decrease trip lengths in the Project area. Therefore, based on the City's adopted significance criteria, the Project VMT/SP is below the applicable threshold for project-related effects on VMT. Based on the results previously discussed, the Project's VMT impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding conflicts with CEQA transportation guidelines beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.15-16 through 4.15-19.

Impact 4.15-4: *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project would result in adequate emergency access. During construction, access roads will be kept and maintained to allow for safe passage of emergency response vehicles. The Project's proposed circulation would be designed in conformance with applicable Grand Terrace MC design guidelines and regulations, which include but are not limited to use of traffic control devices and payment of fair share contributions. Furthermore, the Project would be void of gated communities and speed bumps and thus free and clear access would exist for emergency personnel throughout the Project area. Lastly, the Project's Specific Plan and future project-specific development plans would be reviewed by the City Engineer and Fire Department to ensure that adequate emergency access is provided. Therefore, the Project's impact concerning emergency access would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from impaired emergency access beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.15-19 through 4.15-20.

4.17 Utilities and Service Systems

Impact 4.17-1: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

RHWC's future water extraction is projected to be 5,131 acre-feet (AF) for Year 2045 and future water supply is projected to be 5,900 AF by Year 2045, concluding a surplus water supply of 769 AF. The Integrated Regional Urban Water Management Plan (IRUWMP) has verified that RHWC has sufficient water supplies available during average, single dry, and multiple dry water years within a 25-year

projection that will meet the projected demand associated with the Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses (see Impact 4.17-2 below for more information).

Furthermore, the Project would demonstrate consistency with the Grand Terrace MC Chapter 15.56 Water Efficient Landscape which requires that landscape design, installation, maintenance, and management be water efficient; and that the use of water is limited to the amount reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served. This would apply to the Project's residential and non-residential uses.

The Project would receive sewer service by constructing on-site sewer lines that would connect to existing sewer lines adjacent to the development areas. The regional sewer system was analyzed in the Colton Wastewater Treatment Plant 2016 Master Plan and was determined to have capacity for existing and proposed flows for the area and no upgrades to the system would be required. In addition, project specific applicants would pay fees pursuant to Grand Terrace MC Chapter 4.80 that would cover the City's cost to fund plan review, coordination, and inspection of proposed wastewater collection system improvements. Impacts associated with wastewater would be less than significant.

All new Project-related site-specific drainage improvements would be developed and analyzed as future projects are developed and entitled. All site drainage would ultimately discharge at the existing low point of the Project site and then under I-215. All proposed improvements would be constructed to the requirements of the City and the SBCFCD. Southern California Edison (SCE) can provide the Project sufficient electricity and would not be required to construct additional facilities. Therefore, buildout of the Project would not require the construction or unanticipated relocation of electric power facilities resulting in unanticipated environmental effects. Project operational use of gasoline and diesel would represent a 0.25 percent increase of gasoline use and 0.11 percent increase of diesel use in the County. Fuel demands associated with the Project would not require the construction of additional gas stations or refineries. Provision of telecommunication services to serve the Project site may involve the extension of services for existing providers and/or the petition for additional providers not currently present in the City or serving the Project site. Existing telecommunication lines would be located within adjacent rights-of-way and within existing areas of disturbance such as those adjacent to existing roadways. Any new facilities required for the Project would be constructed within the development area and would be placed underground as per the Grand Terrace MC, Title 13. The construction of substantial new telecommunication infrastructure would not be required. Therefore, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from the increased demand on public facilities beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.17-11 through 4.17-16.

Impact 4.17-2: *Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The WSA projected water demand of the Project at 2,000 gal/acre/day which would result in an annual demand of 273 AF of potable water. This is based on the anticipated population growth in the service area and the expected change in per-capita consumption. RHWC's extraction in 2015 was 2,964 AF and future water extraction is 5,900 AF on a normal year and 6,490 AF on a dry year. Therefore, RHWC has a reliable water supply to supply water to the proposed Project and entire service area. The IRUWMP has verified that RHWC has sufficient water supplies available during average, single dry, and multiple dry water years within a 25-year projection that will meet the projected demand associated with the proposed Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses. Pursuant to SB 221 §66473.7 and SB 610 §10910, RHWC would have sufficient water supplies to meet the demands of the Project in addition to the existing and other projected demands during normal, single dry, and multiple dry years over the next 20 years. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to water supplies beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.17-16 through 4.17-19.

Impact 4.17-3: *Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

Buildout of the Project would generate approximately 27,455 gallons per day or 0.023 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater, as determined by the Sewer System Analysis (**Appendix K2** of the EIR). As stated above, the Project site would be served by the Colton Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) which has a current treatment capacity of 7 MGD, and the plant treats an average of 5.6 MGD. Thus, Colton WWTP has a remaining wastewater treatment capacity of 1.4 MGD. The Project's generated wastewater would represent less than two percent of the Colton WWTP remaining treatment capacity. Therefore, wastewater generated by the Project would be adequately treated at the Colton WWTP. The additional wastewater (quantity and type) that would be generated by the Project and treated by the Colton WWTP would not impede the treatment plant's ability to continue to meet its wastewater treatment requirements.

Additionally, according to the Sewer System Analysis (**Appendix K2** of the EIR), the Project's projected average sewage flows would be approximately 27,455 gallons of sewage per day. The Sewer System Analysis concluded that the existing and local collector sewers have adequate capacity to serve the

Project. In addition, all wastewater utility improvements and proposed connections to the existing wastewater system would be constructed and installed in conformance with the Grand Terrace MC and the City of Colton requirements. This would ensure that wastewater collection facilities are properly designed, implemented, operated, and maintained; thereby furthering efficiency and adequacy of facilities while reducing facilities lifecycle costs. As applicable, each project applicant would also pay a DIF pursuant to the fees listed in the Grand Terrace MC Chapter 4.80 and additional capital costs to extend the existing sewer lines, as well as applicable sewer connection and service fees, which act to fund future improvement plans, operations, and maintenance of existing wastewater collection facilities. Therefore, buildout of the Project would have little or no net effect on the operation of wastewater collection facilities or wastewater treatment capacity. Impacts would be less than significant, and mitigation is not required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding wastewater treatment demand beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.17-19 through 4.17-20.

Impact 4.17-4: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure and would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. All future project-specific development within the Project site would utilize City-approved solid waste generation rates pursuant to Grand Terrace MC Chapter 15.58.060. In addition, each development would be required to initiate service for solid waste collection and pay any fees associated with solid waste removal. Furthermore, each future development project would be required to comply with ongoing waste management programs and requirements implemented by the City.

Buildout of the Project would also comply with all applicable State requirements related to solid waste, including AB 341 and 1826, by implementing a recycling program to separate recyclable, and recyclable organic materials, from non-recyclable solid waste and coordinating with the respective waste hauler(s) for disposal at a proper facility. These requirements are designed to move California to its statewide goal of a 75 percent recycling rate, including a reduction in the level of organic waste disposal by 50 percent from its current levels by 2020.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding solid waste generation beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.17-20 through 4.17-21.

Impact 4.17-5: *Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

Project buildout would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The Project does not propose any activities that would conflict with the applicable programmatic requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with established solid waste policies beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.17-21.

4.18 Wildfire

Impact 4.18-1: *If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project:*

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

The Project area is not located in an SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ. According to CAL FIRE's FHSZ Map Viewer, the Project site occurs in a LRA and is not within a Very High FHSZ. The Project would be developed near regional and local evacuation routes and would be developed in conformance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations and design standards. The Project also includes roadway/circulation improvements that would improve the local circulation system and result in better local evacuation response and services for the City. Therefore, the Project would not impair and adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate impacts to established emergency response or evacuation plans beyond those concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.18-7 through 4.18-8.

Impact 4.18-2: *If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project:*

- b) 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?*

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

The Project would receive fire protection services by the San Bernardino County Fire Station 23 and would pay development impact fees pursuant to the Grand Terrace MC to help improve fire protection services in the City. Furthermore, CAL FIRE works closely with the building industry when implementing building codes and defensible space requirements to ensure development matches the fire hazards for the development area. Future development within the Project site would be constructed in compliance with the Fire Code and California Building Code and would not expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire by exacerbating wildfire risks.

Wildfires may occur in wildland areas that surround the Project site; however, wildfires would not be significantly increased in frequency, duration, or size with future development within the Project site. Additionally, the Project site is surrounded largely by existing development and flat terrain. Lands classified as Very High FHSZs are over a mile away from the Project site and the slopes ascend away from the areas planned for development. Furthermore, the Fire Hazard Abatement (FHA) Program would reduce the amount of flammable materials within the Project site, limiting fuel for wildfires to spread and future development would convert the Project site from readily ignitable fuels to ignition resistant landscapes and structures. As previously stated, the Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 air filtration systems have an average particle size removal efficiency of approximately 75 percent for 0.3 to 1.0 µg/m³ (DPM) and 90 percent for 1.0 to 10 µg/m³ (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and future development within the Project site would adhere to the Fire Code and California building code to reduce exposure to pollutant concentrations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate wildfire impacts beyond those concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.18-8 and 4.18-10.

Impact 4.18-3: *If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project:*

- c) 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?*

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant

The Project area is not located in an SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, and the Project site occurs in an LRA. The Project contains various infrastructure improvements that would be installed in two phases.

The Project includes construction of infrastructure improvements including on- and off-site sewer, water, storm drainage, dry utilities, and roadway and traffic signal facilities. All proposed improvements would be constructed to meet the requirements of the City of Grand Terrace and the San Bernardino Flood Control District (SBCFCD) and would comply with all Grand Terrace GP policies and Specific Plan and Grand Terrace MC design standards and provisions. Therefore, the installation and maintenance of associated infrastructure would result in less than significant impacts regarding temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment and no mitigation measures are required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to the installation of infrastructure beyond those concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.18-10.

Impact 4.18-4: *If located in or near SRA or lands classified as Very High FHSZ, would the Project:*

a) 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?

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant*

Due to the relatively flat topography of the site, along with the location and nature of the existing development surrounding the Project site, people and/or structures would not be exposed to significant risks, including post-fire downslope flooding or landslides. Additionally, the Project is a Specific Plan that could consist of individual smaller development projects; however, a specific development is not proposed at this time. Construction and operation within the Planning Areas would be project-specific and future development would be subject to project-specific City discretionary review and approval. Furthermore, compliance with applicable state and local regulations would ensure that impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial post-fire flooding or landslide impacts beyond those concluded in the EIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR page 4.18-11.

5.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH CAN BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The City finds, based upon the threshold criteria for significance presented in the EIR, that all of the following potentially significant environmental effects of the Project can be avoided or reduced to insignificance with feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR. No substantial evidence has been submitted to, or identified by the City that indicates that the following impacts would in fact, occur at levels that would necessitate a determination of significance.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126(b), requires a description of any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed Project is implemented.

5.1 Biological Resources

Impact 4.3-1: *Would the Project 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

No special-status plant species were observed on-site during the field survey. Based on habitat requirements for specific special-status plant species and the availability and quality of habitat needed by each species, it was determined that the Project site does not provide suitable habitat for any of the special-status plant species or special-status wildlife except for potential burrowing owls, that were determined to have the potential to occur in the vicinity of the Project site. To further avoid any potential impacts to biological resources, implementation of Mitigation Measures (MM)s **BIO-1** through **BIO-3** will ensure a less than significant impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant effect on the environment to below a level of significance with implementation of **MMs BIO-1** and **BIO-2**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.3, Biological Resources** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM BIO-1: To avoid impacts to nesting migratory and/or special-status birds, the removal of any vegetation with the potential to support nesting migratory and/or special-status birds should be performed outside of the nesting season (February 1 through August 31, but potentially earlier if the site can support nesting raptors). If vegetation

must be removed during the nesting season, then a qualified biologist should perform a nesting bird survey no more than three days prior to the removal of any vegetation. If active nests are identified at the site, then the nests should be avoided with an adequate buffer as determined by the biologist until the nests are no longer active and the young can survive independently from the nest.

MM BIO-2:

A qualified biologist shall conduct a take avoidance (pre-construction) survey of all suitable habitat areas for burrowing owl. The survey shall follow the 2012 California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, which indicates that a survey should be performed 14 to 30 days prior to any disturbance activities, with a follow up survey within 24 hours prior to the disturbance. If any burrowing owls are present at the time of the planned disturbance, then the burrowing owls will be passively excluded or passively relocated from the site to avoid direct harm to individual owls; however, exclusion/relocation of nesting owls must occur outside of the breeding season (February 1 to September 15) to avoid impacts to active nests. The exclusion/relocation of owls must be approved by CDFW. If applicable, a Burrowing Owl Exclusion/Relocation Plan should be prepared and submitted to CDFW for review and approval.

MM BIO-3:

If the Crotch bumble bee is no longer a candidate or listed species under the California Endangered Species Act, then this mitigation measure shall not be required.

The Project site was surveyed for Crotch bumble bees and found to have a low potential for Crotch bumble bees. No bees were observed on the Project Site. As such, the following measures shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to this species:

- Survey: To the extent feasible, construction activities (i.e., demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) shall occur outside of the Crotch's bee flight season (February 1 through October 31). If construction activities must occur during the flight season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for Crotch's bumble bee queens, gynes, and colonies. The survey shall be conducted during optimal weather conditions (e.g., warm, sunny days between 65 and 90 degrees Fahrenheit and with wind conditions less than 8 miles per hour). If the survey is negative, no further assessment shall be required, and construction activities shall be allowed to proceed without any further requirements.

If Crotch bumble bee is detected during the survey, the following measures shall be implemented:

- CESA Compliance: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, it shall be demonstrated that CESA-required consultation with CDFW regarding the project's effects to Crotch bumble bee has occurred. If take of Crotch bumble bee is expected, an incidental take permit (ITP) shall be obtained from CDFW. In addition, if an incidental take permit is issued for the project that covers

Crotch bumble bee, that document shall supersede any inconsistent measures provided in this report.

- **Compensatory Mitigation:** Compensatory mitigation for permanent direct impacts to suitable Crotch's bumble bee habitat shall be offset through compensatory mitigation, which may include, but is not necessarily limited to, on-site or off-site habitat preservation, enhancement, restoration, and/or creation at a ratio of no less than 1:1. However, if an incidental take permit is issued for the project that covers Crotch's bumble bee, that document(s) shall supersede any measures and mitigation ratios provided in this report.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of **MM BIO-1**, which requires avoidance of vegetation removal during nesting season, or, if nesting season cannot be avoided, requires a survey prior to any vegetation removal, would reduce impacts to migratory and special status birds to a less than significant level by ensuring protection of nests during nesting season. Implementation of **MM BIO-2** which requires preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls, would ensure impacts are reduced to less than significant level by confirming the absence or occurrence of the species. Implementation of **MM BIO-3**, which requires a survey for crotch bumble bees, California Endangered Species Act (CESA) compliance and compensatory mitigation, would ensure impacts to the crotch bumble bee is reduced to a less than significant level.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.3-37 through 4.3-40.

Impact 4.3-2: *Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Impact 4.3-3 *Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

The construction of the Project would permanently impact 0.59 acre of potential United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and RWQCB jurisdiction (including 0.08 acre of wetlands) and 2.33 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (including 1.99 acres of riparian vegetation). Therefore, Applicants of future development projects impacting these jurisdictional areas will be required to obtain a California Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the USACE, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB, and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW. Furthermore, the Project would implement MM BIO-3 to mitigate impacts concerning jurisdictional waters. Since the Project would obtain the necessary permits from USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW and implement **MM BIO-4**, the Project's construction impact to jurisdictional waters would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with established conservation plans beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM BIO-3**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.3, Biological Resources** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM BIO-4: In addition to obtaining Clean Water Act permits from the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW, impacts to CDFW jurisdiction will require a Streambed Alteration Agreement and the Project shall implement mitigation consisting of one or more of the following options (mitigation would be required at a minimum 1:1 ratio to offset impacts):

- 1) Avoidance and conservation of on-site waters;
- 2) Establishment and/or enhancement of wetlands/riparian habitat on-site;
- 3) Establishment and/or enhancement of wetlands/riparian habitat off-site;
- 4) Purchase of credits from an approved mitigation bank/in-lieu fee program.

Rational for Finding: **MM BIO-3** ensures that potential impacts to riparian communities or federally protected wetlands would be reduced to less than significant levels by avoiding and conserving onsite waters and mitigating at a minimum of a 1:1 offset ratio.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.3-39 through 4.3-42.

5.2 Cultural Resources

Impact 4.4-1: *Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

None of the cultural resources found within the Project boundaries were determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) and all three of the sites identified were recorded outside but adjacent to the Project boundaries near the southwestern corner of the Project area. None of the three would be impacted by future Project development. Because not all structures onsite have been adequately surveyed under the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) guidelines for historic resources, to ensure the Project would not result in the alteration or destruction of a historic structure, object, or site, **MM CUL-1** is required, which specifies the mitigation framework for buildings in excess of 50 years of age. Therefore, with implementation of **MM CUL-1**, potential impacts regarding a substantial adverse change of a historical resource would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 with implementation of mitigation. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM CUL-1**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.4, Cultural Resources** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM CUL-1: Applications for future development facilitated by the Project, shall be required to comply with the following mitigation measure that established the framework for evaluating any buildings to be impacted that may be in excess of 50 years.

For any buildings/structures in excess of 50 years of age having its original structural integrity intact and not already fully evaluated in Appendices C2 through C5, the applicant shall retain a qualified professional historian to determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. A historical resource report shall be submitted by the applicant to the City for approval and shall include the methods used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified, identify potential impacts from the proposed project, and propose measures to mitigate any impacts. The City shall require implementation of appropriate measures based on the report to reduce impacts to less than significant, if possible. If not possible to reduce impacts to less than significant, additional CEQA review shall be required.

Rationale for Finding: MM CUL-1 ensures that the Project would not result in the alteration or destruction of a historic structure, object, or site, through adherence to the mitigative framework described for buildings of 50 years of age or older.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.4-14 through 4.4-16.

Impact 4.4-2: *Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

Construction of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. The EIR concurs with the original evaluation efforts as the current condition of the resources does not provide any additional data or information that would alter those recommendations. Additionally, none of the identified cultural resources within a one-mile radius of the Project area and no tribal cultural resources were identified within or adjacent to the Project area.

Based on these findings, no further cultural resources management is recommended for construction and operation of the Project. However, in the event that a potentially significant archaeological resource is

encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities, **MM CUL-2** would apply to further minimize potential impacts to archaeological resources. Therefore, with implementation of **MM CUL-2**, impacts regarding a substantial adverse change of an archaeological resource would be less than significant.

At the conclusion of site disturbance and construction activities associated with future development projects within the Planning Areas, no impact to known or unknown archaeological resources would occur during the Project operations. Operational impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM CUL-2**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.4, Cultural Resources** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM CUL-2 If unanticipated archaeological resources are exposed or encountered during construction of the Project, all ground disturbing activities within 50 feet of the potential resource(s) shall be suspended. A qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, shall evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted based on significance under CEQA. The evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for California Register of Historical Resources eligibility. The treatment plan shall be reviewed and approved by the qualified archaeologist and submitted to the City for approval.

Rationale for Finding: MM CUL-2 ensures that if buried cultural materials are discovered during earth-moving operations associated with the Project, all work in that area shall be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.4-16 through 4.4-17.

Impact 4.4-3: *Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

While the Project site is not known to contain any cemeteries, ground-disturbing activities have the potential to reveal unknown human remains. Therefore, construction activities in the Project site could disturb human remains should any be discovered during ground-disturbing activities. If human remains are discovered, however, those remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws, including Health and Safety Code (HSC) §§7050.5-7055 and Public Resources Code (PRC) §5097.98 and §5097.99. HSC §§7050.5-7055 describes the general provisions for treatment of human remains.

Specifically, HSC §7050.5 prescribes the requirements for the treatment of any human remains that are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. HSC §7050.5 also requires that all activities cease immediately, and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor be contacted immediately. As required by state law, the procedures set forth in PRC §5087.98 would be implemented, including evaluation by the County Coroner and notification of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC would then designate the Most Likely Descendant of the unearthed human remains.

It is unlikely that any human remains would be encountered given that the Project site is already disturbed. However, previously undiscovered human remains could be encountered during construction activities. If human remains are found during excavation, excavation would be halted in the vicinity of the find and any area that is reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent remains shall remain undisturbed until the County Coroner has investigated, and appropriate recommendations have been made for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following compliance with the established regulatory framework (i.e., HSC §§7050.5-7055 and PRC §§5097.98 and 5097.99) and the application of **MM TCR-3**, the Project's impacts concerning the potential to disturb human remains, would be reduced to a less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM TCR-3**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.4, Cultural Resources** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM TCR-3 Procedures for Burials and Funerary Remains.

In accordance with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, if human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the discovery. The project lead/foreman shall designate an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier 100 feet around the resource and no further excavation or disturbance of the site shall occur while the County Coroner makes his/her assessment regarding the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with Public Resources Code §5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative will then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

Reburial of human remains and/or funerary objects (those artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites) shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code §5097.98 (a) and (b). The MLD in consultation with the landowner, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains and funerary objects. All parties are aware that the MLD may wish to rebury the human remains and associated funerary objects on or near the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The applicant/developer/landowner should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties. It is understood by all Parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code §6254 (r).

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of **MM TCR-3** will ensure that potential impacts to human remains are reduced to less than significant levels by taking the required steps to, upon discovery, cease construction, notify the mandatory parties and protect the area until such discovery is properly handled.

Support Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.4-17 through 4.4-18.

5.3 Geology and Soils

Impact 4.6-5: *Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

Site-specific development plans within the Project would be submitted to the City's Engineering and Building Department for approval, along with a Geotechnical Investigation as part of the City's discretionary review process. Future development would also be required to adhere to the construction design features and **MM GEO-1**. Buildout of future development projects within the Project area would include primarily impervious surfaces. Pervious surfaces during Project operation would include, but not be limited to, maintained landscaping ballparks, and detention basins to be constructed with operational BMPs set forth in the Project's WQMP to minimize soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The Project also includes utility infrastructure improvements that further support the minimization of soil erosion, such as the inclusion of drainage improvements, including the installation of infiltration facilities and permeable landscape areas. These public facilities would be maintained and upgraded as necessary and provided throughout each future developed site as needed. Therefore, operation-related impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM GEO-1**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.6, Geology and Soils** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM GEO-1: Construction Monitoring. No clearing and/or grading activities will be performed without the presence of a qualified geotechnical engineer. Construction monitoring, including testing for on-site pavement design, would be performed during and after the site rough grading operations. During and/or near the completion of site grading, additional expansion index testing would be conducted to characterize selected areas and to develop lot-specific recommendations for foundation design as related to the expansion potential of the graded site soils.

During construction, the qualified geotechnical engineer will perform additional observation and testing in correlation of the findings of the City-approved geotechnical investigations, and if applicable, provide supplemental investigation, with the actual subsurface conditions exposed during construction.

Rational for Finding: MM GEO-1 will require that no clearing and/or grading operations be performed without the presence of a qualified geotechnical engineer and an on-site, pre-job meeting with the developer, the contractor, and soil engineer prior to all grading related operations. All construction activities would also be subject to Best Management Practices (BMPs) described in a Project-Specific SWPPP and WQMP to reduce impacts from runoff associated with soil erosion.

Support Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-14 through 4.6-15 for further information.

Impact 4.6-6: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

Although the majority of the Project site is relatively flat or gently sloping, certain areas approach a 2:1 slope. The Project is not in an area susceptible to liquefaction and the groundwater table is at a depth of 100 feet or more and is not affected by the Project. Project site grading would be performed in compliance with the CBC and applicable local ordinances. Any existing undocumented fills would be removed and replaced with engineered compacted fill to strengthen the foundation. Provided that the grading and foundation design recommendations presented in a future development's geotechnical investigation are implemented, the settlements are expected to be within the structural tolerances of the proposed buildings. Cut slopes excavated within the existing alluvial soils may be subject to surficial instability due to the lack of cohesion within these materials. Therefore, fill slopes could be overfilled during construction and then cut back to expose fully compacted soil. Where fills are to be placed against existing slopes

steeper than five horizontals to one vertical, the fill could be properly keyed and benched into competent native materials. Therefore, stability fills would be implemented within these areas. Overall, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM GEO-1 along with applicable design features, and future developments' specific geotechnical design parameters from the applicable CBC and approved Geotechnical Investigation.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of MM GEO-1.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.6, Geology and Soils** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

Refer to **MM GEO-1**.

Rationale for Finding: MM GEO-1 requires that no clearing and/or grading operations be performed without the presence of a qualified geotechnical engineer and an on-site, pre-job meeting with the developer, the contractor, and soil engineer prior to all grading related operations. With mitigation, impacts related to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse will be reduced to less than significant.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-15 through 4.6-16.

Impact 4.6-7: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

Soils that expand and contract in volume ("shrink-swell" pattern) are considered to be expansive and may cause damage to aboveground infrastructure as a result of density changes that shift overlying materials. Fine-grain clay sediments are most likely to exhibit shrink-swell patterns in response to changing moisture levels. According to the geotechnical investigation of the site, the majority of the site's surficial soils consist of silty sands and sandy silts with a very low to low expansion potential. Although grading activities would likely involve relatively significant mixing and blending of the site materials and a reduction of the overall expansion potential of the fill soils, sandy silt soils of low expansion index would still remain beneath the fill in most areas. Future development within the Project would implement MM GEO-1, and design recommendations described in an approved Geotechnical Investigation, and CBC design standards to reduce impacts from expansive soils.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the 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 beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of MM GEO-1.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.6, Geology and Soils** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

Refer to **MM GEO-1**.

Rationale for Finding: **MM GEO-1** requires that no clearing and/or grading operations be performed without the presence of a qualified geotechnical engineer and an on-site, pre-job meeting with the developer, the contractor, and soil engineer prior to all grading related operations. A qualified geotechnical engineer will perform additional observation and testing in correlation of the findings of the City-approved final geotechnical investigations, and if applicable, provide supplemental investigation, with the actual subsurface conditions exposed during construction. Implementation of **MM GEO-1** ensures the design recommendations described in the approved Geotechnical Investigation, and CBC design standards are implemented and would reduce impacts from expansive soils to less than significant.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-17.

Impact 4.6-9: *Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

Paleontological records search services were provided by the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLAC). These institutions did not identify any paleontological localities within the planning area or within a one-mile radius. The planning area is located on surface deposits of older Quaternary alluvium, and thus shallow excavations would be unlikely to uncover significant fossil vertebrate remains; however, deeper excavation may encounter the older Quaternary alluvium and fossil remains.

Disturbed and near-surface soils within the planning area have low sensitivity for paleontological resources, but the relatively undisturbed, fine-grained sediments underneath have a higher sensitivity for Pleistocene-age vertebrate fossil remains.

Nevertheless, in the event that unknown paleontological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbance activities, future development within the Project would be required to enlist a qualified paleontologist and implement MM GEO-2 (Paleontological Construction Monitoring and Compliance Program) to reduce potential impacts on paleontological resources or unique geologic features to less than significant levels. Therefore, with implementation of MM GEO-2, construction of the future Project components would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, thereby reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of MM GEO-2.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.6, Geology and Soils** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM GEO-2 All earth moving operations reaching beyond the disturbed surface soils, generally below the depth of two feet, should be monitored for paleontological resources. The monitor should be prepared to quickly salvage fossil remains as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and should also collect samples of sediments that are likely to contain fossils of small invertebrates and vertebrates. However, the monitor must have the power to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for removal of abundant or large specimens.

Collected samples of sediments should be processed to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils, and the recovered specimens should be identified and prepared for curation at a repository with permanent retrievable storage.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered specimens, should be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. Approval of the report by the City of Grand Terrace would signify the completion of the mitigation program.

After Project design has been finalized to determine the precise extent and location of planned ground disturbances, and prior to construction activity, a qualified paleontologist (to be retained by the Applicant) will prepare a paleontological resource monitoring plan (PRMP) for approval by the City.

Rationale for Finding: MM GEO-2 requires a qualified paleontologist to prepare a resource monitoring plan, and a monitor be enlisted in the event that unknown paleontological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbance activities, and salvage fossil remains as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays, also collecting samples of sediments that are likely to contain fossils of small invertebrates and vertebrates. A report of finding would then be prepared. **MM GEO-2** would ensure construction of the future Project components would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, thereby reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.6-18 through 4.6-19.

5.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 4.8-2: *Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

Level of Significance: *Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

There are no significant impacts related to on-site soil and soil vapor from the identified recognized environmental condition (REC) and two environmental concerns, including onsite historical grove usage and imported soil materials associated with offsite construction and/or demolition projects. The evaluated parcels did not exhibit evidence of RECs, HRECs, and/or CRECs and no further investigations were recommended unless obvious signs of soil contamination, including staining or odor, are found to be present during grading activities. With implementation of **MMs HAZ-1** through **HAZ-5** and compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulation, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MMs HAZ-1** through **HAZ-5**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**, of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM HAZ-1 Applicable to future development projects within the Project site, if signs of soil contamination, including staining or odor are encountered during ground-disturbance activities, construction shall halt, and the project-specific applicant/contractor is required to prepare a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to evaluate the potential environmental concern. If test results show RECs, HRECs, and/or CRECs, then remediation would be required to clean and detoxify the site subject to approval of regulatory oversight by the County, DTSC or RWQCB, prior to continuing ground-disturbing activities.

MM HAZ-2 Prior to issuance of a demolition permit of the on-site structures, preparation of a demolition plan for the safe dismantling and removal of building components and debris including a plan for lead and asbestos abatement shall be prepared. The demolition plan shall be submitted to the City's (Building and Safety Department) for review and approval prior to commencement of demolition activities.

Prior to demolition activities, an asbestos survey shall be conducted by an Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) and California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) certified building inspector to determine the presence

or absence of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). If ACMs are located, abatement of asbestos shall be completed prior to any activities that would disturb ACMs or create an airborne asbestos hazard.

Asbestos removal shall be performed by a State certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403.

MM HAZ-3 If paint is separated from building materials (chemically or physically) during demolition of the structures, the paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material by a qualified Environmental Professional. If lead-based paint is found, abatement shall be completed by a qualified Lead Specialist prior to any activities that would create lead dust or fume hazard. Contractors performing lead-based paint removal shall provide evidence of abatement activities to the Building Official.

MM HAZ-4 If old cesspools and/or septic systems are encountered during the future development of the Project Site identified in the Phase I ESA included as DEIR **Appendix G3** the landowner/developer shall provide for the removal and disposal of septic tank(s) in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

MM HAZ-5 Applicable to future development projects, prior to development of an area not documented in the Phase I ESAs included as DEIR Appendices G1 through G3, project applicants shall be required to conduct a site-specific Phase I ESA to determine if any potential for significant impact exists. If the Phase I ESA identifies new environmental concerns on-site, a Phase II ESA shall be conducted. If the Phase II ESA identifies that remediation is necessary, such remediation shall occur in consultation with the appropriate regulatory agency (e.g., Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA)) prior to any site disturbing activities.

Rationale for Finding: **MM HAZ-1** ensures that if soil contamination is encountered during ground-disturbance activities within the Project site, construction would halt and all future project-specific applicant/contractors would prepare a Phase II ESA to evaluate the potential environmental concerns. **MM HAZ-2** and **MM HAZ-3** require that any future project inclusive of this parcel be required to conduct asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead based paint (LBP) surveys of the existing on-site buildings and proper ACM and LBP construction controls implemented if such materials are present to protect workers, the public and the environment from ACM and LBP. In the event that cesspools and/or septic systems are encountered, **MM HAZ-4** would require that future developers provide for the removal and disposal of the septic systems in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. **MM HAZ-5** ensures that future development projects located in areas not analyzed in the ESAs included as **Appendices G1** through **G3** would be required to prepare a Phase I ESA to determine if a potential hazard exists. If the Phase I determines that there are hazardous materials, a Phase II ESA would be prepared to address the potential environmental concern(s). All of these measures would reduce the potential impacts to less than significant with mitigation.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.8-18 through 4.8-21.

5.5 Noise

Impact 4.11-1: *Generation of 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?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated*

Noise levels from Project-related construction activities were calculated from the top three loudest construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the acoustical center) to the property line of the nearest receptors. Construction noise would be below the construction noise threshold and would therefore be a less than significant impact. As shown in **Table 4.11-10** of the EIR, the “Opening Year With Project” traffic noise levels along adjacent roadways (i.e., Taylor Street, Commerce Way, De Berry Street, and Van Buren Street) would range from 57.5 to 64.2 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) but noise levels for offsite sensitive receptors would be below the City’s 60 dBA Normally Acceptable threshold and less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, future on-site residences facing adjacent roadways would experience traffic noise levels above the City’s 60 dBA Normally Acceptable exterior standard for residential uses. As such, the Project would be required to comply with **MM NOI-1**. Compliance with **MM NOI-1** would ensure on-site mobile noise impacts would be less than significant. On-site sensitive receptors would be located adjacent to commercial land uses. Notwithstanding, slow-moving truck loading dock activity noise levels would be reduced through implementation of **MM NOI-2**. **MM NOI-2** would ensure on-site sensitive receptors are not exposed to noise levels above the City’s noise standards. Thus, noise impacts associated with slow-moving trucks would be less than significant with implementation of **MM NOI-2**.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not 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, beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MMs NOI-1** and **NOI-2**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.11, Noise** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM NOI-1 On-Site Noise Attenuation. As part of the Site Development Review Permit process for the proposed residential developments, a detailed acoustical study based on architectural plans shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant and submitted to the City of Grand Terrace Community Development Department to demonstrate that all residential units would meet the City’s 60 dBA exterior noise standard for all common outdoor living areas. In addition, the acoustical study shall demonstrate that interior noise levels at all residential units at the Project site would

meet the City's 45 dBA threshold. This mitigation measure complies with the applicable sections of the California Building Code (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations). The necessary noise reduction may be achieved by implementing noise control measures at the receiver locations. Where closed windows are required to achieve the interior 45 dBA CNEL limit, Project plans and specifications shall include ventilation as required by the California Building Code. The final grading and building plans shall incorporate the required noise barriers (patio enclosure, wall, berm, or combination wall/berm), and the property owner/developer shall install these barriers and enclosures.

MM NOI-2 Stationary Noise Sources. Prior to issuance of building permits, a Noise Assessment shall be prepared, for submittal and approval of the City of Grand Terrace City Planner, which demonstrates on-site placement of stationary noise sources at commercial uses would not exceed noise standards established in the City of Grand Terrace General Plan and City of Grand Terrace Municipal Code Chapter 8.108, Noise. The Noise Assessment shall verify that stationary noise sources (e.g., loading dock Facilities, mechanical equipment, and parking lots) are adequately shielded and/or located at an adequate distance from on-site and off-site sensitive receptors and residences in order to comply with noise regulations established by the City of Grand Terrace.

Rationale for Finding: MM NOI-1 requires a detailed acoustical study demonstrating that all residential units would meet the City's 60 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard for all patios, balconies, and common outdoor living areas through any necessary noise reduction features (barriers, berms, enclosures, etc.). **MM NOI-1** would ensure all residential units to be designed to ensure that interior noise levels in habitable rooms from exterior sources (including vehicles on adjacent roadways) shall not exceed 45 dBA, in compliance with the General Plan Noise Element and Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

MM NOI-2 ensures noise-generating stationary source equipment would not exceed the City's noise regulations at on-site and off-site receptors through the preparation of a Noise Assessment, implementation of which will reduce the impact to less than significant.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.11-16 through 4.11-22.

Impact 4.11-2: *Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?*

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

The nearest structure to the Project construction site is approximately 15 feet away to the east. As shown in Table 4.11-11, vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operations that may be used during Project construction range from 0.0065 to 0.4518 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) at 15 feet from the source of activity. All construction equipment would remain below the FTA's 0.20 in/sec PPV threshold at a distance of 15 feet, with the exception of vibratory rollers. As depicted in **Table 4.11-11** of the EIR, vibratory roller operations may exceed the FTA's 0.20 in/sec PPV threshold within 15 and 25 feet of a structure. Therefore, implementation of MM NOI-3 would be required. Pursuant to **MM NOI-3**, should construction activities requiring operation of vibratory rollers take place within 26 feet of a structure, a

Project-specific vibration impact analysis shall be conducted. With implementation of **MM NOI-3**, impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, since truck movements on the Project site would be at low speed (not at freeway speeds) and would be over smooth surfaces (not under poor roadway conditions), Project-related vibration associated with truck activity would not result in excessive groundborne vibrations; no vehicle-generated vibration impacts would occur. In addition, there are no sources of substantial groundborne vibration associated with operation of the Project, such as rail or subways. Therefore, Project related vibration impacts from the operation of the Project would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM NOI-3**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.11, Noise** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM NOI-3 Construction Vibration. Future development projects with construction activities requiring operation of vibratory rollers within 26 feet of a structure shall be required to prepare a project-specific vibration impact analysis to evaluate potential construction vibration impacts associated with the project, and to determine any specific vibration control mechanisms that shall be incorporated into the project's construction bid documents to reduce such impacts. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Rationale for Finding: MM NOI-3 ensures that a future development projects with construction activities requiring operation of vibratory rollers within 26 feet of a structure will conduct a project-specific vibration impact analysis, the results of which will be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The required inclusion of the recommendations into construction bid documents will reduce such impacts to less than significant.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.11-22 through 4.11-24.

5.6 Transportation

Impact 4.15-3: *Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Level of Significance: *Less Than Significant with Mitigation*

The proposed circulation improvements would be compatible with existing and proposed land uses. All proposed improvements would be constructed as approved by the City Engineer and City's Fire Department pursuant to Grand Terrace MC Section 17.52.070, Street Design and Chapter 17.16, and as

part of the Project's proposed tentative tract map approval. In accordance with Grand Terrace MC Section 17.52.010, "All subdivisions and tentative maps thereof, must conform to the City General Plan, Zoning Code, and any applicable specific plans and to all applicable planning, zoning, design, improvement and environmental requirements." Upon approval of the Project's Specific Plan and adherence with the Grand Terrace MC design standards, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use.

For students to get to Terrace Hills Middle School from the Project's residential development, they would utilize Van Buren Street. Currently, there are existing sidewalks in between the western terminus at the proposed new Taylor/Commerce extension to Mt. Vernon Avenue of approximately 3,300 feet in total length. The Project would provide street improvements on Van Buren Street within the Project boundary that would include a new sidewalk segment of nearly 1,700 feet. Although the Project would add a significant amount of new sidewalks of over 50% of the length of the existing sidewalks on Van Buren Street, there would still be a small portion on Van Buren Street that would not have sidewalks. This portion is outside of the Project area and approximately 550 feet in length, measuring west from where Van Buren Street meets with Mt. Vernon Avenue. Due to the physical site constraints from overhead powerlines and drainage pipes, it is infeasible to construct sidewalk in this portion along Van Buren Street as additional right-of-way acquisition or condemnation would be required by the City. Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from hazardous design features beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM TRA-1**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.15, Transportation** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this Mitigation Measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

MM TRA-1: Upon the City's acquisition of the area on Van Buren Street necessary to connect the project's sidewalk to the remainder of Van Buren Street, the applicant will pay its fair share of the cost of construction of that portion of the sidewalk.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.13-23 through 4.13-24.

Rationale for Finding: **MM TRA-1** ensures that the applicant will pay its fair share of the cost of construction of that portion of the sidewalk at west of the Van Buren Street and Mt. Vernon Avenue intersection upon the City's acquisition of the area. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

5.7 Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact 4.16-1: *Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

- i. 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 §5020.1(k) or*
- ii. A 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 (PRC) §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe?*

Level of Significance: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

There is a potential for unknown buried archaeological resources that qualify as TCRs to be encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities. In the event that a potentially significant archaeological resource is encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities, **MM CUL-2** would be applied to minimize potential impacts to archaeological resources. **MM CUL-2** requires that the Project archaeologist consults with local experts and Native American Representatives for the preparation of a treatment plan if significant unknown cultural resources are discovered during construction of the Project. Implementation of **MMs TCR-1** through **TCR-3** would further reduce impacts to any unknown or inadvertently discovered archaeological resources or human remains that are identified as TCRs. All such finds would be required to be treated in accordance with all CEQA requirements and all other applicable laws and regulations. With implementation of these measures, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, beyond those concluded in the EIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM TCR-1** through **TCR-3**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and is made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

Refer to **MM CUL-2**.

MM TCR-1 Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources. In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) the Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians tribe will be notified and work shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians will be contacted if any such find occurs and be provided information and permitted/invited to perform a site visit when the archaeologist makes his/her assessment, so as to provide Tribal input. The archaeologist shall complete an isolate record for the find and submit this document to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

MM TCR-2 Treatment and Disposition of TCRs.

If significant Native American historical resources are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, an SOI-qualified archaeologist shall be retained to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment Plan, as well as a Discovery and Monitoring Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to San Manuel Band of Mission Indians for review and comment.

All in-field investigations, assessments, and/or data recovery enacted pursuant to the finalized Treatment Plan shall be monitored by a San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Tribal Participant(s).

The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with San Manuel Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

After the notification of discovery to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and assessments/evaluations have occurred, the following treatment/disposition of the TCRs shall occur:

Preservation-In-Place of the TCRs, if feasible as determined through coordination between the project archeologist, Master Developer or Site Developers, as applicable, and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, is the preferred method of treatment. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources in perpetuity.

Should Preservation-In-Place not be feasible, the landowner shall accommodate the process for on-site reburial of the discovered items with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. During the course of construction, all recovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on site. The

removal of any artifacts from the project site shall require the approval of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and all resources subject to such removal must be thoroughly inventoried with a tribal representative from San Manuel Band of Mission Indians to oversee the process. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

If Preservation-In-Place and reburial are not feasible, the landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all TCRs and a curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within San Bernardino County that meets federal standards per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 79 shall be established. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to said curation facility by the landowner, and accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCRs) shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials within the County of the discovery, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, it shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

If discoveries were made during the project, a Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the County by the Archaeologist at the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site. Said report will document monitoring and archaeological efforts conducted by the archaeologist and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property, describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled, document the type of cultural resources recovered, and outline the treatment and disposition of such resources. All reports produced will be submitted to the County of San Bernardino, appropriate Information Center, and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

MM TCR-3

Procedures for Burials and Funerary Remains.

In accordance with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, if human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the discovery. The project lead/foreman shall designate an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier 100 feet around the resource and no further excavation or disturbance of the site shall occur while the County Coroner makes his/her assessment regarding the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with Public Resources Code §5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete

their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative will then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

Reburial of human remains and/or funerary objects (those artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites) shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code §5097.98 (a) and (b). The MLD in consultation with the landowner, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains and funerary objects. All parties are aware that the MLD may wish to rebury the human remains and associated funerary objects on or near the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The applicant/developer/landowner should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties. It is understood by all Parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code §6254 (r)..

Rationale for Finding: MM CUL-2 requires that the Project archaeologist consults with local experts and Native American Representatives for the preparation of a treatment plan if significant unknown cultural resources are discovered during construction of the Project.

MM TCR-1 ensures that all work would cease upon the discovery of a find. Additionally, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians will be contacted if any such find occurs and be provided information and permitted/invited to perform a site visit when the archaeologist makes his/her assessment, so as to provide Tribal input. The archaeologist shall complete an isolate record for the find and submit this document to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

MM TCR-2 requires an SOI-qualified archaeologist be retained to develop an cultural resources Treatment Plan, as well as a Discovery and Monitoring Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to San Manuel Band of Mission Indians for review and comment, as well as implement measures such as preservation in place to further reduce potential impacts.

MM TCR-3 will ensure that human remains are protected pursuant to California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 by ceasing construction activities if human remains or funerary objects are encountered. A 100-foot buffer around the find would be implemented and the find would be reported to the County Coroner within 24 hours. The Project lead/foreman shall designate an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier 100 feet around the resource and no further excavation or disturbance of the site shall occur while the County Coroner makes his/her assessment regarding the nature of the remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the NAHC and the NAHC will notice those persons that are believed to be the MLD. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative will

then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains. Accordingly, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.16-9 through 4.16-13.

6.0 FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The City finds, based upon the threshold criteria for significance presented in the EIR, that all of the following potentially significant environmental effects of the Project, remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR. For each significant and unavoidable impact identified below, the City has made a finding(s) pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081. An explanation of the rationale for each finding is also presented below.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126(b), requires a description of any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed Project is implemented.

6.1 Air Quality

Impact 4.2-1: *Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Level of Significance: *Significant and Unavoidable*

The Project would be inconsistent with Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Criterion No. 1, resulting in a determination that impacts in this regard would be considered significant. The Project would implement development-specific air quality mitigation measures identified in this analysis (**MMs AQ-1** through **AQ-5**), acting to generally reduce the Project's construction and operational-source air pollutant emissions. Additionally, incorporation of contemporary energy-efficient technologies and operational programs, and compliance with SCAQMD emissions reductions and control requirements act to reduce Project air pollutant emissions.

The AQMP contains air pollutant reduction strategies based on SCAG's latest growth forecasts, and SCAG's growth forecasts were defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local general plans. The Project would result in a change of land use designations not reflected in the AQMP. Therefore, the Project is conservatively assumed to generate emissions not reflected within the current 2022 AQMP regional emissions inventory for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) and is considered to be inconsistent with the AQMP. Thus, the Project is not consistent with the second criterion.

Implementation of **MM AQ-1** would reduce ROG emissions for the Project's construction phase to less than significant. However, Project implementation would result in air pollutant emissions (reactive organic gas (ROG) and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)) that exceed SCAQMD's operational emission thresholds even with implementation of **MM AQ-2** through **MM AQ-5**. Although mitigation would reduce emissions by the greatest feasible amount, Project emissions levels would remain significant and would contribute

to the nonattainment designations in the SCAB. Therefore, the Project would be inconsistent with the AQMP, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact despite the implementation of mitigation.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 3.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the City hereby finds that, despite the incorporation of Mitigation Measures identified in the EIR and in these Findings, impacts associated with Impact 4.2-1 cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.2, Air Quality**, of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will not reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant. As such, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

MM AQ-1 Low VOC Paint (Construction). During construction, the Project shall utilize “Super Compliant” low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits (i.e., have a lower VOC content than what is required) put forth by SCAQMD’s Rule 1113 for all architectural coatings. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of Grand Terrace Building and Safety Division shall confirm that plans include the following specifications:

- All architectural coatings will be super-compliant low VOC paints.
- Recycle leftover paint. Take any leftover paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based paints.
- Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.
- For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the cleanup water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of cleanup water and take it to the hazardous waste center (www.cleanup.org).
- Use compliant low-VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- Keep all paint- and solvent-laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- Contractors shall construct/build with materials that do not require painting and use pre-painted construction materials to the extent practicable.
- Use high-pressure/low-volume paint applicators with a minimum transfer efficiency of at least 50 percent or other application techniques with equivalent or higher transfer efficiency.

MM AQ-2 Vehicle Trip Reduction. Develop a qualifying Commute Trip Reduction (CTR)/Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to reduce mobile GHG emissions

for all uses. The TDM plan shall be approved by the City of Grand Terrace prior to the issuance of building permits and incorporated into the Project's Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs). The TDM plan shall discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking. The following measures shall be incorporated into the TDM plan.

TDM Requirements for Non-Residential Uses:

- The Project Applicant shall consult with the local transit service provider on the need to provide infrastructure to connect the Project with transit services. Evidence of compliance with this requirement may include correspondence from the local transit provider(s) regarding the potential need for installing bus turnouts, shelters, or bus stops at the site.
- The portion of the TDM plan for non-residential uses shall include, but not be limited to the following potential measures: ride-matching assistance, preferential carpool parking, flexible work schedules for carpools, half-time transportation coordinators, providing a website or message board for coordinating rides, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles, and including bicycle end of trip facilities. This list may be updated as new methods become available. Verification of this measure shall occur prior to building permit issuance for the commercial uses.

TDM Requirements for Residential Units:

- **Owner-Occupied Units.** Upon a residential dwelling being sold or offered for sale, the Project Applicant shall notify and offer to the buyer or prospective buyer, as soon as it may be done, materials describing public transit, ridesharing, and nonmotorized commuting opportunities available in the vicinity of the Project. Such information shall be transmitted no later than the close of escrow. This information shall be submitted to the City of Grand Terrace Planning Division for review and approval, prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.
- **Rental Units.** Upon a residential dwelling being rented or offered for rent, the Project Applicant shall notify and offer to the tenant or prospective tenant, materials describing public transit, ridesharing, and nonmotorized commuting opportunities in the vicinity of the development. The materials shall be approved by the City of Grand Terrace. The materials shall be provided no later than the time the rental agreement is executed. This information shall be submitted to the City of Grand Terrace Planning Division for review and approval, prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.

MM AQ-3

Prohibition of Fireplaces. The installation of wood-burning and natural gas devices shall be prohibited. The purpose of this measure is to limit emissions of ROG, NO_x,

particulate matter and visible emissions from wood-burning and natural gas devices used for primary heat, supplemental heat, or ambiance. This prohibition shall be noted on the deed and/or lease agreements for future property owners/tenants to obey.

MM AQ-4 Electric Landscape Equipment. Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the Planning Division shall confirm that the Project's Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and/or tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all landscaping equipment used onsite shall be 100 percent electrically powered. All residential and non-residential properties shall be equipped with exterior electrical outlets to accommodate this requirement. This requirement shall be included in the third-party vendor agreements for landscape services for the building owner and tenants, as applicable.

MM AQ-5 Low VOC Paint (Operations). The Project Applicant shall require by contract specifications commercial development to use interior and exterior architectural coatings (paint and primer including parking lot paint) products that have a volatile organic compound rating of 10 grams per liter (g/L) or less (i.e., "Super Compliant" low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits). Contract specifications shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Grand Terrace prior to the issuance of occupancy permits. This measure shall be made a condition of approval for continued upkeep of the property.

Rationale for Finding: As construction emissions were determined to be less than significant with implementation mitigation measures identified above, only operational emissions are discussed below.

MM AQ-2 requires a qualifying Commute Trip Reduction (CTR)/ Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to be developed to reduce mobile GHG emissions for all uses. The TDM plan shall discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking and providing for transit infrastructure.

MM AQ-3 prohibits the use of all wood-burning and natural gas devices to limit emissions of ROG, NOX, particulate matter and visible emissions from wood-burning and natural gas devices used for primary heat, supplemental heat, or ambiance. **MM AQ-4** requires that all landscaping equipment used onsite to be 100 percent electrically powered.

MM AQ-5 requires by contract specifications commercial development to use interior and exterior architectural coatings (paint and primer including parking lot paint) products that have a volatile organic compound rating of 10 grams per liter (g/L) or less (i.e., "Super Compliant" low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits).

MM AQ-2 through **MM AQ-5** are feasible measures and are included to reduce operational emissions to the greatest amount feasible. However, even after implementing all identified feasible mitigation, operational emissions would remain above the SCAQMD threshold and contribute to the nonattainment

designations by SCAB. Therefore, the Project would be inconsistent with the AQMP, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact despite the implementation of feasible mitigation.

The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce Impact 4.2-1 to a less than significant level.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.2-23 through 4.2-27.

Impact 4.2-2: *Would the Project 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?*

Level of Significance: *Significant and Unavoidable*

Table 4.2-8 shows that unmitigated construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD threshold for the ROG (VOC). The majority of ROG emissions are generated during the architectural coatings phase of construction. **MM AQ-1** would reduce ROG emissions which requires the use of “Super-Compliant” low VOC paint for interior and exterior architectural coatings and paintings. The Project would also be subject to SCAQMD Rules 402, 403, and 1113. **MM AQ-1** would reduce construction impacts below the SCAQMD’s thresholds. Therefore, the Project’s construction-related emissions would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table 4.2-9 shows unmitigated operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The exceedance of ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} operations emissions are primarily from area and mobile sources. Mitigation measures would be required to reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible; however, emissions of motor vehicles are controlled by State and national standards and the Project has no control over these standards.

MMs AQ-2 through **AQ-5** have been identified to reduce operational emissions. **MM AQ-2** requires the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce single occupant vehicle trips and encourage transit. **MM AQ-3** prohibits the use of any kind of fireplaces, and **MM AQ-4** requires all landscaping equipment used onsite shall be 100 percent electrically powered. **MM AQ-5** requires the use of low VOC paint for interior and exterior architectural coatings and paintings. **Table 4.2-10** shows that despite the implementation of **MMs AQ-2** through **AQ-5**, operational emissions related to ROG and NO_x would remain above the SCAQMD’s thresholds, therefore impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Findings 2 and 3.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the City hereby finds that, despite the incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the EIR and in these Findings, the following environmental impacts cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.2, Air Quality**, of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, **MMs AQ-2** through **AQ-5**, listed above, are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will not reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant. As such, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Rationale for Finding: See Rationale for Finding above, under Impact 4.2-1, for discussion on **MM AQ-2** through **MM AQ-5**.

MMs AQ-2 through **AQ-5** are feasible and are included to reduce operational emissions to the greatest amount feasible. However, even after implementing all identified feasible mitigation, operational emissions would remain above the SCAQMD threshold. Project implementation would result in air pollutant emissions (ROG and NOx) that exceed SCAQMD's operational emission thresholds.

Although mitigation would reduce emissions by the greatest feasible amount, Project emissions levels would remain significant and would contribute to the nonattainment designations in the SCAB, despite the implementation of feasible mitigation. The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce Impact 4.2-2 to a less than significant level. Furthermore, 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.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.2-27 through 4.2-30.

6.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 4.7-1: *Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

Level of Significance: Significant and Unavoidable

The Project's unmitigated emissions would be approximately 20,964 MTCO₂e annually from both construction and operations. Project-related GHG emissions would exceed the 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold used for purposes of analysis. The majority of the GHG emissions (83 percent of unmitigated emissions and 86 percent of mitigated emissions) are associated with non-construction related mobile sources. Emissions of motor vehicles are controlled by State and federal standards, and the Project has no control over these standards. **MMs AQ-2** through **AQ-4** have been identified in EIR **Section 4.2, Air Quality** to reduce operational emissions. **MM AQ-2** requires the implementation of a qualifying Commute Trip Reduction (CTR)/ Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to reduce mobile GHG emissions for all uses. **MM AQ-3** prohibits the use of any kind of fireplaces, and **MM AQ-4** requires that the Project's Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and/or tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all landscaping equipment used on-site shall be 100 percent electrically powered. Mitigation Measures provided at the end of this Impact Statement would further reduce GHG emissions. **MM GHG-1** requires the installation of photovoltaic solar panels on residential buildings to offset energy emissions in residential buildings. **MM GHG-2** requires the Project to meet or exceed the voluntary CALGreen Tier 2 standards to further improve energy efficiency. **MM GHG-3** requires the residential projects to be all electric (i.e., no natural gas) and **MM GHG-4** requires the Project to divert 75 percent of waste from landfills. Additionally, LORs GHG-1 through GHG-4 are required by local, state, or federal regulations or laws and would also apply to the Project. Implementation of these MMs would reduce GHG emissions to 18,539 MTCO₂e per year. As shown in **Table 4.7-3** of the EIR, the Phase 1 residential portion of the Project and the Parks portion of the Project would be net zero energy. However, mobile emissions would remain at 6,129.04 MTCO₂e per year for the residential portion and 11,099.17

for the commercial portion, raising the Project's emissions above the threshold of significance. Therefore, the overall Project's emissions would exceed the 3,000 MTCO₂e threshold by 15,539 MTCO₂e per year.

No additional feasible mitigation to further reduce these emissions is identified. The TDM program required by **MM AQ-2** would reduce GHG emissions resulting from commuter trips, however the number of delivery trips and retail customer trips would not be reduced by a TDM program, and the reduction to the residential and commercial trips would not reduce the impact from mobile sources to below the significance threshold.

Although **MMs AQ 2** through **AQ-4** and **MMs GHG-1** through **GHG-4** will take effect and the Project's non-mobile emissions will be reduced to less than significant, mobile emissions will remain and thus the Project's impact will remain significant and unavoidable.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Findings 2 and 3.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City hereby finds that, despite the incorporation of Mitigation Measures identified in the EIR and discussed in these Findings, the environmental impacts as discussed above cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.2, Air Quality**, and **Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions** of the EIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, **MMs AQ-2** through **AQ-4**, listed above, are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these Mitigation Measures will not reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant. As such, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. Additionally, the following Mitigation Measures apply:

MM GHG-1: Residential Renewable Energy Generation. Prior to issuance of residential building permits for each development phase, residential developments within the Project site shall be required to submit plans for the installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or another source of renewable electricity generation on-site. The PV panels or alternative shall be installed prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy (or the final Certificate of Occupancy within the development phase, if Virtual Net Metering is utilized). Solar-ready zones shall comply with Section 110.10 of the 2022 California Energy Code and meet access, pathway, ventilation, and spacing requirements, and exclude skylight area.

Each residential building (or development phase, if VNEM is utilized) shall include an electrical system and other infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the PV arrays. The electrical system and infrastructure must be clearly labeled with noticeable and permanent signage. The schedule of photovoltaic system locations may be updated as needed.

MM GHG-2 Building Energy Efficiency. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future development within the Project shall be designed to exceed 2022 Title 24 energy efficiency standards by a minimum of 15 percent through any of the following methods: o achieving Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)

standards or meeting or exceeding CALGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time. Alternatively, the Project design shall include on-site renewable energy for future commercial development, for example the incorporation of solar panels into future Project commercial development, such that 15 percent of the on-site energy consumption is offset.

MM GHG-3 **Energy Efficient Appliances.** For residential projects, all major appliances (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers and dryers, water heaters, and equipment for space heating) provided/ installed shall be electric (i.e., appliances that do not use natural gas, propane, or other fossil fuels) and Energy Star certified or of equivalent energy efficiency where applicable. Prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the City of Grand Terrace shall verify implementation of this requirement.

MM GHG-4 **Solid Waste Diversion.** Each future development within the Project shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy, a recyclables collection and load area shall be constructed in compliance with City standards for recyclable collection and loading areas.

Rationale for Finding: See Rationale for Finding above, under Impact 4.2-1, for discussion on **MM AQ-2** through **MM AQ-5**.

MM GHG-1 requires that residential development within the Project site install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable electricity generation on-site. **MM GHG-2** requires future development within the Project be designed to achieve LEED standards, meet or exceed CALGreen Tier 2 standards in effect at the time to exceed 2022 Title 24 energy efficiency standards by a minimum of 15 percent, or alternatively, include on-site renewable energy for future commercial development such that 15 percent of the on-site energy consumption is offset.

MM GHG-3 ensures all major appliances provided/installed be electric and Energy Star certified or of equivalent energy efficiency where applicable. **MM GHG-4** requires that each future development divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste.

Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts because it exceeds the 3,000 MTCO₂e threshold set by the SCAQMD and used for purposes of analysis. The City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce Impact 4.7-2 to a less than significant level. Furthermore, 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.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to EIR pages 4.7-19 through 4.7-24

7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by a proposed project. Generally, the section states that a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if the following occurs:

- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources in a way that would make their nonuse or removal unlikely;
- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; and
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources in a way that would make their nonuse or removal unlikely.

Nonrenewable resources associated with the development of the Project would include fossil fuels which would serve as energy sources during both construction and operation activity. Fossil fuels would serve as energy sources during both construction and operations of project-specific development. Fossil fuels would act as transportation energy sources for construction vehicles and heavy equipment during the construction period and by vehicles and equipment used during operations. Although buildout of the Project would endeavor to utilize fossil fuels efficiently, their use would be vital for construction and operations activities, making their nonuse unlikely.

Energy-efficient equipment used in operations such fuel-efficient trucks and electric/hybrid cars would be utilized according to their availability and/or in order to comply with energy regulations and policies for the Project as a whole as it pertains to the Project's proposed mixed uses. The California Solar Mandate is expected to be updated in 2023 in accordance with the 2022 California Building Standards Energy Code, which may require the proposed commercial businesses to have both solar panels and battery storages. Although no site-specific development is proposed as part of the Project, future development projects would undergo subsequent CEQA review to determine that the use of energy resources such as fossils fuels is used efficiently in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

The Project would also require the permanent commitment of land on which the Project would be developed for mixed-use development. Land is a finite resource that once developed, it removes the likely ability for that land to be used for other purposes. However, the development proposed by the Project would provide planned growth and economic benefits to the City and development of the Project would not eliminate the possibility of redevelopment in the future.

Overall, the Project shall utilize nonrenewable resources in a way that would not make their nonuse or removal unlikely.

The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses.

The Project's development is anticipated to produce significant and unavoidable impacts based on analyses conducted in **Section 4.2, Air Quality** and **Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions** of the EIR. The primary and secondary impacts would affect the surrounding environment but would not necessarily commit future generations to similar uses. Although grading activities would occur at the Project site, grading activities would be limited to project-specific development. Additionally, the Project would implement mitigation measures, air pollutant and greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies and design standards, and standard conditions to reduce impacts from air quality and greenhouse gas emissions to the extent feasible. Furthermore, all future projects within the Project site would be subject to additional environmental review and approval processes to identify impacts and reduction efforts as applicable at the time of development.

The mixed-use nature of the Project is unlikely to lead to primary and secondary impacts that would relegate future generations and developments to similar uses. Therefore, the Project would not influence future development in that land area other than that identified in the Specific Plan and the land use designations would be unchanged.

The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.

The Project would be developed with commercial, residential, utilities, and public park land uses that would not release significant amounts of hazardous materials into the environment. The Project would utilize/handle hazardous materials typical of construction and operational activities. The routine transport, handling, or disposal of these hazardous materials would be temporary and adhere to applicable federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials including, but not limited to, those implemented by the U.S EPA, the California DTSC, and Cal/OSHA. Additionally, all future development would adhere to Grand Terrace MC §§13.20.150, 18.36.040, and 15.58.060 which would help reduce the risk to life and property from the use, transportation, storage, treatment, or disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. Projects within the Specific Plan area will be required to submit a waste management plan, as applicable, as part of the City's demolition permitting requirements, implement BMPs pursuant to NDPES permitting, and prohibits the storage of certain hazardous materials that may accidentally seep into the environment.

The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

The Project would comply with any applicable federal, state, and local regulation and laws regarding the use of resources during both construction and operations. As established in **Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems** of the EIR, buildout of the Project would not significantly impact water, electricity, solid waste, and telecommunications resources. Riverside Highland Water Company (RHWC), the water supplier for the City and Project, would have adequate water supply to serve the Project's total demand. As concluded in **Section 4.5, Energy** of the EIR, the Projects use of energy resources would be utilized in an efficient, justifiable manner. Energy resources and consumption is discussed in greater detail in **Section 4.5, Energy** of the EIR.

8.0 FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Under State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(e), a project would be considered to have a growth-inducing effect if it would result in any of the following effects:

- Directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing;
- Remove obstacles to population growth;
- Require the construction of new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

As discussed below, the Project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts beyond development of the Project itself.

The Project would potentially add up to 695 additional housing units. However, the City and County are considered “housing poor.” The additional housing from the Project would provide needed regional housing and are well within the Southern California Association of Government’s forecasted 2045 population and housing growth for the City and County. The Project would generate employment, but the existing 3.8 percent unemployment rate in San Bernardino County suggests that there is a need for local employment opportunities which are anticipated to be filled by both the local and regional labor forces and would not require additional housing construction beyond the housing proposed by the Project.

The Project would not remove obstacles to population growth because it would not include any infrastructure or other facilities that would enable growth beyond the Project itself. The projected population growth would also be well within the population growth in the area as indicated by local and regional planning documents.

The Project would include infrastructure improvements and connections to existing facilities to allow for the Project’s demands of resources such as natural gas, electricity, and water; however, these improvements would not cause significant environmental impacts. The environmental impacts resulting from the facility improvements associated with the Project have been analyzed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics through Section 4.18, Wildfire of the EIR. Mitigation measures were proposed as applicable that, when implemented, would reduce potential impacts resulting from the Project’s need for construction of new and expanded facilities to less than significant levels.

The growth-related impacts of the Project would be limited to the Project itself and would not encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment.

Finding – The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project does not directly result in any significant growth-inducing impacts.

Supportive Evidence – Please refer to EIR pages 5-3 through 5-5.

9.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives were addressed in the EIR:

- 1) The No Project Alternative
- 2) Reduced Retail Development by 20 Percent Alternative
- 3) No Commercial Alternative

9.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Description: State CEQA Guidelines §15126.6, requires an evaluation of the “No Project” alternative for decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving a project with the impacts of not approving it. Under Alternative 1, the adoption of the Specific Plan would not occur, and no new development nor infrastructure improvements would occur and the existing conditions and uses would remain. Accordingly, Alternative 1 provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the Project as compared to the current environmental conditions, resulting from not approving or denying the Project. Alternative 1 would not develop the 695 dwelling units, 335,700 square feet (SF) of general commercial uses or associated on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements that would otherwise occur as part of the Project.

Finding – The City adopts Finding 3.

The City finds that Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project objectives, as identified above as the Project site would remain in its existing condition. The Project site would not provide housing or employment opportunities and would not provide economic stimulation or roadway improvements in the City. Therefore, this Alternative is considered and rejected because it does not meet the Project objectives.

Supporting Evidence – Please see EIR Pages 6-6 through 6-10.

9.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Retail Development by 20 Percent Alternative

Description: The Reduced Retail Development by 20 Percent Alternative or “Alternative 2” assumes the development of commercial uses, but at a smaller retail square footage (20 percent less) than what is proposed for the Project. The Project proposes a projected maximum net development of approximately 335,700 SF of general commercial uses, which include 232,800 SF of retail space, 11,000 SF of restaurant space, and 91,900 SF of self-storage space. Alternative 2 would reduce the Project’s proposed retail space from 232,800 SF to 186,240 SF (or 5.34 to 4.07 acres). This would result in a 20 percent reduction of projected workforce, and customer base, resulting in a trip generation reduction of 20 percent from 8,616 daily trips to approximately 6,893 daily trips. Residential units are assumed to be the same. Although the overall project area would be built out in a similar manner as the Project, Alternative 2 would have a smaller development footprint.

Finding – The City adopts Finding 3.

The City finds that Alternative 2 would reduce some of the Project's environmental impacts due to the 20 percent reduction in commercial retail development. However, the majority of impacts would remain similar. Alternative 2 would likely lead to reduced impacts in air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, transportation, and utilities and service systems, but would not result in the avoidance or substantial lessening of any of these impacts. Additionally, this Alternative would fulfill most Project objectives, as Alternative 2 is generally consistent with the Project's proposed land uses. However, Alternative 2 would meet the Project Objectives to a lesser degree than the Project because the 20 percent reduction in commercial retail development would not allow for the same level of development of the commercial retail facilities and would still require the same level of infrastructure costs; therefore, the Alternative would not fully meet all the project objectives. Specifically, the 20 percent reduction included under this Alternative would not meet Project objective 1, which is to authorize the redevelopment of a blighted and under-utilized property, by not maximizing the use of the under-utilized property. Alternative 2 would not utilize the existing site to the greatest extent feasible and would result in a reduction in the number of employees due to the 20 percent reduction in commercial retail opportunities. Additionally, it would not generate to the full potential the availability of commercial resources to the consumer and would not maximize the number of jobs created.

Supporting Evidence – Please see EIR Pages 6-10 through 6-16.

9.3 Alternative 3: No Commercial Alternative

Description: The No Commercial Alternative or "Alternative 3" assumes that the Project would not include any commercial development and would limit the Project's commercial component as a zone change only. Development under Alternative 3 would only consist of the development of 695 dwelling units and not include the 335,700 SF of combined retail, restaurant, and self-storage spaces that are proposed by the Project. Parcels that would be rezoned for commercial use would remain undeveloped or be developed by a separate project applicant in the not foreseeable future. Additionally, the Specific Plan would not include entitlements for commercial development and any future commercial development (by others) would be subject to the Specific Plan's applicable design standards and provisions. All other Project components would stay the same.

Finding – The City adopts Finding 3.

The City finds that Alternative 3 would reduce a majority of the Project's environmental impacts, although other impacts would be similar. Alternative 3 would likely lead to reduced impacts in aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, transportation and traffic, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. This Alternative fails to meet Project objectives pertaining to the development of a variety of businesses that provide new jobs and services and therefore is rejected for further consideration. Specifically, by removing commercial uses, this Alternative would not meet Project objective 1, which is to authorize the redevelopment of a blighted and under-utilized property, by not maximizing the use of the under-utilized property; it would not meet Project Objective 2, which is to organize a mix of land uses which will provide a variety of housing and businesses, spurring new jobs and services, by not providing commercial services to the site, reducing opportunities for new

jobs and services to the City. Alternative 3 would not utilize the existing site to the greatest extent feasible and would result in a reduction in the number of employees and services to the City.

Supporting Evidence – Please see EIR Pages 6-16 through 6-22.

10.0 FINDINGS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that when making findings required by Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, the Lead Agency approving a project shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval, in order to ensure compliance with project implementation and to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The City hereby finds that:

- 1) A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project, which includes the necessary mitigation measures. The MMRP is incorporated herein by reference and is considered part of the record of proceedings for the Project.
- 2) The MMRP designates responsibility for implementation and monitoring of proposed mitigation measures. The City's Planning and Development Services Department will serve as the overall MMRP coordinator and will be primarily responsible for ensuring that all mitigation measures are complied with.
- 3) The MMRP prepared for the Project has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. The MMRP meets the requirements of Section 21021.6 of the Public Resources Code. The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

11.0 OTHER FINDINGS

The City hereby finds as follows:

- 1) The foregoing statements are true and correct;
- 2) The City is the "Lead Agency" for the Project evaluated in the CEQA Documents and independently reviewed and analyzed in the Draft EIR and Final EIR for the Project;
- 3) The Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR was circulated for public review. It requested that responsible agencies respond as to the scope and content of the environmental information germane to that agency's specific responsibilities;
- 4) The public review period for the Draft EIR was for 50 days between June 26, 2023 and August 14, 2023. The Draft EIR and appendices were available for public review during that time. A Notice of Completion and copies of the Draft EIR were submitted electronically via CEQA.net to the State Clearinghouse, and notices of availability of the EIR were published by the City. In addition, the Draft EIR was available for review on the City's website. Physical copies of the environmental documents were and are available at the City of Grand Terrace, Planning and Development Services Department.

- 5) The CEQA Documents were completed in compliance with CEQA;
- 6) The CEQA Documents reflect the City's independent judgment;
- 7) The City evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the City prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The City reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information to the EIR regarding adverse environmental impacts. The City has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these Findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the EIR;
- 8) The City finds that the CEQA Documents, as amended, provide objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit all comments made during the public review period;
- 9) The CEQA Documents evaluated the following impacts: (1) aesthetics; (2) agriculture and forestry; (3) air quality; (4) biological resources; (5) cultural resources; (6) energy; (7) geology and soils; (8) greenhouse gas emissions; (9) hazards and hazardous materials; (10) hydrology and water quality; (11) land use and planning; (12) mineral resources; (13) noise; (14) population and housing; (15) public services; (16) recreation; (17) transportation and circulation; (18) tribal cultural resources; (19) utilities and service systems; (20) wildfire. Additionally, the CEQA Documents considered, in separate sections, significant irreversible environmental changes and growth-inducing impacts of the Project, as well as a reasonable range of project alternatives. All of the significant environmental impacts of the Project were identified in the CEQA Documents;
- 10) The MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the CEQA Documents and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the Project. The MMRP provides the steps necessary to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable;
- 11) The MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation; the City's Planning and Development Services Department Director will serve as the MMRP Coordinator;
- 12) In determining whether the Project may have a significant impact on the environment, and in adopting these Findings pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, the City has complied with CEQA Sections 21081.5 and 21082.2;
- 13) The impacts of the Project have been analyzed to the extent feasible at the time of certification of the CEQA Documents;
- 14) The City made no decisions related to approval of the Project prior to the initial recommendation of certification of the CEQA Documents. The City also did not commit to a

definite course of action with respect to the Project prior to the initial consideration of the CEQA Documents.

- 15) Copies of all the documents incorporated by reference in the CEQA Documents are and have been available upon request at all times at the offices of the Planning and Development Services Department, the custodian of record for such documents or other materials;
- 16) The responses to the comments on the Draft EIR, as contained in the Final EIR, clarify and amplify the analysis in the EIR;
- 17) Having reviewed the information contained in the CEQA Documents and in the administrative record, the City finds that there is no new significant information regarding adverse environmental impacts of the Project in the EIR; and
- 18) Having received, reviewed and considered all information in the CEQA Documents, as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, these Findings are hereby adopted by the City in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency.

12.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a) and (b), the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” as provided in 14 CCR §15093 (a). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record. 14 CCR §15093(b).

Courts have upheld overriding considerations that were based on a variety of policy considerations including, but not limited to, new jobs, stronger tax base, and implementation of an agency’s economic development goals, growth management policies, redevelopment plans, the need for housing and employment, conformity to community plan, and provision of construction jobs; *see Towards Responsibility in Planning v. City Council* (1988) 200 Cal App. 3d 671; *Dusek v. Redevelopment Agency* (1985) 173 Cal App. 3d 1029; *City of Poway v City of San Diego* (1984) 155 Cal App. 3d 1037; and *Markley v. City Council* (1982) 131 Cal App.3d 656.

The City finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR that are within the purview of the City would be implemented with the Project, and that the mitigation measures that may be within another agency’s discretion have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency. As identified below, the City further finds that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the EIR, and the record.

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), when implemented, would avoid, or substantially lessen almost all of the significant effects identified in the EIR

for the Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan (Project). However, certain significant impacts of the Project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts would result from air quality and greenhouse gas emission impacts due to inconsistency with AQMP and Project operational emissions and cumulative long-term impacts. The Project would implement development-specific air quality mitigation measures identified in these Findings (**MM AQ-1** through **MM AQ-5**), acting to generally reduce the Project's operational-source air pollutant emissions. Additionally, the Project would also implement development-specific greenhouse gas emissions mitigation measures identified in these Findings (**GHG-1** through **GHG-4**), to reduce operational GHG emissions.

In combination, the Project air quality mitigation measures; and Project emissions-reducing operational programs are consistent with and support overarching AQMP air pollution reduction strategies. Project support of these strategies would globally promote timely attainment of AQMP air quality standards and would bring the Project into conformance with the AQMP to the extent feasible. Notwithstanding, based on the analysis presented here, the Project is considered to be inconsistent with applicable AQMP Consistency Criteria, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. Unmitigated operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. **MMs AQ-2** through **AQ-5** were identified to reduce operational emissions. **MM AQ-2** requires the implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce single occupant vehicle trips and encourage transit. **MM AQ-3** prohibits the use of any kind of fireplaces, and **MM AQ-4** requires all landscaping equipment used onsite shall be 100 percent electrically powered. **MM AQ-5** requires the use of low VOC paint for interior and exterior architectural coatings and paintings. Notwithstanding, based on the analysis presented here, despite the implementation of **MMs AQ 2** through **AQ 5**, operational emissions related to ROG and NO_x would remain above the SCAQMD's thresholds, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Additionally, greenhouse gas emissions would exceed the Project's operational-source GHG emissions threshold. LOR GHG-1 through LOR GHG-4, as required by the California Building Code, would provide designated parking to promote the use of alternative fuels and clean fleets, water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste, facilitate future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment, and limit idling times. Furthermore, **MM GHG-1** requires the Project to install solar photovoltaic systems, **MM GHG-2** requires the Project to meet or exceed CALGreen Tier 2 standards to further improve energy efficiency; **MM GHG-3** requires the residential projects to utilize energy efficient appliances; and **MM GHG-4** requires the Project to divert 75 percent of waste from landfills. Even with implementation of regulatory requirements, standard conditions of approval, and feasible mitigation, the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts because it exceeds the 3,000 MTCO₂e threshold set by the SCAQMD and used for purposes of analysis. Despite implementation of **MMs AQ-1** through **AQ-5** in **Section 4.2, Air Quality** and **MMs GHG-1** through **GHG-4** in **Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions**, a significant and unavoidable impact would remain.

The City finds that all feasible mitigation measures would be implemented with the Project. As identified below, the City further finds that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed by the Project benefits and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the EIR, and the record.

The City finds that any one of the benefits set forth below is sufficient by itself to warrant approval of the Project. This determination is based on the findings herein and the evidence in the record. Having balanced the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts against each of the benefits, the City hereby adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations for the following reasons:

1. All feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to lessen Project impacts to less than significant levels; and furthermore, alternatives to the Project are infeasible because while they have similar or less environmental impacts, they do not provide the economic benefits of the Project or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible when compared to the Project, as described in the Statement of Facts and Findings.
2. Approval of the Project will create maximum local and regional employment-generating opportunities for citizens of the City and surrounding communities. Specifically, approval of the Project will contribute to the City's population by approximately 1,911 persons which could help fill the permanent employment opportunities.
3. Approval of the Project will contribute towards increasing new housing units within the City to improve the jobs-housing balance and to reduce housing need within the City. The Project will attract businesses that can expedite the delivery of essential goods to consumers and businesses in the City and region.
4. Approval of the Project will result in improved infrastructure to keep pace with development and will enhance the quality of life for the City's residents by linking land use, transportation and infrastructure development.
5. The Project is strategically located in close proximity to freeways and roads, thereby ensuring efficient movement of goods and a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.
6. The Project will pay fair share contributions towards future regional circulation improvements.
7. The Project is consistent with and will contribute to achieving the goals and objectives established by the General Plan. Implementing the City's General Plan as a policy is a legal and social prerogative of the City. The Project would be consistent with the following General Plan Goals and Policies through the implementation of Mitigation Measures as listed below. Additionally, while the City's General Plan is the primary guide for City-wide growth and development, the Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan focuses on the distinctive characteristics of properties within their surrounding context by customizing the planning process and land use regulations specifically in this area, in a manner consistent with the General Plan.

Objectives of the Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan (Project) intends to:

- Authorize the redevelopment of a blighted and under-utilized property;
- Organize a mix of land uses which will provide a variety of housing and businesses, spurring new jobs and services;
- Implement development standards and design guidelines establishing a vibrant community;

- Provide diversity of high-quality architecture and landscape with appropriate open space areas;
- Provide for the distribution, location and extent and intensity of major components of public and private roads, sewage, water, drainage, dry utilities, and other essential facilities within the Specific Plan area and/or needed to support the proposed land uses;
- Establishes compatibility standards and guidelines to minimize negative impacts on adjacent properties;
- Include operational and maintenance plans for financing improvements;
- Provide the extension of Commerce Way from its current terminus point southward to Taylor Street and then Main Street; and
- Provide public recreational facilities to meet the needs of the community by incorporating a public park with a new baseball field and playground.

Goals and policies from the City of Grand Terrace General Plan that are applicable and not applicable to the Project include:

Land Use Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 2.1: Provide for balanced growth which seeks to provide a wide range of employment and housing opportunities and maintenance of a healthy, diversified community.		
2.1.1	Implementation of General Plan goals shall be reviewed every five years with the first review occurring one year after adoption of the General Plan. This will include an assessment of the relationship between General Plan land use designations and existing land uses at the time of the review as well as growth patterns in surrounding communities.	N/A
2.1.2	The City will establish a formal liaison with adjacent jurisdictions, i.e., Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and the Cities of San Bernardino and Colton, for the purpose of evaluating the effects of each jurisdiction's land use planning activities on contiguous areas.	N/A
2.1.3	Grand Terrace's potential role within the regional market area will be reviewed every 2 ½ years as an integral part of the General Plan.	N/A
2.1.4	The supply of vacant land and underutilized lands within the City shall be reviewed every 2 ½ years to consider changes in zoning in support of General Plan goals.	N/A
2.1.5	Enhancement of the City's image shall be undertaken by the establishment of City entrances and development of unified streetscapes.	N/A
2.1.6	Mixed use development which can demonstrate superior use of land, more efficient utilization of public facilities, and more effective conservation of natural resources shall be strongly encouraged by the City of Grand Terrace.	SP complies
2.1.7	The City shall continually refine population growth forecasts to ensure adequate planning for anticipated increased levels of sewerage, water and other necessary community services.	SP complies
Goal 2.2: Preserve and enhance the quality and character of the City's residential neighborhoods.		
2.2.1	Any development occurring within the Hillside Residential designation shall be required to prepare a Specific Plan.	N/A
2.2.2	All residential developments shall comply with the goals and policies of the Housing Element of the General Plan.	SP complies
Goal 2.3: Provide a wide range of retail and service commercial opportunities designed to meet the needs of the City's residents, businesses, and visitors while also providing employment opportunities.		
2.3.1	Commercially designated freeway frontage shall be master planned to ensure a comprehensive commercial development pattern that will serve as a scenic entry into the City.	SP complies
2.3.2	Maintenance and continued development of Grand Terrace's established commercial areas, as an encouragement of new commercial development.	SP complies

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
2.3.3	Additional freeway service-oriented commercial uses shall be encouraged.	SP complies
2.3.4	Commercial areas along Barton Road shall be designated in a manner that discourages “strip commercial” type development.	N/A
2.3.5	Measures to reduce potential land use incompatibility between commercially designated areas and all other plan areas will be given special consideration. Specific features could include increased setbacks, walls, berms, and landscaping.	SP complies
Goal 2.4: Provide for a mix of attractive industrial land uses designed to generate employment opportunities		
2.4.1	The City shall promote the development of employment generating, light, non-polluting industry with the present land use pattern.	N/A
2.4.2	The City shall promote the development of light non-polluting industrial uses within the City.	N/A
2.4.3	Whenever feasible, industrially designated areas shall be master planned to provide an “industrial park” character.	N/A
2.4.4	Buffering to prevent potential land use incompatibilities between industrial areas and other areas shall be given special consideration. Specific features could include increased setbacks, walls, berms, and landscaping.	N/A
2.4.5	The City’s Redevelopment Agency shall assist in the consolidation and assemblage of properties to assure adequate sized quality development with areas designated as light industrial.	N/A
Goal 2.5: Provide for the preservation of natural resources and open space.		
2.5.1	All areas of Blue Mountain above elevation 1,450 feet above sea level shall be maintained as open space. Consideration shall be given to the maintenance of existing communications towers.	N/A
2.5.2	Areas designated as Open Space shall be preserved to provide long-term recreation opportunities as well as the preservation of scenic and environmental resources and the protection of public health and safety.	N/A
2.5.3	Energy efficiency shall be encouraged in all future development.	SP complies

Safety Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 3.1: Provide a comprehensive transportation system that provides for the current and long-term efficient movement of people and goods within and through the City.		
3.1.1	Provide a transportation system which supports planned land uses and improves the quality of life.	SP complies
3.1.2	An arterial street system shall be established that provides for the collection of local traffic and provide for the efficient movement of people and goods through the City.	SP complies
3.1.3	Commerce Way shall provide for the movement of traffic associated with commercial and business traffic.	SP complies
3.1.4	Coordinate with transportation planning, programming and implementation agencies such as SCAG, Caltrans, SANBAG, and the cities of San Bernardino County, as well as neighboring jurisdictions in Riverside County on various studies relating to freeway, high occupancy vehicle/high occupancy toll lanes and transportation corridor planning, construction, and improvement in order to facilitate the planning and implementation of an integrated circulation system in accordance with regional planning goals.	N/A
3.1.5	New development projects shall be analyzed in accordance with SANBAG congestion management Program (CMP) Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines.	SP complies
3.1.6	The City shall work with adjacent jurisdictions to assess future land development projects and their impact to the City circulation system and provide appropriate mitigation for identified impacts.	N/A
3.1.7	The maximum acceptable Level of Service for streets identified in the City Master Plan of Streets and Highways during peak hours shall be LOS “D.”	SP Complies

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
3.1.8	The City shall use the Caltrans Design and traffic manuals as guidelines for street lighting, traffic signage, street markings and intersection signalization.	SP complies
Goal 3.2: Provide for a well-maintained roadway system.		
3.2.1	The City shall continue to require the dedication of street right-of-way, as identified in the Circulation Plan, from all proposed land development projects.	SP complies
3.2.2	The City shall require that street improvements be constructed at the time that development occurs on vacant or underutilized property.	SP complies
3.2.3	The extension, improvement and maintenance of City streets using City funds shall be based upon an adopted Capital Improvement Program.	SP complies
Goal 3.3: Provide for a safe circulation system.		
3.3.1	Promote the safe and effective movement of all segments of the population and the efficient transport of goods.	SP complies
3.3.2	The City shall require that new developments provide adequate off street parking in order to minimize the need for on street parking.	SP complies
3.3.3	The City shall ensure that local street improvements are designed with proper attention to community appearance and aesthetics as well as the need to move traffic safely and efficiently.	SP complies
3.3.4	The City shall route truck traffic away from residential areas and work with regional agencies in order to mitigate potential impacts from regional traffic.	SP Complies
3.3.5	The City shall evaluate and, when appropriate, implement traffic calming measures on residential local residential streets.	SP complies
3.3.6	The City shall ensure that the design of Commerce Way at the UPRR line is coordinated with the UPRR Company.	SP complies
Goal 3.4: Provide for an efficient and safe bikeway system within the City.		
3.4.1	Develop a system of continuous and convenient bicycle routes designed to connect schools, residential areas, shopping centers, parks, and employment areas.	SP complies
3.4.2	The City shall promote and facilitate the use of bicycles as an alternative mode of transportation through the development of a City-wide network of bikeways.	N/A
3.4.3	The City shall seek grants and other available funding sources to construct additional segments of the Bikeway Plan.	N/A
3.4.4	The City shall develop a public relations program, in concert with other local and regional agencies, to promote bicycle usages.	N/A
3.4.5	The City shall work with the San Bernardino County Parks Department to provide connections within the City to the Santa Ana River Trail.	N/A
3.4.6	The City shall require the provision of bike racks at all new commercial and industrial developments.	SP complies
Goal 3.5: Provide for efficient alternative modes of travel.		
3.5.1	Promote measures, which reduce reliance on single occupant vehicle usage by enforcement of the Traffic Control Measures (TCM) ordinance, which addresses development standards, land use patterns, employer based rideshare programs and bicycle/pedestrian facilities.	SP Complies
3.5.2	The City shall participate in local and regional public transit programs.	N/A
3.5.3	The City shall encourage and facilitate pedestrian movement by creating environments that are conducive to walking and maintaining a "human scale" of development.	SP complies
3.5.4	The City shall work closely with the regional transit agencies to ensure convenient, and the affordable bus service continues to be available to local residents.	N/A
3.5.5	The City shall work with OmniTrans and SANBAG to implement a public transit system that meets the City's need for internal circulation as well as connections to regional activity centers and inter-urban transit routes.	N/A
3.5.6	The City shall encourage Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to provide housing that is in close proximity to designated public transit facilities and routes. All projects will be	SP Complies

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
	reviewed in relationship to their proximity to existing and future transit systems.	
3.5.7	The City shall provide amenities along the Barton Road corridor that promote pedestrian and bicyclist use, such as a continued system of pedestrian paths and bike lanes to connect the City Center with schools, parks, and residential areas.	N/A

Open Space and Conservation Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 4.1: That the Open Space needed for outdoor recreation in the City of Grand Terrace be provided and thereby, improve the quality of life for the residents of the City		
4.1.1	A park standard of (five) 5 acres per 1,000 population shall be used to determine the total acreage of developed parkland for the City.	SP Complies
4.1.2	The City shall evaluate the siting of a public park site within that portion of the City lying westerly of I-215. The evaluation shall include the possibility of utilizing privately held, underutilized parcels and those areas subject to flood hazard lying west of the freeway.	N/A
4.1.3	The City shall evaluate the possibility of developing existing utility easements as linear parks.	N/A
4.1.4	The City shall evaluate the possibility of developing the Gage Canal as a linear park including a pedestrian/bike trail, which would connect with the proposed regional trail along the Gage Canal in Riverside County.	N/A
4.1.5	The City will establish guidelines and standards for the establishment of a linkage system among the City's parks and open space areas. In residential areas, the feasibility of utilizing sidewalks shall be made. These sidewalks will be part of the "Pedestrian Sidewalk Master Plan" called for in the Circulation Element and "safe routes" to schools plan. In addition, consideration will be given to the placement of appropriate signage along the sidewalk identifying them as part of a designated trail system.	SP Complies
4.1.6	The City will work with other public agencies and private entities to coordinate its trail planning and development to tie into the regional trails systems, including the California Recreational Trail System, connecting neighboring cities and counties. These trails shall be used for pedestrian, equestrian, or biking. Such efforts will include a connection with the Santa Ana River Trail as shown in the "Plan of Open Space and Trails for the County of San Bernardino" and with the trail system of the County of Riverside including the proposed regional trail along the Gage Canal in Riverside County.	SP Complies
4.1.7	The City will explore various means to fund the construction and maintenance of its trail system.	N/A
4.1.8	The City shall evaluate the feasibility of developing observation points (lookouts" along the northern boundary of the City to take advantage of the spectacular views of the San Bernardino Mountains.	N/A
4.1.9	The City shall develop Susan Petta Park as a passive park site connected to the City's Senior Center.	N/A
4.1.10	The City will consider the feasibility of utilizing various methodologies and techniques to provide open space for identified future needs. These programs shall include: • Open space zoning pursuant to Sect.65910 of the Government Code • Public acquisition of open space • Private acquisition of open space (e.g., non-profit land trusts or conservancies) • Application of the Quimby Act to subdivision approvals • Provision for open space in specific plans • Provision for open space in development agreements • Transfer of development rights • Open space in planned unit developments. Joint use agreements with the Colton Joint Unified School District	N/A
4.1.11	The City will explore various ways for park/open space development and maintenance funding	N/A

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
	including such programs as: • “Adopt a Park” where private groups and organizations can support, financially the procurement or recreational equipment and park maintenance. • Actively seek out various government grant programs such as the Local Assistance Grants administered by the California Department of Parks & Recreation; the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program; CDBG grants, and other government sponsored programs. • Explore the possibility of obtaining grants from private corporations. • Actively use various resources on the Internet. Review the feasibility of utilizing various other mechanisms for funding open space development and maintenance.	
4.1.12	The City shall evaluate the feasibility of developing the proposed Grand Terrace Wilderness Park into an active recreational facility including biking, hiking, and picnicking.	N/A
4.1.13	The City shall require development adjacent or in proximity to the proposed Grand Terrace Wilderness Park to provide land for access, parking and/or staging areas, as appropriate.	N/A
Goal 4.2: Natural resources in the City of Grand Terrace shall be protected and preserved by utilizing open space designations or related regulations		
4.2.1	The City shall use existing information regarding biological resources including data on natural vegetation and wildlife habitats for both rare and endangered species in identifying potential natural resource open space areas.	N/A
4.2.2	The City shall establish land use regulations to preserve and protect any identified natural resources.	N/A
4.2.3	The City shall cooperate with the County of San Bernardino and other participating cities in identifying regional natural resource areas and developing appropriate mitigation measures to protect these resources.	N/A
4.2.4	The City shall evaluate developing a specific plan for the western face of Blue Mountain. The specific plan will contain policies to preserve and maintain the open space resources of Blue Mountain including its biologic properties.	N/A
4.2.5	The City shall act to reasonably conserve and protect significant biological resources.	N/A
4.3.1	The City shall periodically review and keep abreast of geologic and seismic reports and information that shall affect the City.	N/A
4.3.2	The City shall identify areas within the City that shall be subject to geologic or seismic hazards and evaluate the potential to designate these areas as open space.	N/A
4.3.3	Open space shall be used to protect public health and safety resulting from flood hazard conditions in the City of Grand Terrace.	SP complies
4.3.4	The City shall periodically review the flood hazard maps to identify potential flood hazards.	N/A
4.3.5	Those areas subject to flood hazard shall be placed in a flood hazard overlay zone	N/A
4.3.6	Areas of the City subject to flood hazard shall be evaluated to determine whether they shall be designated as open space.	N/A
4.3.7	Where appropriate, open space shall be used to protect public health and safety resulting from wildland fires in the City of Grand Terrace.	N/A
4.3.8	The City shall work with the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District to identify areas of the City that are subject to wildland fires.	N/A
4.3.9	The City shall apply a high fire overlay district to those areas in the City subject to wildland fires such as portions of Blue Mountain.	N/A
4.3.10	Areas of the City subject to wildland fires shall be evaluated to determine whether they shall be designated as open space.	N/A
Goal 4.4: Provide open space to enhance community identity.		
4.4.1	The City shall consider the establishment of a public plaza in the proposed "Town Square" project on Barton Road. This public plaza shall be designed to serve the social and cultural needs of the community.	N/A
4.4.2	The City shall evaluate the feasibility of extending bike lanes and pedestrian paths to allow	N/A

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
	people to walk to the public plaza area in the Town Square project on Barton Road.	
4.4.3	The City shall use various multi-media marketing methods to proactively market the City's parks and recreation facilities.	N/A
4.4.4	The City shall continue to implement the City's Bike Trail Master Plan as funds are available.	N/A
Goal 4.5: Protect and promote the beauty of Blue Mountain.		
4.5.1	The City shall consider developing a specific plan for the western face of Blue Mountain.	N/A
4.5.2	The City shall designate Blue Mountain as a community symbol reflecting its value as a major open space and scenic resource.	N/A
4.5.3	The City shall evaluate the development of the Grand Terrace Wilderness Park to encourage the City's residents to relate to Blue Mountain.	N/A
4.5.4	The City shall evaluate the feasibility of developing a trail system emanating from the proposed Grand Terrace Wilderness Passive Park to provide trails on Blue Mountain with possible connections to regional trail systems in the area.	N/A
4.5.5	A fire overlay district shall be applied to Blue Mountain to protect both the future development that shall be constructed on the lower, more gentle slopes at the foot of the mountain and also its natural beauty.	N/A
Goal 4.6: The City shall support and promote the conservation of energy resources.		
4.6.1	The City shall establish an energy conservation policy and implementation program for all City facilities.	N/A
4.6.2	The City shall implement a public outreach program to provide the public with information regarding energy conservation practices and programs.	N/A
4.6.3	The City shall encourage energy and environmentally sustainable design in new land development projects using Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) or similar standards.	Sp complies
4.6.4	The City shall work with its franchised solid waste collection company to implement recycling programs designed to reduce the per capita waste generation within the City while responding to the requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989.	N/A
Goal 4.7: Support air quality planning through land use policies, outreach efforts, and participation in regional air quality planning.		
4.7.1	The City shall evaluate and implement traffic flow improvements and construction management practices that reduce locally generated vehicle emissions.	SP complies
4.7.2	The City shall encourage the use of public transportation through coordination with local and regional transit providers.	N/A
4.7.3	The City shall encourage land use planning and urban design that reduces vehicle trips through mixed use development, consolidation of commercial uses along arterial highways, and pedestrian connection between residential and commercial uses.	SP complies
4.7.4	The City shall promote public education programs regarding air quality programs and practices.	N/A
4.7.5	The City shall encourage employers to develop and implement trip reduction plans including alternate work schedules, rideshare programs, telecommuting, and employee education programs.	N/A
4.7.6	The City shall implement policies and procedures designed to reduce emissions generated by construction activities including enforcement of SCAQMD Rule 403.	N/A
4.7.7	The City shall promote energy conservation efforts in new and existing residences and businesses.	SP complies
Goal 4.8: Achieve regional water quality objectives and protect the beneficial uses of the regions surface and groundwater.		
4.8.1	Evaluate all proposed land use and development plans for their potential to create groundwater contamination hazards from point and non-point sources, and cooperate with other appropriate agencies to assure appropriate mitigation	SP complies

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
4.8.2	Comply with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).	SP complies
Goal 4.9 Comply with state and federal regulations to ensure the protection of historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources.		
4.9.1	The City shall take reasonable steps to ensure that cultural resources are located, identified and evaluated to assure that appropriate action is taken as to the disposition of these resources.	SP complies

Public Health and Safety Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 5.1: Minimize the risk to public health and safety, social and economic welfare of the City resulting from geologic and seismic hazards		
5.1.1	All new development shall comply with current seismic design standards.	SP complies
5.1.2	All proposed developments shall be evaluated for impacts associated with geologic and seismic hazards.	SP complies
5.1.3	Existing structures which are seismically unsound shall be identified and programmed for mitigation or removal where necessary to protect the public safety. Cultural and historic significance of buildings shall be considered in this program.	N/A
5.1.4	Grading plans for development projects shall include an approved drainage and erosion control plan to minimize the impacts from erosion and sedimentation during grading.	SP complies
Goal 5.2: Protect humans and property from hazards associated with slope instability.		
5.2.1	The City shall continue to enforce hillside development standards for proposed developments in areas on or near areas of potential slope instability.	N/A
5.2.2	All new developments in areas of slope instability shall be required to perform adequate geotechnical analysis and provide an engineered design to assure that slope instability will not impact the development.	N/A
Goal 5.3: Reduce the risk to life and property in areas designated as flood hazard areas.		
5.3.1	All development proposed within a designated 100-year floodplain shall be reviewed to assure that all structures designated for human habitation are adequately protected from flood hazards.	N/A
5.3.2	The City shall work with the San Bernardino County Flood Control District and Army Corps of Engineers to provide adequate flood protection along the Santa Ana River.	N/A
5.3.3	The City shall evaluate the flood control system of the City and improve it as required and as funds become available.	SP complies
5.3.4	The City shall require all development projects to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and implement appropriate Best Management Practices.	SP complies

Noise Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 6.1: Protect the citizens of Grand Terrace and sensitive land uses from annoying and excessive noise generated by non-transportation oriented uses and activities		
6.1.1	Implement a review process of the City's noise ordinance and City policies and regulations affecting noise.	N/A
6.1.2	Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent land uses by limiting the permitted hours of activity.	SP complies
6.1.3	Require City departments to observe state and federal occupational safety and health noise standards.	N/A
6.1.4	Require new equipment and vehicles purchased by the City to comply with noise performance standards consistent with available noise reduction technology.	N/A
Goal 6.2: Prevent and mitigate the adverse impacts of excessive exposure to residential and commercial land uses.		

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
6.2.1	Incorporate noise considerations into land use planning decisions to minimize or avoid detrimental impacts, reduce encroachment of non-residential land uses, and enforce the local noise ordinance.	SP complies
6.2.2	Adopt planning guidelines that establish acceptable noise standards for various land uses throughout the City of Grand Terrace	N/A
6.2.3	New residential developments located in close proximity to existing commercial/industrial operations shall be evaluated for potential noise impacts and interior noise mitigation.	SP complies
6.2.4	Commercial uses developed as part of any mixed-use project including residential component shall not be noise intensive. Mixed-use structures shall be designed to prevent commercial noise impacts to the project's residential uses.	SP complies
6.2.5	New commercial/industrial operations located in proximity to existing or proposed residential areas shall incorporate noise mitigation into project design.	SP complies
6.2.6	Impacts of construction noise and vibration on adjacent land uses shall be regulated through limiting the permitted hours of activity.	SP complies
6.2.7	The City shall evaluate potential ground-borne vibration impacts as part of the land use planning process to mitigate or avoid detrimental impacts on adjacent land uses.	SP complies
Goal 6.3: Protect the residents of Grand Terrace from excessive noise generated by transportation-oriented sources.		
6.3.1	The City shall be actively involved in improvements programs for I-215 to promote noise mitigation along the freeway corridor through the City.	N/A
6.3.2	The City shall enforce the California Vehicle Code noise standards within the City.	N/A
6.3.3	The City shall consider noise impacts to residential neighborhoods when designating truck routes and major circulation corridors.	SP complies
6.3.4	The City shall promote the establishment of bus routes that meet public transportation needs while minimizing bus noise impacts to residential areas.	N/A
6.3.5	Encourage, where feasible, noise mitigation measures, such as noise barriers and realignments, in the design and construction of new roadway projects in the City of Grand Terrace.	SP complies
6.3.6	The City shall promote the construction of noise barriers along rail lines that pass adjacent to residential areas.	N/A
6.3.7	The City shall encourage a reduction in the level of noise produced by train movements and whistle noise within the City.	N/A
6.3.8	The City shall monitor activities associated with future aircraft and rail movements that shall result in noise impacts to the City.	N/A

Public Services Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 7.1: Coordinate and balance the provision of public services with existing and planned development to eliminate service gaps, maximize the use of existing public facilities and services, provide a high level of quality public services at a reasonable cost, and maintain adequate services to meet the needs of current and future City residents and businesses.		
7.1.1	All proposed developments shall be evaluated to determine whether current public services and facilities can meet with their needs. If determined that current services and facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of new development, appropriate mitigation measures shall be applied to the new development to assure an adequate level of service.	N/A
7.1.2	The City shall establish and periodically update a Development Impact Fee program for new development designed to generate adequate fees to provide new public services and facilities necessary to serve the new development.	N/A
7.1.3	Ensure that existing residents and businesses are not burdened with the economic costs of new infrastructure to support new development.	SP complies
7.1.4	The City shall coordinate with public and private utility companies and agencies to assure the long-term provision of necessary public services including water, sewer, electrical, natural gas,	SP complies

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
	telephone, cable TV and waste collection/recycling.	
7.1.5	The City shall prepare and implement a Capital Improvement Program and, in accordance with AB 1600, monitor the capacity of existing facilities to assure that new development does not exceed their capacity. The City shall regularly review and update the Capital Improvement Program to address the changing needs of the community.	N/A
7.1.6	The City shall work with the County of San Bernardino to evaluate the feasibility for the development of a new library within the City.	N/A
7.1.7	The City shall seek grants and other funding sources to improve public services and facilities.	SP complies
7.1.8	The City shall work with the Colton Joint Unified School District to evaluate the potential to share facilities such as playgrounds, libraries, and assembly halls in a effort to efficiently use these facilities and avoid duplication of these facilities.	N/A
Goal 7.2: Provide a water system that produces high-quality water at sufficient pressure and with adequate quantity to meet current and future domestic demand.		
7.2.1	Continue to work with Riverside Highland Water Company to provide efficient and economic distribution of an adequate water supply.	SP complies
7.2.2	Work with Riverside Highland Water Company to ensure that the City's water supply meets or exceeds State and Federal health standards.	N/A
7.2.3	Work with Riverside Highland Water Company to promote water conservation and education programs.	N/A
Goal 7.3: Provide a safe and efficient sanitary sewer system to meet the current and future needs of the City's residents and businesses.		
7.3.1	Work with the City of Colton to ensure a quality wastewater treatment system that meets or exceeds all State and federal health standards.	N/A
7.3.2	Establish a sewer main maintenance program to ensure proper and timely maintenance of the City's sanitary sewer collection system.	N/A
Goal 7.4: Provide for an efficient and environmentally sound solid waste collection and recycling, and disposal system		
7.4.1	Work with the City's franchise waste collection company to ensure an effective and efficient waste collection program for all City residents and businesses.	N/A
7.4.2	Work with the County Waste Management Department to ensure a cost effective waste disposal system with adequate capacity to meet current and future needs.	N/A
7.4.3	Work with the County and the City's waste hauler to implement effective recycling programs to reduce the total amount of waste requiring disposal.	N/A
Goal 7.5: Provide for adequate law enforcement and police protection services and facilities		
7.5.1	Work with the County Sheriff's Department to ensure that adequate police personnel, response times, and equipment are available to meet current and future demands of the City's residents and businesses.	N/A
7.5.2	Maintain and expand existing crime prevention and public education programs.	N/A
Goal 7.6: Provide for adequate fire protection services and facilities.		
7.6.1	Work with the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District to ensure that adequate fire protection personnel, response times, and equipment are available to meet current and future demands of the City's residents and businesses.	N/A
7.6.2	Work with Riverside Highland Water Company to ensure adequate water pressure for fire fighting throughout the City.	N/A
7.6.3	Maintain and expand existing fire prevention and public education programs.	N/A
Goal 7.7: In cooperation with the Colton Joint Unified School District, provide adequate public education facilities and programs		
7.7.1	Work with the Colton Joint Unified School District to provide expanded public education facilities that meet the current and future needs of the City's residents.	N/A
7.7.2	Cooperate with the School District in the collection of school impact mitigation fees for all new developments within the City.	SP complies
Goal 7.8: In cooperation with private utility companies, provide adequate and updated utility services to the City's residents		

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
and businesses		
7.8.1	Work with electrical and telecommunications companies to underground lines whenever feasible.	SP complies
7.8.2	Coordinate with telecommunications companies to provide state-of-the-art telecommunications and internet services to the City's residents and businesses.	N/A
7.8.3	Coordinate with all utility companies to provide maintenance programs that minimize the impact to public streets and rights-of-way.	N/A

Housing Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 8.1: Provide and encourage a supply of housing suitable to the needs and sufficient in number to serve existing and projected residents of Grand Terrace.		
8.1.1	Promote and encourage development of housing, which varies by type, design, form of ownership and size.	SP complies
8.1.2	Maximize use of remaining vacant land suitable for residential development	SP complies
8.1.3	Promote and encourage infill housing development and more intensive use of underutilized land for residential construction.	SP complies
8.1.4	Encourage the use of innovative land use techniques and construction methods to minimize housing costs without compromising basic health, safety and aesthetic considerations.	SP complies
8.1.5	Strive to provide incentives for and otherwise encourage the private development of new affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households.	N/A
8.1.6	Facilitate construction of low- and moderate-income housing to the extent possible.	N/A
8.1.7	Periodically reexamine local building and zoning codes for possible amendments to reduce construction costs without sacrificing basic health and safety considerations.	N/A
8.1.8	Continue a policy of expeditious processing of residential development proposals and permits.	N/A
8.1.9	Amend the Barton Road Specific Plan to promote a village atmosphere in the downtown that will encourage a mix of residential and commercial activity.	N/A
8.1.10	Promote mixed use development with senior citizen housing in the Barton Road Specific Plan areas.	N/A
8.1.11	Provide Redevelopment Agency assistance and bond financing to qualified developments to obtain new senior citizen housing in the Barton Road Specific Plan area.	N/A
8.1.12	Provide for a new zoning category to permit a density of at least 20 units/ acre with a density bonus of 25% per State housing law, which would qualify for very low income housing.	N/A
8.1.13	Provide for housing set-aside funds to be committed to the "Habitat for Humanity" or similar organization for the development of low-income housing.	N/A
Goal 8.2: Promote and encourage housing opportunities, accessible to employment centers and quality community services for all economic segments of the community including designated very low, low, and moderate income households.		
8.2.1	Continue a policy of expeditious processing of residential development proposals and permits.	SP Complies
8.2.2	Encourage a wide range of housing types, prices and ownership forms in new construction.	SP Complies
8.2.3	Emphasize and promote the role of the private sector in the construction of low- and moderate-income housing.	SP Complies
8.2.4	Support the development of cost saving and energy conserving construction techniques.	SP Complies
8.2.5	Assist private developers in identifying and preparing land suitable for lower- income housing developments.	N/A
8.2.6	Encourage the inclusion of units for low- and moderate-income families as part of private sponsored housing developments.	N/A
8.2.7	Support efforts of private lenders to provide alternative financing methods to make homeownership available to a greater number of households.	N/A
8.2.8	Streamline administrative procedures for granting approvals and permits and establish time	SP Complies

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
	limits for such approvals to minimize time, costs and uncertainty associated with development.	
8.2.9	Provide zoning, subdivision and construction incentives to minimize the cost of new and rehabilitated units.	SP Complies
8.2.10	Promote mixed use development that includes provisions for affordable housing.	SP Complies
8.2.11	Provide Redevelopment Agency assistance and bond financing to qualified developments.	N/A
8.2.12	Continue operation of the City Housing Office to administer and monitor City housing programs to low and moderate income residents.	N/A
8.2.13	Commit existing and future housing set-aside dollars to continue and expand the City's existing first time home buyer assistance program as needed to meet the community's low and moderate income housing needs, as described in this Housing Element.	N/A
8.2.14	Commit the City's Housing Office to seek available State grants to provide funds to qualified owners of mobilehomes for rehabilitation or replacement purposes and to qualified buyers for the purchase of mobilehomes.	N/A
8.2.15	Work with the San Bernardino County Housing Authority in placing Section 8 certificates in the community, when appropriate.	N/A
8.2.16	Maintain and enhance the low density character of existing residential neighborhoods.	N/A
8.2.17	Investigate and pursue programs and funding sources designed to maintain and/or improve the affordability of existing housing units to low- and moderate-income households.	N/A
Goal 8.3: Promote and encourage the rehabilitation of deteriorated dwelling units and the conservation of the currently sound housing stock.		
8.3.1	Promote utilization of rehabilitation assistance programs to alleviate overcrowded conditions and to remove architectural barriers.	N/A
8.3.2	Encourage the rehabilitation of deteriorating owner-occupied and rental housing.	N/A
8.3.3	Take action to promote the removal and replacement of those substandard units that cannot be rehabilitated.	N/A
8.3.4	Upgrade community facilities and municipal services as community needs warrant.	SP complies
8.3.5	Encourage the use of rehabilitation assistance programs to make residences more energy efficient.	N/A
8.3.6	Commit existing and future housing set-aside dollars to continue and expand the City's housing rehabilitation program as needed to meet the community's low and moderate income housing, as described in this Housing Element.	N/A
8.3.7	Utilize public information and assistance programs to encourage repair before deterioration occurs.	N/A
8.3.8	Monitor housing conditions in Grand Terrace on a semi-annual basis.	N/A
8.3.9	Prevent the encroachment of incompatible uses into established residential neighborhoods.	N/A
8.3.10	Sustain a high standard of maintenance for all publicly owned property.	N/A
8.3.11	Preserve the physical character of existing neighborhoods.	SP complies
8.3.12	Encourage the maintenance of sound owner-occupied and rental housing.	N/A
8.3.13	Maintain and enhance the low density character of existing residential neighborhoods, and higher density in the downtown area.	N/A

Sustainable Development Element Consistency Analysis

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
Goal 9.1: Reduce the City's per capita energy usage.		
9.1.1	The City shall work with Southern California Edison to promote energy conservation at residences and businesses.	N/A

Policy #	Goal/Policy	Consistency
9.1.2	The City shall incorporate energy conservation measures into conditions of approval for new development projects.	SP complies
Goal 9.2: Reduce the total quantity of waste generated within the City requiring landfill disposal to meet or exceed the State waste diversion goals.		
9.2.1	The City shall reduce the use of disposable products at all City facilities.	N/A
9.2.2	Require all new development projects to recycle construction and demolition wastes.	SP complies
9.2.3	The City shall work with its franchise waste collection company to expand current recycling programs.	N/A
Goal 9.3: Support sustainable development through good urban design practices.		
9.3.1	Incorporate “green” building practices into the review of all new or renovated development projects.	SP complies
9.3.2	Site and building design in new developments shall maximize opportunities for efficient energy performance.	SP complies
Goal 9.4: Provide parks and open space throughout the City.		
9.4.1	The City shall implement the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan to provide an average of five acres of parks and open space for every 1,000 residents.	SP Complies
9.4.2	The City shall provide trees and other landscaping along all arterial highways.	SP complies
9.4.3	The City shall seek to preserve open space and habitat areas on Blue Mountain.	N/A
Goal 9.5: Provide alternative transportation modes designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled.		
9.5.1	The City shall encourage alternative transportation modes, including mass transit, ride sharing, bicycles, and pedestrian transportation.	SP complies
9.5.2	The City shall encourage the creation of local jobs designed to reduce commuter mileage and fuel consumption.	SP complies
9.5.3	The City shall encourage new and rehabilitation projects that support alternative transportation modes.	N/A
Goal 9.6: Promote the use of non-hazardous materials in residences, businesses, and institutional facilities.		
9.6.1	The City shall discourage the use of volatile and hazardous materials at municipal facilities.	N/A
9.6.2	The City shall support public environmental health agencies in promoting healthy environment programs.	N/A
Goal 9.7 Reduce the City’s per capita demand for water consumption.		
9.7.1	The City shall work with Riverside Highland Water Company to reduce water consumption throughout the City.	N/A
9.7.2	The City shall incorporate water conservation into the development review process.	SP complies
Goal 9.8 The City shall lead the development community by example in green building, and energy and resource conservation practices, as feasible.		
9.8.1	The City shall support green development standards for new or rehabilitated public buildings and facilities, as feasible.	N/A
9.8.2	The City shall actively reduce greenhouse gas emissions from public facilities throughout the community.	N/A

Although significant unavoidable impacts will remain, implementation of mitigation measures as provided in the MMRP will mitigate significant adverse impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions to the maximum extent practicable. In its decision to approve the Project, the City Council has considered the Project benefits to outweigh the environmental impacts.

13.0 CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

The City Council certifies that the Final EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and that the City Council has complied with CEQA's procedural and substantive requirements.

The City Council further certifies that it has reviewed and considered the Final EIR in evaluation of the Project and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council. The City Council further finds that no new significant information as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, has been received by the City Council after the circulation of the Final EIR that would require further recirculation.

Accordingly, the City Council certifies the Final EIR for the Gateway at Grand Terrace Specific Plan Project.

As the decision-making body for approval, the City Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in these Findings and supporting documentation. The City Council determined that the Findings contain a complete and accurate reporting of the unavoidable impacts and benefits of the Project as detailed in this Statement of Overriding Considerations.