

## **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. **Project Title:**

Tentative Tract Map No. 18882  
Conditional Use Permit No. 1010

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of Redlands  
Community Development Department  
210 E. Citrus Avenue  
Redlands, CA 92373

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Manuel Baeza  
Principal Planner  
909-798-7555

4. **Project Location:**

The southwest corner of San Bernardino Avenue, and Dearborn Street.

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Brush Creek Ranch Co.  
30 Beacon Bay  
Newport Beach, CA

6. **General Plan Designation:**

The General Plan Designation is Very Low Density Residential (0 to 2.7 units per gross acre)

7. **Zoning:**

The Zoning Designation is R-E (Residential Estate) District.

8. **Description of Project:**

The project is a tentative tract map (TTM No. 18882) that would subdivide nine (9) acres in twenty-seven (27) single family residential lots and two (2) lettered lots for a planned residential development (CUP No. 1010) located on the southwest corner of San Bernardino Avenue, and Dearborn Street in the R-E (Residential Estate) District. The planned residential development (PRD) is proposed to allow for variation in lot dimensions, and area but is required to provide a minimum of 20% of the gross area in open space. Lots range in size from 7,090 to 9,093 square feet and have an average width of 65 feet.

The planned residential development (PRD) contains two private streets. Primary access to the project is provided via Street B located on the west side of Dearborn Street. All 27

dwellings are situated along a single street, Street "A" which has a north-south alignment and terminates with a cul-de-sacs on either end. The project will also install a 42 foot wide half width of Pennsylvania Avenue along the southerly boundary of the project. For emergency access a second driveway is proposed off of Pennsylvania Avenue. This driveway will remain closed but will be equipped with gate an Knox box to allow for use by City emergency personnel.

The project contains 2.88 acres of open space that would be within the two common area lots. Lot A encircles the project site and has an area of 2.61 acres. The lot is configured to provide a deep landscape buffer along the entire San Bernardino Avenue frontage, and smaller buffers of variable depth along the Dearborn Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue frontage, as well as the west property line. The balance of open space will contain a private park located on the north end of the project site.

## 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The property is surrounded by single family residential development to the east, by vacant land to the west, by agricultural land used for row crops to the south, and by a farm to the north. The Sports Park complex is located north east of the project site.

## 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions           | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning              | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

### DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☐

I find that although the Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE ☒

DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. ☐

I find that the Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Project, nothing further is required. ☐

---

Manuel Baeza  
Principal Planner  
City of Redlands  
March 27, 2013

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

I. **AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	—	—	—	✓
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	—	—	—	✓
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	—	—	—	✓
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	—	—	—	✓

### **Aesthetics**

- I.a) Adoption of the proposed project will not affect a scenic vista or scenic highway. The City's General Plan MEA/EIR does not identify the project site and surroundings as part of a scenic vista. The project adjoins existing residential development on the east and agricultural lands in all other directions. No mitigation is required.
- I.b) The project site is currently vacant and its is not in a historic district. The site and its environs do not contain any other scenic resources such as rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Since the site is not located near any of these items no mitigation measures are needed.
- I.c) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. The site is currently vacant and is adjacent to residential development on the east. It will not degrade the existing visual character or affect the quality of the site and its surroundings. No mitigation measures are needed.
- I.d) The project is residential and will not have a lighting component which will introduce a significant amount of light and glare to the area. No further measures are needed to provide any mitigation.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

- II. **AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a). Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	—	—	—	✓
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.	—	—	—	✓
c) 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))?	—	—	—	✓
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	—	—	—	✓
e) 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?	—	—	—	✓

## **AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

- II.a) Figure 5.2 of the Master Environmental Assessment for the General Plan (MEA/EIR) classifies the property "S" Agricultural lands of Statewide Importance, however the project site has been rezoned (in May of 2007) to R-E (Residential Estate). In addition the land has a General Plan land use designation of Very Low Density Residential (0 to 2.7 units per gross acre). Furthermore, the project contains no agricultural uses. Therefore there are no impacts to agricultural resources. No mitigation is required.
- II.b) According to the City's Agricultural Preserve Map the property is not located in a City Agricultural Preserve and is not under Williamson Contract from the State of California, Department of Conservation, therefore there is no impact on land zoned for agricultural use or land under a Williamson Act contract. No Mitigation Measures are needed.
- II.c) The project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned timberland production. No Mitigation is required.
- II.d) The project site is vacant and adoption of the project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No mitigation is required.
- II.e) The project site consists of vacant land. The site and adjoining properties to the east, west and south are zoned for residential use. Adoption of the proposed project will not 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. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

III. **AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	—	—	—	✓
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	—	—	—	✓
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone				

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
precursors)?	—	—	—	✓
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	—	✓	→	—
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	—	—	—	✓

### Air Quality

III.a-c) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) residential lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. The project is not large enough to conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an adopted air quality plan, violate an air quality standard, or contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation. Because of the project's limited scope it does not have the potential to generate a considerable net increase in pollutants. No mitigation is required.

III.d) The project will involve grading activities near surrounding residential development. These activities have the potential to generate significant amounts of fugitive dust which could temporarily violate local air quality standards. In order to prevent the project from violating any air quality standard or generating significant amounts of dust that would have a negative impact on sensitive receptors **Mitigation Measure No. 1** shall require that during the period of construction the applicant be required to perform on-site daily watering during all outdoor construction activities in order to mitigate the potential impacts to air quality from the generation of dust.

III. e) The proposed project is residential and will not produce any long term objectionable odors and no additional mitigation measures are needed.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

### IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

— — — ✓



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	—	—	—	✓
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	—	—	—	✓
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	—	—	—	✓
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	—	—	—	✓
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	—	—	—	✓

### **Biological Resources**

- IV.a-b) Adoption of the proposed project will not result in an adverse impact on 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. The project site is not identified in the Biotic Resources Map, Figure 7.1 of the MEA/EIR, as being within an area containing endangered, rare or species of special status or rare biological resources, or their valued habitat. A Biological Resources Assessment was completed for the site by the Lilburn Corporation due to the discovery of San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat (a federally-listed endangered species) north and east of the project site. As part of the assessment a field survey was conducted for the purpose of assessing habitat present within and immediately adjacent to the study area and to determine the presence or probability of presence of Candidate, Threatened, or Endangered species or their habitat. The survey states that the site was previously developed with a citrus grove but that all citrus has been removed and that the site had been disked for weed abatement. Vegetation observed

consisted of a single palm tree, and non-native weed species. The study determined that no sensitive species occupy the site, nor did the site contain critical habitat for sensitive species. Moreover the study concluded that the project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. No mitigation is required.

- IV.c) Adoption of the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. The project is not located on or near any property designated as wetland.
- IV.d) Adoption of the proposed project will not 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. The project site is not identified in the Biotic Resources Map, Figure 7.1 of the MEA/EIR, as being within an area containing resident migratory wildlife or their habitat nor is it used by wildlife as a migratory corridor. No mitigation is required.
- IV.e) Adoption of the proposed project will not cause a conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project site at one time contained a citrus grove that has since been cleared and disked for weeds. No biological resources are located in this area thus the project will not cause a conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting these resources. No mitigation is required.
- IV.f) Adoption of the proposed project will not cause a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The project site is in an urbanized area and is not subject to any conservation plan. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?    | — | — | — | ✓ |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?        | — | ✓ | → | — |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                           | — | — | — | ✓ |

## **Cultural Resources**

- V.a) According to the Archaeological Resource Sensitivity Map (Figure 10.1 of the MEA/EIR), the subject site is identified as being within a Rural Historic, Prehistoric, Archaeological District. The project site was previously surveyed in 2004 as part of a larger (71 acre) project that is no longer active (TTM No.16689). The survey included a records search by the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center at the San Bernardino County Museum. In addition a field survey was conducted in the same year to determine if there were any archaeological sites or historic age structures that could be impacted by development of the site. According to this research there were no structures that were eligible for the National Register of Historic Places nor were there any structures that would be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or City of Redlands local register. No mitigation is required.
- V. b) As discussed above, it was determined that the site contained no structures that were eligible for the National Register of Historic Places nor were there any structures that would be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or City of Redlands local register. In addition no archaeological sites were identified within or near the project area during previous field surveys. Therefore it was determined that there would be no impact archaeological resources with development of the project site. No mitigation is required.
- V.c) As part of the cultural resource surveys prepared for the previous inactive project a paleontologic literature review and records search was conducted for the project area by the Division of Geological Sciences of the San Bernardino County Museum on November 7, 2005. This included a search of the Regional Paleontologic Locality Inventory (RPLI) and review of geologic maps of the vicinity. The results of the search of the RPLI indicate that no paleontologic resources have been previously recorded within one mile of the project area. Geologic maps of the area indicate that the project area lies on surface exposures of middle Holocene alluvium. These Holocene sediments have a low potential to contain paleontologic resources. However, older deposits of Pleistocene age may be present underneath the Holocene sediments. Pleistocene sediments found elsewhere within the Inland Empire have proved to be highly fossiliferous. Fossils recovered from these Pleistocene sediments represent extinct fauna from the Ice Age including mammoths, ground sloths, dire wolves, short-faced bears, sabre-toothed cats, large and small horses, large and small camels, and bison. Excavation into Pleistocene sediments, therefore, has a high potential to impact significant, nonrenewable paleontologic resources.

Based on the depositional context of the area and the proximity of the Santa Ana River, it is considered likely that any Pleistocene sediments present within the project area would only be encountered at depths of more than 10 to 15 feet below the existing ground surface. If excavation does not exceed depths of 15 feet, there is low potential to impact paleontologic resources and no mitigation measures would be required.

If excavation will reach depths greater than 15 feet below the ground surface, or if Pleistocene deposits are encountered above this depth, or if fossils are encountered during excavation, impacts to paleontologic resources could occur. **Mitigation Measure No. 2** shall require that if Pleistocene deposits are encountered during the construction phase, particularly the grading phase, all work in the vicinity must stop until a qualified paleontologist can examine excavated soils for the presence of paleontologic resources. If any fossils are encountered, all construction activities must be halted in the vicinity of the find until the resource has been recorded, mapped, and collected by the project paleontologist. Recovered specimens must be identified and prepared for curation in accordance with the standards of an accredited museum repository. Potential impacts to paleontologic resources would be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	—	—	—	✓
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	—	—	—	✓
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	—	—	—	✓
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	—	—	—	✓
iv) Landslides?	—	—	—	✓
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	—	✓	➔	—
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	—	—	—	✓
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table				

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	—	—	—	✓
e) 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?	—	—	—	✓

### **Geology and Soils**

VI.a-d) According to Figures 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 4.9 of the MEA/EIR the project site is not located in an area susceptible to erosion, landslides, soil expansion, fault rupture hazard or liquefaction. A preliminary soils investigation was submitted by the applicant in accordance with City requirements for subdivisions. The study analyzes the existing site conditions and outlines site preparation and construction measures for the development of the tentative tract. The applicant shall be required to develop the project in accordance with all the recommendations included in the soils investigation prepared for the project site. Additionally the proposed project will be constructed to adhere to all federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to seismic safety design. Although Figure 4.3 does not identify the project site as being in an area prone to erosion, there is the potential for erosion during and after grading activities have been completed. In order to mitigate temporary impacts from wind and water erosion **Mitigation Measure No. 3** shall require the applicant to provide the City with a Soil Erosion Plan that shall include measures designed to reduce wind and water erosion of the site during and after construction. In addition, **Mitigation Measure No. 4** shall require that all permanent landscaping shall be installed prior to final occupancy, and following construction disturbed soils shall be landscaped, or otherwise treated, to protect soils from wind and water erosion. No further mitigation is required.

VI.e). The project will be required to connect to the City's sewer system and not involve the use of these types of waste water disposal systems. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. <b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> Would the project:				
a) Generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	—	—	—	✓
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or				

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	—	—	—	✓

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

VII.a,b)The project will develop a 27 unit planned residential development. As such the project is not large enough to generate gas emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment, nor would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing greenhouse gas. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

VIII. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | — | — | — | ✓ |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | — | — | — | ✓ |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | — | — | — | ✓ |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                 | — | — | — | ✓ |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in |   |   |   |   |

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the project area?	—	—	—	✓
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	—	—	—	✓
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	—	—	—	✓
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	—	—	✓	—

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

- VIII.a-c) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. This will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project does not have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment nor is the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste being proposed. No mitigation is needed.
- VIII.d) The project site is not located in an area which is included on the State Department of Health's List of Hazardous Waste Sites and will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No mitigation is required.
- VIII.e-f) The project site is located less than one mile from the Redlands Municipal Airport and is within Zone D of the Redlands Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. According to the compatibility plan, Zone D includes areas within the airport vicinity which are overflown less frequently or at higher altitude by aircraft arriving and departing the airport. Impacts are negligible according to the plan. Due to the project site's proximity to the airport deed notices are required for residential development. The project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working (during the construction period) in the project area. No mitigation is required.
- VIII.g) The proposed project will not result in impairing implementation of or physically interfering with the City of Redlands or County of San Bernardino emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No mitigation is required.

- VIII.h) The proposed project is not located in an area identified as a high fire danger according to Figure 15.1 of the MEA/EIR. The project will be required by the Redlands Fire department to utilize fire resistant roofing materials, such as composition or concrete tile, for protection from this hazardous fire area and City ordinance requires that the homes contain fire sprinklers. These mandatory improvements will also reduce any fire hazards. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	—	✓	→	—
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	—	—	—	✓
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	—	—	—	✓
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	—	—	✓	—
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	—	—	—	✓
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	—	—	—	✓
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard				



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	—	—	—	✓
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	—	—	—	✓
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	—	—	—	✓
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	—	—	—	✓

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

- IX.a) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. The project will not specifically violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. However because the project area exceeds one acre it is required to adhere to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements for a permit under the Federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Thus the requirement for an NPDES permit requirement will be extended to this project. **Mitigation Measure No. 5** shall require the project to comply with all requirements of the NPDES permit issued by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Redlands. The project shall also provide the appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) within the project site to stop first flush of accumulated pollutants from entering the City storm drain system. The project may also incorporate other measures such as bio-swales in planter areas which can also eliminate the first flush of accumulated pollutants on street surfaces. Similarly **Mitigation Measure No. 6** shall require the applicant to comply with the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared in accordance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board guidelines to be reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. Adherence to both these mitigation measures will avoid or reduce all associated water quality impacts below a level of significance.
- IX.b) The proposed project is not large enough that it will substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. No mitigation is required.
- IX.c-e) In accordance with City requirements a drainage study was submitted for the project providing information on pre and post development of the site. According to the study the vacant site is improved with an asphalt berm along San Bernardino Avenue that

directs flows to westerly to Judson Street. Frontage along Dearborn Street is also improved with existing curb and gutter that directs flows north to an existing catch basin located across the project's frontage. From this catch basin flows are directed north to the Santa Ana River. The site currently drains from the southeast to the northwest. All on site flows are directed westerly to the property to the west and to San Bernardino Avenue where they continue west along the asphalt berm onto Judson Street as surface flows. There the flows are direct north to the Santa Ana River.

Proposed development will utilize a private street constructed of 21,281 square feet of pervious pavement that will treat all runoff for water quality purposes and will also provide onsite storage and mitigation of flows. Flows will continue the existing drainage pattern from the southeast to the northwest along the private street. From there street flows will be directed to an under sidewalk drain and ribbon gutter system that will outlet via an additional under sidewalk drain to San Bernardino Avenue. There will be no anticipated increase in flows from the site due to the improvements and pervious pavement provided in the private streets. Flows from the proposed 27 lots will be treated for water quality purposes with onsite bio-retention depressions prior to leaving the lot to the street.

- IX.f) No potential water quality impacts other than those already described in this section are forecast. No mitigation is required.
- IX.g) The project site is not in the 100-year flood zone and will not result in the exposure of people or property to water related hazards as depicted on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map. No mitigation measures are needed.
- IX.h) The project site is not in the 100-year flood zone as depicted on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map and therefore structures would not impede or redirect flood flows. No mitigation measures are needed.
- IX.i) The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam since it is not in the vicinity of a levee or dam. No mitigation is required.
- IX.j) Adoption of the proposed project will not expose people to seiche hazards because the City is not within an area that is affected by these types of hazards. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?      ☐      ☐      ☐      ☒
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy,      ☐      ☐      ☐      ☐

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	—	—	—	✓
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	—	—	—	✓

### **Land Use and Planning**

X.a-c) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common for a planned residential development. As such the project will not divide an established community, conflict with any applicable land use plan nor is the project subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	—	—	—	✓
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	—	—	—	✓

### **Mineral Resources**

XI.a-b) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. The project site is not located within a known mineral resource area as identified in General Plan MEA/EIR figure 8.2. Therefore the project would not result in the loss of mineral resources. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. <b>NOISE.</b> Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	—	✓	→	—
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	—	—	—	✓
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	✓
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	✓
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	—	—	—	✓
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	—	—	—	✓

## **Noise**

- XII.a) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. The project is located at the southwest corner of San Bernardino Avenue and Dearborn Streets which are respectively classified under the General Plan as a Minor Arterial and Collector street. Due to the potential for increased noise levels an acoustical analysis was provided for the project. For residential development the General Plan establishes a maximum noise limit of 60 dBA CNEL for exterior noise and a maximum noise limit of 45 dBA CNEL for interior noise. The acoustical analysis measured existing noise levels on both of the streets and recorded an average noise level of 53.9 dBA and 59.0 dBA for the combined location of both Dearborn Street and San Bernardino Avenue. Traffic information was also factored into noise model in order to determine CNEL data. Noise levels for back yards facing Dearborn Street are estimated to be 58.81 dBA CNEL which is within General Plan limits. For San Bernardino

Avenue the closest residential lot is Lot 21 located 158 feet away from the centerline of the street. Noise is estimated to be 58.05 dBA which is also within General Plan limits. With regard to interior noise, the study finds that the noise level at the closest building face will be 54.4 dBA CNEL for Dearborn Street and 58.05 for San Bernardino Avenue. According to the study basic building shell design for residential construction provides a reduction of at least 20 dBA and attenuates noise to be well below the maximum level allowed under the General Plan.

The proposed project would generate short-term noise in association with site grading and construction-related vehicle/equipment operation, during the construction period. Noise levels that would be generated on and off-site would depend on the type and number of equipment in use, the time of day, and the amount of time that machinery and equipment are operated. The sensitive noise receptors are located on the north and east side of the project and consists of single family homes. In order to mitigate potential short-term impacts to ambient noise during the construction period, **Mitigation Measure No. 7** shall limit all construction activities to the hours between 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m with no construction activities permitted on Saturdays, Sundays and Federal Holidays. Therefore adoption of the proposed project will not expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan or applicable standards of other agencies. No further mitigation is required.

- XII.b) Site excavation would require only standard earthmoving equipment. No ripping or blasting would be necessary to excavate through the alluvial materials on site. No piles will need to be driven to reach a stable rock foundation for any structures. No ground borne vibration or noise impacts, therefore, would occur during construction. The project does not entail the use of machinery and equipment that would result in measurable vibration impacts off site. No mitigation is required.
- XII.c) Noise making activities will be limited to short term construction associated with grading of the site and construction of future single family dwellings. Adoption of the proposed project will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. No mitigation is required.
- XII.d) Please refer to the response in XII(a) above regarding short-term construction impacts. Proposed grading would not involve temporary activities that would generate significant noise levels. As described above in items XI(a) and (b), no significant short- or long-term noise-related impacts are anticipated from the proposed project. No mitigation is required.
- XII.e) The project will involve temporary outdoor construction activities with development of the tract and will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.
- XII.f) The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  | — | — | — | ✓ |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  | — | — | — | ✓ |

**Population and Housing**

XIII.a-c) Growth in population is controlled by land use regulations which dictate the type and density of development which can occur. The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. No part of this project has the potential to either directly or indirectly induce substantial growth or displace existing housing, especially affordable housing. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project:

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) 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?   | — | — | ✓ | — |

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Police protection?	—	—	—	✓
iii) Schools?	—	—	—	✓
iv) Parks?	—	—	—	✓
v) Other public facilities?	—	—	✓	—

### **Public Services**

- XIV.a) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. Adoption of the proposed project is not expected to significantly impact or result in a need for new or altered public services provided by the City of Redlands, the Redlands Unified School District, or other governmental agencies. Development of the site will entail the storage of building equipment and materials on-site over night. The storage of equipment and materials could potentially result in their theft if not properly stored. **Mitigation Measure No. 8** shall require that the applicant submit a construction site security plan approved by the police department providing adequate security measures such as lights, video cameras, vehicle transponders, locks, alarms, trained security personnel, fencing etc. The nature of the measures will depend on the specific requirements of the site, and may vary with the different stages of construction. The developer shall be responsible for the compliance of all sub-contractors working on the site. Other impacts associated with new development are mitigated with the payment of development impact fees, and State established school fees.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <b>RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	—	—	—	✓
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	—	—	—	✓

## Recreation

- XV.a) The project will subdivide nine (9) acres into twenty-seven (27) lots and two (2) common area lots for a planned residential development. Given the scope of the project, it can be said that it does not have the potential to increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities nor will it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No mitigation is required.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

### **XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	—	—	—	✓
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	—	—	—	✓
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	—	—	—	✓
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	—	—	—	✓
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	—	—	—	✓
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	—	—	—	✓



## Transportation / Traffic

XVI.a-b) The project will result in a very modest increase in traffic. According to the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual the generation factor for this project is ten (10) trips per household which means that the project will generate 270 daily trips. Moreover the number of peak hour trips will be 20 trips in the morning (7 to 9 AM) using a factor of 0.75 and 27 trips in the evening (4 to 6 PM) using a factor of 1.01. Both peak hours totals are less than 250 which is the threshold set forth in the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Plan, for a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) therefore no TIA is needed. Development of adjoining streets (San Bernardino Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue) to the ultimate half width will be required by the City of Redlands Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department as part of the project's conditions of approval. No mitigation is required.

XVI.c-e) Adoption of the proposed will not result in a change in air traffic patterns. Access to the future single family dwelling will be constructed in accordance with the Redlands Municipal Code which includes provisions to ensure emergency access. No mitigation is required.

XVI.f) The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

XVII. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	—	—	—	✓
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	—	—	—	✓
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	—	—	—	✓

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	—	—	—	✓
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	—	—	—	✓
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	—	—	—	✓
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	—	—	—	✓

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

XVII.a) The project will be required to connect to the City's sewer system which is required to comply with the Wastewater Treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. No mitigation is required.

XVII.b) The project will not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities and/or the expansion of existing facilities. No mitigation is required.

XVII.c) The project will require improvements to the City's storm water drainage system. Any impacts to the storm water drainage system are mitigated with the payment of development impact fees established by the City of Redlands and paid at the appropriate time established by the City. This system insures that all impacts to the City's storm water system are self-mitigating. No mitigation is required.

XVII.d) Local water mains and extensions are required for the project or payment of frontage charges for existing mains. Impacts to the water service system are mitigated with the payment of development impact fees established by the City Council of the City of Redlands and paid at the time of applicable approvals. No additional mitigation measures are needed.

XVII.e) Local sewer mains and extensions are required for the project or payment of frontage charges for existing mains. Impacts to the sewer system are mitigated with the payment of development impact fees established by the City Council of the City of Redlands and paid at the time of applicable approvals. No additional mitigation measures are needed.

- XVII.f-g) San Bernardino County has landfill capacity in compliance with State regulations for a minimum of five (5) years including projected growth based on the General Plan Densities that include both the California Street Landfill and the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill. The project will be required to comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste. No additional mitigation measures are needed.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | — | — | — | ✓ |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)   | — | — | — | ✓ |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  | — | — | — | ✓ |

**Mandatory Findings of Significance**

- XVIII.a) Adoption of the proposed project will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environmental.
- XVIII.b) The project will not significantly impact the environment by itself and with the mitigation measures identified within this document will not be cumulatively significant.
- XVIII.c) Adoption of the proposed project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

## REFERENCES

Master Environmental Assessment / Final Environmental Impact Report for Redlands General Plan

Acoustical Analysis by Gordon Bricken & Associates March 2013.

Biological Resources Assessment by Lilburn Corporation February 2013.

Preliminary Drainage Study by Thatcher Engineering February 2013.

Initial Study by Ecorp Consulting October 2006

## MITIGATION MEASURES AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

### Air Quality:

1. To mitigate the potential impact as identified in Section III.(d) of the environmental checklist, the applicant shall be required to perform on-site daily watering of the site during all construction activities.

To be monitored by the Development Services Department, Building and Safety Division, during construction of the project.

### Cultural Resources

2. To mitigate the potential impact identified in Section V(c) of the environmental checklist, If excavation will reach depths greater than 15 feet below the ground surface, or if Pleistocene deposits are encountered above this depth, or if fossils are encountered during excavation, particularly the grading phase, the applicant shall require that all work in the vicinity must stop until a qualified paleontologist can examine excavated soils for the presence of paleontologic resources. If any fossils are encountered, all construction activities must be halted in the vicinity of the find until the resource has been recorded, mapped, and collected by the project paleontologist. Recovered specimens must be identified and prepared for curation in accordance with the standards of an accredited museum repository.

To be monitored by the Development Services Department and Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department and satisfied during construction of the project.

### Geology and Soils:

3. To mitigate the potential impact identified in Section VI(b) of the Environmental Checklist, the applicant shall prepare and submit to the City a soil erosion plan that shall include measures designed to reduce wind and water erosion of the site during and after construction.

To be monitored by the Development Services Department, Planning Division, and satisfied prior to issuance of grading permits.

4. To mitigate the potential impact identified in Section VI(b) of the Environmental Checklist, all permanent landscaping shall be installed prior to final occupancy, and following construction disturbed soils shall be landscaped, or otherwise treated, to protect soils from wind and water erosion.

To be monitored by the Development Services Department, Planning Division, and satisfied prior to issuance of grading permits.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality:**

5. To mitigate the potential impacts identified in Section IX(a) of the Environmental Checklist, the project to comply with all requirements of the NPDES permit issued by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of Redlands. The project shall also provide the appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) within the project site to stop “first flush” of accumulated pollutants from entering the City storm drain system. The project may also incorporate other measures such as bio-swales in planter areas which can also eliminate the “first flush” of accumulated pollutants on street surfaces.

To be monitored by the Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department and satisfied during construction of the project.

6. To mitigate the potential impacts identified in Section IX(a) of the Environmental Checklist, the applicant shall be required to prepare and comply with the final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared in accordance with Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board guidelines to be reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.

To be monitored by the Municipal Utilities and Engineering Department and satisfied during construction of the project.

### **Noise**

7. To mitigate the potential short term impacts identified in Section XII(a) of the Environmental Checklist relative to the increase in ambient noise levels in the early morning and evening hours from construction activities, all grading and construction activities shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and prohibited on Saturdays, Sundays and Federal Holidays.

To be monitored by the Development Services Department, Building & Safety Division and Planning Division, and satisfied during construction of the project.

## **Public Services**

8. To mitigate the potential impact identified in Section XIII(a) of the Environmental Checklist, the applicant shall be required to submit a construction site security plan approved by the police department providing adequate security measures such as lights, video cameras, vehicle transponders, locks, alarms, trained security personnel, fencing etc. The nature of the measures will depend on the specific requirements of the site, and may vary with the different stages of construction. The developer shall be responsible for the compliance of all sub-contractors working on the site.

To be monitored by the Police Department, Community Development Department, Planning Division and Building and Safety Division, and completed prior to issuance of a grading and building permit.

Updated 10/27/10