

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

RESOLUTION NO. R-60-13

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COLTON CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH # 2012031037) PREPARED FOR THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, ADOPTING THE CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.

WHEREAS, the City of Colton (“City”) has completed an update to its General Plan (“project”), to establish a vision and guiding policies to shape and manage long term growth in the City planning area; and

WHEREAS, the project is a long-range planning program, to guide the orderly growth and development of the City planning area over the long-term; and

WHEREAS, the project includes updates to the Land Use Element, Mobility, and Housing Elements of the City General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Land Use Element establishes overall development capacity for the City and surrounding areas, and serves as a policy guide for determining the appropriate physical development and character of the City; and

WHEREAS; the updated Mobility Element provides for a circulation system in balance with the Land Use Plan, and addresses City goals to provide “complete streets” consistent with state law; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element Update addresses the 2008 to 2014 planning period for jurisdictions within the Southern California Association of Governments region; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”), and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.) the City determined that a Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) should be prepared pursuant to CEQA in order to analyze all potential adverse environmental impacts of the project; and

WHEREAS, the City issued a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of a Draft EIR on or about March 11, 2012, and circulated it for a period of 30 days pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines sections 15082, subdivision (a) and 15375; and

WHEREAS, the City solicited comments from potential responsible and trustee agencies and members of the public; and

////

////

1 **WHEREAS**, the City held a public scoping meeting on March 22, 2012 to gather public
2 comments on the project and its potential impacts on the physical environment; and

3 **WHEREAS**, the City received written comments in response to the NOP, which assisted
4 the City in narrowing the issues and alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIR; and

5 **WHEREAS**, on or about January 14, 2013, the City initiated a 45-day public review
6 period by filing a Notice of Completion and Availability with the State Office of Planning and
7 Research and releasing the Draft EIR for public review and comment; and

8 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15086, the City consulted with and
9 requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and the
10 public during the 45-day comment period; and

11 **WHEREAS**, the City received written comments during the public review period for the
12 Draft EIR; and

13 **WHEREAS**, the City has prepared a Final EIR, consisting of comments received during
14 the 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft EIR, written responses to those
15 comments, and revisions and errata to the Draft EIR. For the purposes of this Resolution, the
16 “EIR” shall refer to the Draft EIR, as revised by the Final EIR’s errata section, together with the
17 other sections of the Final EIR; and

18 **WHEREAS**, environmental impacts, including environmental impacts identified in the
19 Final EIR as potentially significant but which the City finds can be substantially lessened through
20 the imposition of feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and set forth in Exhibit
21 A, attached hereto; and

22 **WHEREAS**, the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other
23 benefits of the project which outweigh the significant effects on the environment are also set forth
24 in Exhibit A, attached hereto; and

25 **WHEREAS**, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program sets forth the mitigation
26 measures to which the City shall bind itself in connection with this project and is attached hereto
27 as Exhibit B; and

28 **WHEREAS**, on June 11, 2013 the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public
hearing on the project, at which time all persons wishing to testify were heard and the project was
fully considered; and

WHEREAS, at the close of its June 11, 2013 hearing, the Planning Commission
recommended that the City Council certify the EIR for the project, adopt the CEQA Findings and
Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting
Program, and approve the project; and

1 **WHEREAS**, on July 16, 2013, the City Council of the City of Colton held a public
2 hearing to discuss the Planning Commission’s recommendations and to consider the project, and
3 at such hearing the City Council heard all persons interested in or opposed to the EIR and/or the
project; and

4 **WHEREAS**, as contained herein, the City has endeavored in good faith to set forth the
5 basis for its decision on the project; and

6 **WHEREAS**, all the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines have been
7 satisfied by the City in the EIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially
significant environmental effects of the project have been adequately evaluated; and

8 **WHEREAS**, the EIR prepared in connection with the project sufficiently analyzes both
9 the feasible mitigation measures necessary to avoid or substantially lessen the project’s potential
10 environmental impacts and a range of feasible alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing
these effects in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and

11 **WHEREAS**, all of the findings and conclusions made by the City Council pursuant to
12 this Resolution are based upon the oral and written evidence presented to it as a whole and not
based solely on the information provided in this Resolution; and

13 **WHEREAS**, prior to taking action, the City Council has heard, been presented with,
14 reviewed and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including
15 the Final EIR, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings,
all of which is incorporated herein by this reference; and

16 **WHEREAS**, the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City and is deemed
17 adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the project; and

18 **WHEREAS**, the City has not received any comments or additional information that
19 produced substantial new information requiring recirculation or additional environmental review
20 under Public Resources Code sections 21166 and 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines section
15088.5; and

21 **WHEREAS**, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

22 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE**
23 **CITY COLTON:**

24 **SECTION 1.** The City Council of the City of Colton finds that it has reviewed and
25 considered the Final EIR in evaluating the project, that the Final EIR is an accurate and objective
26 statement that was completed in full compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines and
27 that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

28 **SECTION 2.** The City hereby adopts the CEQA Findings of Fact attached hereto as
Exhibit A and incorporated by this reference as if fully set forth herein.

Exhibit-A of City Council Resolution No. R-60-13

City of Colton General Plan Update -
Land Use, Housing, and
Mobility Elements

Findings of Fact
and
Statement of Overriding Considerations

SCH No. 2012031037

This document is designed for double-sided printing to conserve natural resources.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Purpose 3
Section 1: Findings 5
Section 2: Resolution Regarding Environmental Impacts Not Requiring Mitigation 5
Section 3: Resolution Regarding Environmental Impacts Mitigated to a Level of
Less than Significant 37
Section 4: Resolution Regarding Environmental Impacts Not Fully Mitigated to a
Level of Less than Significant..... 40
Section 5: Resolution Regarding Cumulative Environmental Impacts 44
Section 6: Resolution Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes 45
Section 7: Resolution Regarding Growth-Inducing and Urban Decay Impacts.... 45
Section 8: Resolution Regarding Alternatives 46
Section 9: Resolution Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations 60

Introduction and Purpose

The *Project* addressed in these Findings of Fact is the 2013 City of Colton General Plan update of the Land Use, Housing, and Mobility Elements.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) statutes (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 through 21178) Section 21081 requires the Lead Agency (City of Colton) to issue written findings for significant impacts identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), accompanied by a brief rationale for each finding. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines states that:

- (a) *No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report 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 possible findings are:*
- (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 Final EIR.*
 - (2) *Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.*
 - (3) *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.*
- (b) *With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.*

In accordance with Section 21081 of the CEQA Statutes, whenever significant impacts cannot be substantially mitigated and remain unavoidable, the benefits of the proposed project must be balanced against the unavoidable environmental consequences in determining whether to approve the project. The Lead Agency must make Findings of Fact and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations

where the decision of the Lead Agency allows the occurrence of significant effects that are identified in the EIR, but are not substantially mitigated.

This document sets forth the City of Colton's Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to Section 21081 of the CEQA Statutes, as supported by substantial evidence in the record.

The Environmental Impact Report for the project, including the Draft EIR, as revised by the Final EIR's errata section, together with the other sections of the Final EIR, is incorporated in its entirety into these Findings as if fully set forth herein.

Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program

As required by CEQA Statute 21081.6, a program for reporting on and monitoring project mitigation will be adopted by the Lead Agency.

Location of Documents

The Draft EIR (DEIR), Final EIR (FEIR), and administrative record for the City of Colton General Plan Update are available for review upon request at:

City of Colton
Development Services Department
659 North La Cadena Drive
Colton, California 92324

Discussion of Findings

Where—as a result of the environmental analysis of the project and the identification of project design features; compliance with existing laws, codes, and statutes—impacts have been determined by the City to be less than significant and, therefore, do not require mitigation, such a finding, as well as a finding in the EIR of no impact, is referred to herein as **Finding 1**.

Where—as a result of the environmental analysis of the project and the identification of feasible mitigation measures—potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, the City has found in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) that “Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.” Such a finding, as well as a finding in the EIR of no impact, is referred to herein as **Finding 2**.

Where, as a result of the environmental analysis of the project, the City has determined that a) even with the identification of project design features, compliance with existing laws, codes and statutes, and/or the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts cannot be reduced to a level of less than significant or b) no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives are available to mitigate the potentially significant impact, the City has found in accordance CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report." Such a finding is referred to herein as **Finding 3**.

References for discussion of environmental impacts within the EIR are noted with each finding. Impact numbers refer to the section number and the threshold letter referenced in the DEIR where the full discussion of impacts is included.

Section 1: Findings

At a session assembled on July 17, 2013, the City Council determined that, based on all of the evidence presented, including but not limited to the EIR, written and oral testimony given at meetings and hearings, and the submission of testimony from the public, organizations and regulatory agencies, the following environmental impacts associated with the Project are: 1) less than significant and do not require mitigation, or 2) potentially significant but will be avoided or reduced to a level of insignificance through the identified Mitigation Measures or 3) significant and cannot be fully mitigated to a level of less than significant but will be substantially lessened to the extent feasible by the identified Mitigation Measures.

Section 2: Resolution Regarding Environmental Impacts Not Requiring Mitigation

The City Council hereby finds that the following potential environmental impacts of the Project are less than significant and therefore do not require the imposition of Mitigation Measures.

A. Aesthetics

1. Impact 4.1.A and 4.1.B

Impacts to scenic vistas and resources will be less than significant with implementation of existing General Plan policies.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.1.A and 4.1.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.1 of the EIR. Impact 4.1.A and 4.1.B indicates that with implementation of existing General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Policies 6 and 7, impacts to scenic vistas and resources will be less than significant by limiting development in canyons and hillsides and preserving views through use of easements, height limitations, and design review. (See DEIR at 4.1-5 – 6.) The General Plan Update does not propose to establish any scenic corridors or highways nor do any occur in the planning area. Therefore, there will be no impact to scenic corridors or highways. The proposed General Plan Update does lay the groundwork for future residential, mixed-use, commercial, and industrial development throughout the planning area – the details of which are to be determined by future individual development plans. As portions of the planning area are undisturbed hillside, it is possible that development could impact scenic vistas currently visible from the southernmost parts of the City. However, since the proposed update would not authorize any site-specific land altering activities or any particular development project, infrastructure improvement, community facility, etc., and with implementation of Policies 6 and 7, the update would itself have no direct impact on these vistas.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.1.A and 4.1.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policies will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.1.C

Impacts to the visual character and quality of the planning area will be less than significant with implementation of proposed General Plan policies.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.1.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.1 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.1-7 – 8.) The proposed General Plan Update supports low-density residential and light industrial development in the Pellissier Ranch area in the southwestern portion of the City adjacent to the City of Riverside. Development in this area over the long-term will incrementally convert this area from naturalized open space to an urban character. The remainder of the planning area is generally developed and future development supported by the General Plan would generally be constructed within context of an urbanize environment. Impact 4.1.C indicates that with implementation of General Plan Land Use Element policies, impacts to the visual character and quality of the planning area will be less than significant by requiring preservation of historic buildings, encouraging quality and pedestrian scale design, and requiring buffering and other measures between potentially incompatible adjacent land uses through the City's design review process. The proposed policy

framework will guide new private and public development to be consistent with existing natural and urban characters, while still providing a variety and visual interest.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.1.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policies will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.1.D

Impacts due to light and glare will be less than significant with implementation of existing zoning standards.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.1.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.1 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.1-8 – 9.) The City's Zoning Code regulates glare and outdoor lighting in the Performance Standards section (Chapter 18.42). Direct or reflected glare from light sources originating on a property are prohibited from being visible from the property line. Impact 4.1.D indicates that with implementation of existing zoning standards, impacts from light and glare will be less than significant through City requirements that direct or reflected glare be contained within a property. The City's design review and plan check process will ensure such requirements are met.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.1.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing zoning standards will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

B. Agricultural Resources

1. Impact 4.2.A

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update will not result in impacts to farmland.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.2.A will result in no impact is provided in Section 4.2 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.2-5 – 6.) The properties designated by the CDC as Farmland of Statewide Importance and Prime Farmland, located in the SOI along Reche Canyon Road just

south of Prado Lane, are limited in size (less than 13 acres combined) and are completely surrounded by residential housing. The area designated Prime Farmland is being used as a plant nursery and Christmas tree farm. The area with Farmland of Statewide Significance designation is partially occupied by a tree farm. These areas are currently designated Residential Estates and are proposed to be designated as the Reche Canyon Specific Plan, which provides for the area to be developed with low-density residential. Impact 4.2.A indicates that the proposed General Plan Update would continue to allow agricultural uses in areas designated as Important Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Prime Farmland within the planning area. Any potential conversion to non-agricultural use of these designated farmlands, as also allowed by the update Land Use Element, would require a specific analysis at that time based on the California Department of Conservation's *Land Evaluation & Site Assessment Model*. With implementation of this existing procedure, no impacts to designated farmland will result from the General Plan Update.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.2.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing agricultural conversion analysis procedure will result in no impacts to farmland.

2. Impact 4.2.B

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update will not result in any Williamson Act Contract impacts.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.2.B will result in no impact is provided in Section 4.2 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.2-6.) Impact 4.2.B indicates that no specific zoning for agricultural and no Williamson Act contracts exist within the planning area. Therefore, no impacts from conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract would occur.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.2.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that no impact to existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts would occur.

3. Impacts 4.2.C and 4.2.D

No impact would occur to existing zoning for forest land or timberland as a result of the General Plan Update.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.2.C and 4.2.D will result in no impact is provided in Section 4.2 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.2-6 – 8.) Impacts 4.2.C and 4.2.D indicate that no zoned or substantial forest or timberland or similar resources exist within the planning area. Therefore, no impacts to forest or timberland or resources would occur.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.2.C and 4.2.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that no impact to forest or timber land or resources would occur.

4. Impact 4.2.E

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would not create conflicts involving agricultural zoning and would not result in other changes to the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.2.E will result in no impact is provided in Section 4.2 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.2-8.) Impact 4.2.E indicates the General Plan Update would not create conflicts with agricultural uses and would not result in other changes to the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural or forest land to non-forest use.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.2.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that no changes to the existing environment would occur that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural or forest land to non-forest use.

C. Air Quality

1. Impact 4.3.D

The proposed General Plan Update has the potential to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to pollutant emissions associated with industrial uses. However, potential impacts can be addressed at the project level. Impact will be less than significant with implementation of General Plan policies and application of standard development practices.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.3.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.3 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.3-24 – 29.) Impact 4.3.D indicates the General Plan Update would not result

in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive pollutant emissions with the implementation of proposed General Plan policies. These policies require analysis of and adequate mitigation for toxic air contaminants for any industrial development proposed within 1,000 feet of an existing or proposed residential area, or for any residential development proposed within 1,000 feet of an existing industrial use or within 500 feet of a freeway.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.3.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.3.E

The proposed General Plan Update has the potential to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to odors from industrial uses. However, potential impacts can be addressed at the project level. Impact will be less than significant with implementation of General Plan policies and application of standard development practices.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.3.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.3 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.3-29 – 30.) Impact 4.3.E indicates the General Plan Update would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive pollutant emissions with the implementation of proposed General Plan policies. Such policies require that the time a project is proposed, the applicant must conduct an analysis of potential impacts from odors on new sensitive receptors located near existing odor generating uses or on new odor generating uses on existing or potential sensitive receptors.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.3.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

D. Biological Resources

1. Impact 4.4.B

No impact to Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest or Southern Riparian Scrub habitat will occur as a result of implementation of the General Plan Update.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.4.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.4 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.4-19.) Impact 4.4.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community since no changes are proposed that would impact the Southern Cottonwood Willow Riparian Forest in the Santa Ana River or Southern Riparian Scrub habitat area in the Reche Canyon area.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.4.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in no impact.

2. Impact 4.4.C

No impact to Section 404 wetlands will occur as a result of implementation of the General Plan Update.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.4.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.4 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.4-19.) Impact 4.4.C indicates that no wetlands are located within the planning area.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.4.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a less than significant impact.

3. Impact 4.4.D

No impact to the Lytle Creek and Santa Ana River wildlife corridors or any wildlife nurseries will occur as a result of implementation of the General Plan Update.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.4.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.4 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.4-19.) Impact 4.4.D indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a change to existing wildlife corridors since no changes are proposed that would impact the Lytle Creek and Santa Ana River wildlife corridors.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.4.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a less than significant impact.

4. Impact 4.4.E

No impact related to conflicts with the proposed General Plan Update and other existing policies, regulations, or standards would occur.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.4.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.4 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.4-20.) Impact 4.4.E indicates that there are no existing County or City policies, regulations, or standards designed to protect biological resources applicable to the planning area.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.4.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a less than significant impact.

5. Impact 4.4.F

No impact related to conflicts between the proposed General Plan Update and existing Habitat Conservation Plans will occur.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.4.F will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.4 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.4-20.) Impact 4.4.F indicates that the General Plan Update designates active Habitat Conservation Plans for the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly as open space, consistent with the draft Habitat Conservation Plan that applies. Impact 4.4.F also indicates that the Project does not include land use changes or proposed circulation improvements within any other adopted Habitat Conservation Plan area.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.4.F, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in a less than significant impact.

E. Cultural Resources

1. Impact 4.5.A

Impacts to historic resources will be less than significant with implementation of existing policies and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.5.A will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.5 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.5-12.) Impact 4.5.A indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a

substantial impact to historic resources with the implementation of General Plan policies that work to preserve existing historic resources and districts, together with application of existing federal, state, and local laws protecting historic resources.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.5.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies and existing regulations protecting historic resources will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.5.B

Impacts to archaeological resources will be less than significant with implementation of existing policies and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.5.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.5 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.5-13 – 14.) The existing General Plan Cultural Resources Preservation Element includes goals, policies, and implementation measures designed to protect and maintain local archaeological resources. Future development and infrastructure improvements guided by the Land Use, Mobility, and Housing Element Updates will be subject to policies of the Cultural Resources Preservation Element that includes goals to identify, designate, and preserve archaeological resources (Goal 1). Impact 4.5.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to archaeological resources with the implementation of existing General Plan policies that work to preserve existing archaeological resources by requiring surveys, documentation, and protection of resources, combined with application of existing federal, state, and local laws protecting archaeological resources.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.5.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies and existing regulations protecting archaeological resources will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.5.D

Impacts to human remains will be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.5.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.5 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.5-15.) Impact 4.5.D indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to human remains since the implementation of existing state

laws and regulations regarding discovery of human remains and notification to the Native American Heritage Commission and determined most likely descendent will continue to be applied to all proposed development projects.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.5.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies and existing regulations protecting human remains will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. .

F. Geology and Soils

1. Impact 4.6.A.1

Hazardous impacts to people and structures resulting from the potential rupture of the San Jacinto Fault System will be less than significant with implementation of standards contained in the adopted General Plan Safety Element.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.A.1 will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-12.) Impact 4.6.A.1 indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from rupture of the San Jacinto Fault with the implementation of existing General Plan policies that 1) require avoidance known fault rupture zones, 2) required detailed geologic studies and appropriate mitigation when development projects are proposed within identified Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.A.1, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policies and existing regulations regarding fault rupture will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.6.A.2

Impacts to life and property resulting from earthquakes will be less than significant with implementation of existing City standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.A.2 will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-12 – 13.) Impact 4.6.A.2 indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from earthquakes with the implementation of existing building code regulations that identify local ground shaking potential and require appropriate building design standards to minimize damage in the event of an earthquake.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.A.2, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing building code and design regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.6.A.3

Impacts to life and property resulting from seismically induced liquefaction or settlement will be less than significant with implementation of the City's existing standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.A.3 will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-13 – 14.) Impact 4.6.A.3 indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from seismically induced liquefaction or settlement with implementation of existing City standards and regulations that require preparation of geological and soil studies to determine potential and appropriate design measures. Geologic Hazard Standard 1 of the existing General Plan Safety Element requires developers to prepared geotechnical studies to identify any liquefaction and other ground failure potential and require appropriate design parameters on a project-by-project basis. Furthermore, soils reports are required under the City-adopted Chapter 18 of the 2010 CBC.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.A.3, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing City standards and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

4. Impact 4.6.A.4

Impacts to life and property within the La Loma Hills, Box Springs Mountains, and other portions of the planning area related to seismically induced landslides will be less than significant with implementation of existing standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.A.4 will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-14.) Impact 4.6.A.4 indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from landslides with the implementation of existing City building code standards and regulations that: 1) regulate grading design and practices, and 2) require soil reports that address slope stability. The City uses Chapter 18 and Appendix J of the 2010 CBC to regulate all grading design and criteria. This includes

design criteria for development on slopes and at the toe of slopes The CBC requires soils reports to include slope stability studies that discuss grading procedures, soil design criteria for structures and embankments, and site geology.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.A.4, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing City standards and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

5. Impact 4.6.B

Impacts related to wind-blown soil erosion and loss of topsoil will be less than significant.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-14 – 15.) Impact 4.6.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from wind-blown soil erosion or loss of topsoil with the implementation of existing South Coast Air Quality Management District fugitive dust regulations.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

6. Impact 4.6.C

Impacts related to ground failure will be less than significant with implementation of existing City policies and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-14 – 15.) Impact 4.6.C indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from ground failure with the implementation of existing General Plan policies and building code requirements. Geologic Hazard Standard 1 of the existing General Plan Safety Element requires developers to conduct geotechnical studies to identify any liquefaction, collapse, subsidence, and other ground failure potential, and requires that appropriate design parameters be implemented on a project-by-project basis (in addition to soils reports required under the City adopted Chapter 18 and Appendix J of the 2010 CBC).

Implementation of existing standards and regulations will reduce impacts associated with ground failure to less than significant levels.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policies and building code regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

7. Impact 4.6.D

Impacts related to expansive soils will be less than significant with implementation of existing City regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-16.) Impact 4.6.D indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from potential expansive soils with the implementation of existing City regulations and building code requirements. Such policies and requirements provide for studies to be performed for development projects in the affected areas to identify whether such conditions exists and if they do, what design measures will be applied to meet code requirements.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing City regulations and building code regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

8. Impact 4.6.E

No impacts related to soils and septic systems will occur.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.6.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.6 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.6-16.) Impact 4.6.E indicates the planning area is supported by a fully functioning sewer system, and that septic systems would not be permitted with the availability of sewer service.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.6.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the General Plan Update would result in no impact.

G. Hazards and Hazardous Wastes

1. Impacts 4.8.A, 4.8.B, and 4.8.C

The proposed General Plan Update will result in less than significant impacts from the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.8.A, 4.8.B, and 4.8.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.8 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.8-14 – 16.) Impacts 4.8.A, 4.8.B, and 4.8.C indicate the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes with the implementation of existing and proposed General Plan policies. Such policies provide for: 1) compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations regarding use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, and 2) the conduct of health risk assessments or similar analyses when new industrial uses or processes involving hazardous wastes are proposed in proximity to residences, schools, and other sensitive uses. The use of hazardous materials is regulated and monitored under EPCRA, RCRA, and the Hazardous Materials Disclosure Program. Transportation of hazardous materials and/or wastes is regulated under RCRA, the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Hazardous Wastes Control Law, and California Code of Regulations Title 22. Disposal of hazardous wastes regulated under RCRA, Hazardous Wastes Control Law, and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22. Sections 2729 through 2732 of the (CCR) provide requirements for the reporting, inventory, and release response plans for hazardous materials. These requirements establish procedures and minimum standards for hazardous material plans, inventory reporting and submittal requirements, emergency planning/response, and training. In addition, all regulated substance handlers are required to register with local fire or emergency response departments per the California Accidental Release Prevention Program. Locally, this is overseen by the San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division. The SBCFDHMD reviews and approves of an Emergency/Contingency Plan for regulated facilities.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.8.A, 4.8.B, and 4.8.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policies and existing regulations regarding hazardous materials will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impacts 4.8.E and 4.8.F

No impacts related to operation of public or private airports could occur.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.8.E and 4.8.F will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.8 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.18-17.) Impacts 4.8.E and 4.8.F indicate that no private or public airports or airstrips are located within or near the planning area.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.8.E and 4.8.F, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the General Plan Update would result in no impact.

3. Impact 4.8.G

The proposed General Plan Update will not interfere with the implementation of the City's emergency response and evacuation procedures.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.8.G will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.8 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.18-17.) Impact 4.8.G indicates the General Plan Update does not include any proposed changes in the physical organization of the planning area that could interfere with the City's emergency response or evacuation procedures pursuant to NIMS, SEMS, or the City's emergency response plan.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.8.G, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the General Plan Update would result in no impact.

4. Impacts 4.8.H

Impacts due to wildland fires will be less than significant.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.8.H will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.8 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.18-17.) Impact 4.8.H indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from wildland fires with the implementation of existing building code fire protection requirements.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.8.H, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing building code requirements will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

H. Hydrology and Water Quality

1. Impacts 4.9.A and 4.9.F

Implementation of the General Plan Update will not violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or otherwise degrade water quality.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.9.A and 4.9.F will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-24 – 26.) Impacts 4.9.A and 4.9.F indicate the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to water quality with the implementation of existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) regulations and wastewater discharge permits.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.9.A and 4.9.F, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations and permits will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.9.B

Impacts related to overdrafting of groundwater resources and lowering of groundwater levels will be less than significant with application to existing standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.9.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-26.) Impact 4.9.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to groundwater levels, as projected population and employment growth and water use fall within the assumptions of the with Urban Water Management Plan. Also, policies and programs requiring adherence to safe yield pumping limits and incorporation of retention and detention basins within new development work to mitigate impacts on groundwater resources.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.9.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing plans and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impacts 4.9.C and 4.9.D

Flooding and sedimentation impacts caused by on- or off-site flooding will be less than significant with implementation of existing City practices.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.9.C and 4.9.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-27 – 28.) Impacts 4.9.C and 4.9.D indicate the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial alteration to the drainage pattern that would result in substantial erosion or flooding, as the project does not involve any changes to existing stormwater or flood control systems. Also, with the implementation of existing City regulations regarding flood control and storm drain design, as effectuated through the design review process, any localized impacts can be addressed at the individual project design stage.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.9.C and 4.9.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

4. Impact 4.9.E

Impacts related to polluted urban runoff and storm drain capacity will be less than significant with implementation of existing standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.9.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-28 – 29.) Impact 4.9.E indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from polluted urban runoff and storm drain capacity with the implementation of existing Master Drainage Plan, NPDES, and City regulations and practices through the design review process.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.9.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing plans, regulations, and practices will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

5. Impact 4.9.G

Impacts due to the placement of housing within 100-year flood zones will not occur as a result of implementation of the General Plan Update.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.9.G will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR

at 4.9-29.) Impact 4.9.G indicates the General Plan Update would not result in any land use changes that would increase residential densities within already developed residential areas nor does it include any other land use changes that support residential development in flood hazard areas.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.9.G, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** the General Plan Update would result in no impact.

6. Impact 4.9.H

Impacts related to the diversion of floodwaters will be less than significant with implementation of existing City regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.9.H will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-29 – 30.) Impact 4.9.H indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from placement of structures within a floodplain since few developable properties are directly impacted by flooding. Also, with the implementation of existing City regulations, any development within a floodplain requires hydrological evaluation and appropriate building approaches to guard against flood hazards.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.9.H, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

7. Impact 4.9.I

Impacts related to inundation due to dam or levee failure will be less than significant with implementation of existing federal and County regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.9.I will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-30.) Impact 4.9.I indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from inundation from potential dam or levee failure since implementation of existing regulations and procedures for levee and dam safety inspection and certification guard against potential impact. Also, continued inspection and maintenance of the Seven Oaks Dam and the procedures outlined in the evacuation plan are considered adequate precautions to reduce impacts due to potential dam inundation to less than significant

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.9.I, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations and procedures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

8. Impact 4.9.J

Impacts associated with mudflows, tsunami, and seiche will be less than significant with implementation of existing City regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.9.J will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.9 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.9-31.) Impact 4.9.J indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from potential mudflows, tsunami, and seiche. Implementation of existing regulations and procedures in the building code for slope stability guards against mudflows. Due to its distance from the Pacific Ocean, open reservoirs, and other bodies of water, Colton is not subject to tsunami and seiche hazards.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.9.J, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations and procedures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

I. Land Use and Planning

1. Impact 4.10.A

No impact will occur as the General Plan Update will not result in a division of an established community.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.10.A will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.10 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.10-14 – 15.) Impact 4.10.A indicates the General Plan Update does not propose or would not result in any new transportation routes, facilities, or other feature that would divide an existing community. The proposed Land Use Plan will retain the City's primarily residential character in these areas while providing for additional commercial development within and adjacent to these areas. In addition, the proposed Land Use Plan provides for more intense industrial development to primarily occur in the southern portion of the City and along existing rail lines where similar industrial development exists. The proposed Circulation Element

would not establish any new transportation routes or facilities. No other types of major corridors are planned that would require clearing of existing land uses.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.10.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the General Plan Update would result in no impact.

2. Impact 4.10.B

The potential for impact associated with long-term implementation of the General is discussed in other sections of this EIR; the analysis in those sections indicate that a less than significant impacts would occur.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.10.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.10 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.10-15.) The project involves an update of the General Plan's Land Use Element, Circulation Element, and Housing Element. No other agency has jurisdiction over land use issues in the City of Colton. San Bernardino County has jurisdiction over land uses within the SOI. The planning area is subject to a variety of Federal, State, and locally adopted plans designed to mitigate environmental impacts or to preserve important resources. Impact 4.10.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation designed to mitigate an environmental effect based on the analysis included in the remaining sections of the EIR.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.10.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that adherence to existing plans, policies, or regulations designed to mitigate an environmental effect as discussed in the remaining sections of the EIR will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.10.C

The proposed Land Use Plan designation of Recovery Units of the Delhi-Sands Flower-Loving Fly Recovery Plan as open space supports the objectives of habitat and natural community conservation plans.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.10.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.10 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.10-15 – 16.) Impact 4.10.C indicates the General Plan Update, as fully analyzed in the Biological Resources Section would not result in a conflict with the objectives of the Delhi-Sands Flower-Loving Fly Recovery Plan.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.10.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that the proposed General Plan Update would result in a less than significant impact.

J. Mineral Resources

1. Impact 4.11.A

Implementation of the General Plan Update will result in a less than significant loss of known mineral resources of value to the region and the state.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.11.A will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.11 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.11-6 – 7.) Impact 4.11.A indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to a state or regionally important mineral resource with the continued implementation of existing General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element Principal 4. Principal 4 of the existing General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element is designed to protect significant mineral deposit sites until such time a substantial regional need for such resources is demonstrated. The proposed General Plan Update does not contain policies that conflict with this principal; therefore, significant mineral resource deposits will continue to be protected over the long-term.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.11.A the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policy will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.11.B

No impact to locally important mineral resources will occur as a result of the implementation of the General Plan Update.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.11.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.11 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.11-7.) Impact 4.11.B indicates that neither the existing and proposed General Plan nor any other City planning document identifies any locally important mineral resources.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.11.B the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the General Plan Update would result in no impact.

K. Noise

1. Impacts 4.12.A and 4.12.C

Projected long-term traffic volumes and the extension of new roadway segments would increase noise by less than significant levels with continued implementation of General Plan policies. Also, no new land uses would be exposed to noise levels in conflict with noise/land use compatibility criteria.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.12.A and 4.12.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.12 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.12-17 – 22.) The proposed General Plan Update would not authorize any specific construction. Potential increases in noise levels along existing and proposed roadways will be assessed in conjunction with the City's review of site-specific noise impact analyses. Also, the proposed land use plan has been designed to buffer residential land uses from incompatible uses to the greatest extent possible given long-established land use patterns. Residential parcels have been shielded from intensive industrial uses by applying the Industrial Park designation between residential uses and the Heavy Industrial designation wherever possible. Impacts 4.12.A and 4.12.C indicate that the implementation of existing General Plan noise policies and the City's noise ordinance over the long term will avoid exposure of persons to excessive noise levels.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.12.A and 4.12.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing General Plan policy will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.12.B

Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels with implementation of the General Plan Update will result in a less than significant impact.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.12.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.12 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.12-22 – 25.) Impact 4.12.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact from groundborne noise levels with the implementation of requirements for vibration during the design review process.

Potential vibration due to future construction activities would be assessed in conjunction with the City's routine review of site-specific geotechnical studies and the recommended grading and foundation design measures. This will occur in the project planning process, prior to project approval, for projects subject to review under CEQA, and this will provide an adequate mechanism to require special measures to mitigate potentially significant vibration impacts of the updated General Plan.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.12.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing procedures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.12.D

The proposed project would allow for additional development of residential and mixed-use development that may result in increased temporary or intermittent noise impacts. Those impacts are less than significant with the continued implementation of the City's Municipal Code.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.12.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.12 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.12-26 – 27.) Impact 4.12.D indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels with the implementation of existing construction noise requirements, noise standards, and other noise regulations. The Proposed Project would accommodate the development of additional residential and mixed-use development, which may result in an increased number of residents registering noise complaints from neighboring uses. Continuing enforcement of the Municipal Code would reduce potential nuisance noise impacts.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.12.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing requirements, standards, and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

4. Impacts 4.12.E and 4.12.F

The proposed project would not expose people residing or working within two miles of any public airport nor private airport to excessive noise levels associated with air traffic.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.12.E and 4.12.F will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.12 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.12-27.) Impacts 4.12.E and 4.12.F indicate that the planning area is not located near any public or private airport or airstrip that could impact any land use within the planning area.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.12.E and 4.12.F, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan Update would result in no impact.

L. Population and Housing

1. Impact 4.13.A

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would have a less than significant impact with regard to inducing population and housing growth, as anticipated increases are consistent with 2012-2035 forecasts of the Southern California Association of Governments.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.13.A will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.13 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.13-2 – 3.) Impact 4.13.A indicates the General Plan Update would accommodate projected growth for Colton. If the estimated potential new housing units allowed by the proposed land use policies were to be built and occupied, this would yield a total residential population of approximately 67,182 persons in the City limits and approximately 5,354 persons in the SOI, for a planning area total of 72,536 residents. This is an approximately 28 percent increase in population over the current (2011) population estimate. However, the population and housing growth is consistent with SCAG's 2012 -2035 RTP forecasts.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.13.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impacts 4.13.B and 4.12.C

The General Plan Update does not propose policies that would result in displacement or demolition of permanent or temporary residential structures.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.13.B and 4.13.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.13 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.13-3 – 4.) Impacts 4.13.B and 4.13.C indicate the General Plan Update does not propose any policies that are intended to or would indirectly result in displacement or demolition of any residential structures.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.13.B and 4.13.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in no impact.

M. Public Services

1. Impact 4.14.A

Impacts related to the expansion of fire protection facilities to maintain applicable service standards will be less than significant with implementation of existing General Plan and Municipal Code policies and requirements.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.14.A will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.14 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-7 – 8.) Impact 4.14.A indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to fire protection services with the implementation of existing design review processes and impact fees.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.14.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing procedures and fees will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

2. Impact 4.14.B

Impacts related to the expansion of police protection facilities to maintain applicable service standards will be less than significant with implementation of existing General Plan and Municipal Code policies and requirements.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.14.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.14 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-8 – 9.) Impact 4.14.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to police protection services with the implementation of existing design review processes and impact fees.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.14.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing procedures and fees will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.14.C

Impacts related to the expansion of school facilities to maintain applicable service standards will be less than significant with implementation of existing state regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.14.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.14 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-9 – 11.) Impact 4.14.C indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to school facilities with payment of required school impact fees. Local school districts will monitor growth in the planning area and update facilities plans to identify new facilities needs including locations, timing, and funding for expanded or new classrooms and related facilities. Each district will continue to collect development impact fees to pay for the costs of expanded facilities, in accordance with state law.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.14.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations and fees will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

4. Impact 4.14.D

Impacts related to the expansion and construction of parks to maintain applicable service standards will be less than significant with implementation of existing General Plan and Municipal Code policies and requirements.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.14.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.14 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-11 – 12.) Impact 4.14.D indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to park facilities with the implementation of existing impact fees. The proposed General Plan Update designates 1,219 acres as Open Space throughout the community, of which 46 acres are designated as Open Space-Recreation on existing parkland. Additionally, the West Valley Specific Plan includes approximately 30 acres of Open Space for recreation and resource purposes and the Reche Canyon Specific Plan designates 817 acres of Open Space. Overall, the General Plan supports 2,066 acres of Open Space for recreation and resource

purposes. In addition, approximately 3,356 acres has been identified as vacant within the planning area, of which approximately 820 acres are designated for residential land use. While not all of the area designated as Open Space or vacant land may be suitable as parkland, it could be assumed that acquisition and provision of an additional 41.4 acres of parkland (five percent of the residential designated vacant area) is feasible through existing Quimby Act fee and DIF collection from future development to not deteriorate beyond the existing park provision ratio at a minimum.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.14.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing fees will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

5. Impact 4.14.E

Impacts related to the expansion and construction of libraries to maintain applicable service standards will be less than significant with implementation of existing Municipal Code requirements.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.14.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.14 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-12.) Impact 4.14.E indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to library facilities with the implementation of existing impact fees.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.14.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing fees will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

N. Recreation

1. Impact 4.15.B

Impacts related to the expansion and construction of recreational facilities will be less than significant since the General Plan update does not specifically provide for new park facilities.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.15.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.15 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-5.) Impact 4.15.B indicates the General Plan Update would not result

in or require the construction of additional parkland or any impacts from such construction.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.15.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the General Plan Update will result in no impact.

O. Transportation and Traffic

1. Impact 4.16.C

Impact with respect to air traffic patterns would be less than significant.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.16.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.16 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.16-25.) Impact 4.16.C indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to air traffic patterns given the distance to public and private airports and airstrips.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.16.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in less than significant impacts.

2. Impact 4.16.D

Impact with respect to traffic hazards would be less than significant.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.16.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.16 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.16-25.) Impact 4.16.D indicates the General Plan Update would result in street improvements that will be designed in accordance with all applicable standards relating to vehicle traffic, bicycles, and pedestrian safety.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.16.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing standards would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

3. Impact 4.16.E

Impact with respect to emergency access would be less than significant.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.16.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.16 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.16-25 -26.) Impact 4.16.E indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to emergency access with implementation of the City's existing Fire Code regarding emergency access. The General Plan update does not include policies that would change standards related to emergency access, nor will it interfere with policy implementation.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.16.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of existing regulations would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

4. Impact 4.16.F

Impact with respect to parking capacity would be less than significant.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.16.F will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.16 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.16-26.) Impact 4.16.F indicates the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial impact to parking capacity with implementation of proposed General Plan policies and the City's existing Zoning Code requirements. The Mobility Element supports provision of adequate parking in future developments through Policies 6-1 through 6-6 cited above. These policies, in conjunction with the parking supply and design standards requirements of the City's Zoning Code, will ensure that adequate parking is provided on a project-by-project basis.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.16.F, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan policies and existing requirements would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

5. Impact 4.16.G

No adverse impact will result with respect to alternative transportation.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.16.G will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.16 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.16-26.) Impact 4.16.G indicates the General Plan Update includes plans and policies to support alternative transportation and would not conflict with

alternative transportation plans or operations. These include Policies M-1.1 through M- 1.5, Policies M-2.1 through M-2.14, and Policy M-3.8 that support the use of public transit and promote bicycling and walking. Also, the Complete Streets plan shown on Exhibit 4.16-6 highlights the City's commitment to provide for street design that can accommodate diverse travel modes.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.16.G, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of proposed General Plan would result in no impact.

P. Utilities and Service Systems

1. Impact 4.17.A

Impacts related to the exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the Colton Wastewater Reclamation Facility will be less than significant based on existing City plans and regulatory requirements.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.17.A will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.17 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.17-13.) The City's Municipal Code requires incremental expansion of wastewater treatment facilities based on new development through the collection of Public Improvement Fees. This ensures that adequate funding is available to meet future facilities needs, should expansion be necessary. Wastewater treatment requirements are administered by the RWQCB. The CWRF will be required to comply with these discharge requirements to ensure that effluent discharges are within acceptable water quality parameters. Impact 4.17.A indicates the anticipated growth and buildout capacity of General Plan Update would not exceed the capacity of wastewater treatment plants and would thus not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.17.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in less than significant impacts.

2. Impact 4.17.B

Impacts related to the potential future construction of water and wastewater infrastructure will be less than significant with implementation of existing City standards.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.17.B will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.17 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.17-13 – 14.) Impact 4.17.B indicates the anticipated growth and buildout capacity of General Plan Update would not exceed the capacity of water and wastewater treatment plants and would thus not result in the need for new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.17.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the proposed General Plan Update would result in less than significant impacts.

3. Impact 4.17.C

Impacts related to the potential future expansion of storm drain facilities will be less than significant with implementation of existing City standards.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.17.C will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.17 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.17-14.) Impact 4.17.C indicates that the General Plan Update would not result in potentially significant impacts from new storm drain facilities with implementation of the master drainage plan and its regional facilities. The master drainage plans prepared by the County account for future development on vacant lands. In addition, future review pursuant to CEQA for localized storm drain facilities will be required for any proposed development pursuant to the General Plan.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.17.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the existing master drainage plan and CEQA will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

4. Impact 4.17.D

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Update will not require new or expanded water supply entitlements to be secured.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.17.D will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.17 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.17-14 – 15.) The proposed General Plan Update does not contain policies or programs that would conflict with existing policies and standards designed to conserve water, such as the Water Conservation in Landscaping Act. The proposed General Plan Update includes policies supporting green building and sustainable

building practices that will support water conservation efforts (see Goal LU-14). Impact 4.17.D indicates that the General Plan Update would not result in potentially significant impacts since water supply entitlements can accommodate projected population and employment growth.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.17.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the existing plans and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

5. Impact 4.17.E

Impacts related to insufficient wastewater treatment capacity will be less than significant with implementation of existing standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.17.E will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.17 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.17-15.) The General Plan does not include policies that will interfere with the implementation of the current or future CIP or the collection of Public Improvement Fees. Impact 4.17.E indicates that the General Plan Update would not result in potentially significant impacts since anticipated growth and buildout capacity allowed by the General Plan would not exceed the capacity of wastewater treatment plants.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.17.E, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the existing plans and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

6. Impacts 4.17.F and 4.17.G

Impacts related to insufficient landfill capacity will be less than significant with implementation of existing standards and regulations.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.17.F and 4.17.G will be less than significant is provided in Section 4.17 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.17-16.) Impacts 4.17.F and 4.17.G indicate that the General Plan Update would not result in potentially significant impacts to landfill capacity and solid waste regulations since the anticipated growth and buildout capacity of the General Plan Update, disposal rates, current and projected landfill capacity can be accommodated by existing facilities. Also, the City will continue to implement existing waste reduction, recycling, and re-use regulations.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.17.F and 4.17.G, the City hereby makes **Finding 1** that implementation of the existing plans and regulations will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Section 3: Resolution Regarding Environmental Impacts Mitigated to a Level of Less than Significant

A. Biological Resources

1. Impact 4.4.A

Impacts to special status species and their habitat resulting from implementation of the General Plan Update will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.4.A will be substantially lessened or avoided is provided in Section 4.4 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.4-17 – 19.) Impact 4.4.A identifies potentially significant impacts to special status species and their associated habitat. One species of particular concern that has been sighted in the planning area is the burrowing owl. The opportunistic nature of this species' nesting habits in existing burrows, culverts, or other appropriately sized holes allows it to theoretically occur on any vacant site in the planning area, from a single vacant lot in the South Colton to the open spaces of the West Valley Specific Plan area. Any future development on vacant land pursuant to the proposed Land Use Element could potentially impact this species. The focus areas identified in the West Valley Specific Plan area are located within the Colton RU of the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (DSF) recovery plan. A Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) has been prepared for the West Valley Area east of the City of Rialto City limits, west of Meridian Avenue, North of Valley Boulevard, and south of San Bernardino Avenue. The draft HCP has been accepted by the USFWS and final programs are being prepared including an Environmental Assessment and an Implementation Plan. This area has been identified by the USFWS as essential for the recovery of this species; therefore, impacts to this habitat could constitute a potentially significant impact to the long-term survival of the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. Mitigation Measures 4.4.A-1 and 4.4.A-2 (see DEIR at 4.4-20) will be incorporated into the City's standard environmental review process requiring preparation of biological assessments for individual development projects to determine occurrences of special status species or habitat. Measures 4.4.A-1 and 4.4.A-2 establish performance measures that minimize impacts to such species

through project-level mitigation. Examples of project-level mitigation include relocation, on-site conservation, off-site banking, and avoidance.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.4.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 2** that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

B. Cultural Resources

1. Impact 4.5.C

Impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.5.C will be substantially lessened or avoided is provided in Section 4.5 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.5-14.) Impact 4.5.C identifies potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources. Excavation and other earthmoving activities required for future development pursuant to General Plan policy within surface and subsurface exposures of Pleistocene era alluvium materials could disturb paleontological resources. Failure to survey development sites and if necessary, monitor earthmoving activities to ensure proper identification and recovery of paleontological resources could result in a significant impact to fossil resources due to the loss of information important to understanding pre-historic life and evolution. The City currently does not have any policies related to the protection of paleontological resources during development-related earthmoving activities. Therefore, mitigation is required to avoid or minimize impacts to buried paleontological resources. Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (see DEIR at 4.5-15 – 16.) will be incorporated into the City's standard environmental review process requiring preparation of paleontological assessments prior to grading for individual development projects that contain middle to late Pleistocene era sediments and recommend if monitoring is required during grading. Measure 4.5-1 establishes a procedure and performance measures for monitoring and potential findings and recovery that minimize impacts to such paleontological resources through project-level mitigation.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.5.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 2** that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

C. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Impact 4.8.D

Impacts to development and persons due to building siting on contaminated properties will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.8.D will be substantially lessened or avoided is provided in Section 4.8 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.8-16.) Impact 4.8.D identifies potentially significant impacts to people from development of potentially contaminated properties. The Housing Element Update identifies a developed site (PA20) in the West Valley Specific Plan area that includes religious and industrial office uses. Depending on current or past uses at the industrial building, site contamination may have occurred. The Housing Element also identifies at least three underutilized industrial sites (Sites A, B, and D) that could be redeveloped as mixed-use projects to include high density residential. These properties are currently in operation as light industrial uses. Contamination may occur at these sites depending on past and/or current uses. Sensitive and other land uses could also be proposed on known or currently unknown sites contaminated by hazardous materials. Development on contaminated sites not only poses a threat to persons on the site but also prevents the contamination from being cleaned, allowing it to continue to transport through the soil and eventually to groundwater resources. Mitigation Measure 4.8.D-1 (see DEIR at 4.8-18) will be incorporated into the City's standard environmental review process requiring that site assessments be conducted prior to project approvals to identify any potential contamination. Measure 4.8.D-1 sets performance standards for clean-up prior to approval of development or redevelopment projects. This will ensure that as properties within the City are developed and reused, site contamination is removed and impacts to persons and other resources will be reduced to acceptable levels.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.8.D, the City hereby makes **Finding 2** that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

Section 4: Resolution Regarding Environmental Impacts not Fully Mitigated to a Level of Less than Significant

A. Air Quality

1. Impacts 4.3.A, 4.3.B, and 4.3.C

The proposed General Plan Update has the potential to conflict with the 2007 and 2012 Air Quality Management Plans because land use policy does not support the same level of population growth projected. Also, projected cumulative daily pollutant emissions program-wide have the potential to exceed SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants. Impacts at the program level are significant and unavoidable.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.3.A, 4.3.B, and 4.3.C are significant and unavoidable is provided in Section 4.3 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.3-16 – 24.) The proposed General Plan land use changes will not accommodate the high level of growth assumed in the *2012 Regional Transportation Plan*; thus, the Project is inconsistent with regional growth projections. The lack of additional, feasible mitigation and the short- and long-term impacts related to conflicts with the 2007 and 2012 AQMP remain significant and unavoidable.

Due to changes in proposed land uses (as discussed in the Project Description) from the existing General Plan land use plan, upon which the 2007 AQMP is partially based, and the proposed General Plan Update, potential future development supported by implementation of the proposed General Plan Update will not be consistent with the growth projections utilized in the 2007 AQMP. This could result in potentially significant impacts because air quality attainment goals could be delayed because the strategies adopted in the AQMP will not account for land use changes in the planning area. The proposed General Plan Update has the potential to support 5,190 more dwelling units, 16,445 more residents, and approximately 12.4 million square feet more of non-residential development when compared to the existing General Plan. Regarding potential violation to an existing or projected air quality violation, the 2007 and 2012 AQMPs are projected to achieve attainment of criteria pollutants based on the projections, measures, and timeframes included in each as described in Section 4.3.2 (Regulatory Framework) of the EIR. The proposed General Plan Update would actually support AQMP implementation to achieve the attainments through the measures included in the AQMPs through the proposed policies. These policies support reductions in operational criteria pollutant emissions by reducing reliance on single-rider automobile trips in favor of walking, biking, bus riding, and carpooling. Traffic congestion and associated pollutants will

also be reduced through programs such as flex-scheduling and telecommuting that reduces peak hour trip generation. Construction-related emissions will be reduced through scheduling and programming techniques and reduced fugitive dust emissions through daily site watering. However, as previously stated, the proposed General Plan could potentially interfere with the implementation of either the 2007 or 2012 AQMP. The EIR notes that General Plan Housing, Air Quality, and Land Use Element policies designed to reduce pollutant emissions will reduce long-term pollutant emissions, but additional mitigation cannot be identified at the program level to ensure that pollutant emissions will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.3.A, 4.3.B, and 4.3.C, the City hereby makes **Finding 3** that no feasible mitigation measures or acceptable alternatives exist to mitigate these potentially significant impacts.

B. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

1. Impacts 4.7.A and 4.7.B

The proposed General Plan Update has the potential to conflict with long-term SCAG regional growth projection and would thus potentially conflict with SCAG's Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan (SCS/RTP), as well as the California Air Resources Board's Scoping Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions based on these long-term growth projections. Also, projected cumulative daily pollutant emissions program-wide have the potential to exceed SCAQMD interim threshold for greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts at the program level are significant and unavoidable.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.7.A and 4.7.B are significant and unavoidable is provided in Section 4.7 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.7-16 – 27.) Because of the proposed General Plan land use changes, inconsistency with regional growth projections, and lack of additional, feasible mitigation, the long-term impacts related to conflicts with SCAG's SCS/RTP and CARB's Scoping Plan remain significant and unavoidable. Over the long term, GHG emissions may exceed regional thresholds established, as projected population capacity for Colton falls below population growth assumptions in the regional plans. As assumed in the RTP/SCS, based on current City boundaries, Colton is forecast to grow to a total population of 71,700, with 29,600 jobs, by 2035. The ultimate build-out of the proposed General Plan land use plan can accommodate a total population of 67,182 and total employment of 29,874 within the current incorporated boundaries. Therefore, the proposed General Plan Update is not consistent with the population growth forecasts of the RTP/SCS because it does not provide the

capacity for residential development to accommodate the projected population growth. The proposed General Plan Update would therefore be inconsistent with the Scoping Plan and the RTP/SCS based on SCAG's growth projections, thereby potentially contributing to nonattainment of regional GHG reductions targets, only because land use policy does not support the same high level of population growth projected. The General Plan does, however, incorporate policies that support cooperation with and support of these plans, and requires greenhouse gas emission analysis for individual projects. However, with the inconsistency with the RTP/SCS growth projections, the proposed General Plan Update would potentially result in significant impacts related to long-term GHG emissions in the region. Additional mitigation cannot be identified at the program level to ensure long-term consistency with growth projections or that greenhouse emissions will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.7.A and 4.7.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 3** that no feasible mitigation measures or acceptable alternatives exist to mitigate these potentially significant impacts.

C. Recreation

1. Impact 4.15.A.

Implementation of General Plan land use policy would indirectly contribute to long – term deterioration of existing park and recreation facilities based on the additional residential population associated with the proposed land use plan. Although existing fee collection is in place to offset additional residential development, it cannot be guaranteed that these fees will achieve the funding requirements to either develop new park land and/or maintain existing park conditions. Impacts at the program level are significant and unavoidable.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impact 4.15.A are unavoidable is provided in Section 4.15 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.14-4 – 5.) The proposed General Plan Update has the potential to result in the deterioration of existing parks and recreation facilities, and adequate funding cannot be identified at this time to mitigate the impacts. The Land Use Element does not include specific provisions for new public parklands, but does include the goal and policies below. Within the West Valley Specific Plan, 9.33 acres are designated Open Space/Park. No timeline has been established for construction of park facilities; the Specific Plan has not yet been adopted. Colton currently is very deficient in park space relative to the goal of five acres per 1,000 residents, and this deficiency can be expected to continue with adoption of the General Plan Update. While residential subdivision activity will result in new park facilities

through payment of Quimby fees and all new development projects will require payment of Development Impacts Fees (a portion of which will fund parkland acquisition and park maintenance), the degree to which these fees will actually result in new park space and adequate maintenance cannot be projected. Additional mitigation cannot be identified at the program level to ensure adequate funding is established and park improvements and/or maintenance are accomplished in a timely manner to serve additional residential development so as to not deteriorate existing park and recreational facilities.

Finding

Regarding Impact 4.15.A, the City hereby makes **Finding 3** that no feasible mitigation measures or acceptable alternatives are available to mitigate this potentially significant impact.

D. Transportation and Traffic

1. Impacts 4.16.A and 4.16.B

Long-term implementation of General Plan land use policy, in combination with regional contributions to traffic on the local road network, will cause an increase in traffic that will result in several intersections and roadway segments to operate at Level of Service (LOS) F. Impacts at the program level are significant and unavoidable.

Substantial Evidence

Evidence supporting the fact that the environmental effects identified in Impacts 4.16.A and 4.16.B are significant and unavoidable is provided in Section 4.16 of the EIR. (See DEIR at 4.16-20 – 24.) Nineteen intersections and seven roadway segments were identified as projected to operate at deficient levels of service (LOS F) as a result of the General Plan Update and ambient growth in regional traffic. Mitigation for intersection, interchange, and roadway improvements have been identified that would improve levels of service to acceptable levels, thus reducing impacts to less than significant levels. [\(See Mitigation Measures 4.16-1 through - 6.\)](#) However, the physical or financial feasibility of implementing these improvements has not been investigated in detail due to the complexities inherent in the implementation of intersection and interchange improvements and long corridor improvements over an extended time period. Although funding for improvements would likely be collected through a combination of development-based fees and regional funding, this funding cannot be guaranteed to accomplish the physical improvements required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. In addition, it has not been determined that the recommended mitigation can be accommodated, [although Mitigation Measure 4.16-7 requires the City to attempt to enter into a regional traffic improvement funding program.](#) Additional mitigation cannot be identified at the program level to ensure adequate funding is

established and road improvements are accomplished in a timely manner to serve additional development and traffic and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Finding

Regarding Impacts 4.16.A and 4.16.B, the City hereby makes **Finding 3** that no feasible mitigation measures or acceptable alternatives exist to fully mitigate these potentially significant impacts.

Section 5: Resolution Regarding Cumulative Environmental Impacts

Sections 15130(a) through 15130(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines require the contents of an EIR to include a discussion of cumulative impacts. Section 15355 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a cumulative impact as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.

Substantial Evidence

Impacts regarding Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Population and Housing, Recreation, and Transportation and Traffic were determined to be potentially cumulatively significant. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions are potentially cumulatively significant based on inconsistency with long-term growth projections; this policy may interfere with implementation of the 2012 SCAQMP, RTP/SCS, and CARB Scoping Plan, which aim to reduce regional emissions by potentially redirecting growth where these plans do not anticipate it to occur. Similarly, cumulative impacts could result to Population and Housing with this redirected growth by the City potentially not accommodating the long-term growth.

Since the individual impact section for Recreation determined a potentially significant impact, cumulative regional impacts may also result based on the potential for adequate parks and recreation facilities to not be provided within the City.

Cumulatively significant Traffic impacts would occur as detailed in the Transportation and Traffic section of the EIR (see DEIR at 4.16-20 – 24) for those intersections and roadways determined to potentially operate at LOS E and F, as well as for freeway congestion on I-10 and I-215 due to the inability to assure that adequate mitigation could be provided considering funding sources and potential physical constraints.

All other impacts were determined to have cumulatively less than significant impacts or no impact. Full evidence and analysis of all cumulative environmental

impacts is provided in Section 6.0 of the EIR (see DEIR at 6.2 – 24) and furthermore, within each individual impact analysis in Section 4.0 of the EIR.

Finding

With respect to Cumulative Impacts on Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Population and Housing, Recreation, and Transportation and Traffic, the City hereby makes **Finding 3** that no feasible mitigation measures or acceptable alternatives exist to mitigate these potentially significant cumulative impacts.

Section 6: Resolution Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) states that significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the General Plan Update should be identified in the EIR. The General Plan Update provides a policy and regulatory framework to guide future growth into both infill sites and undeveloped areas. Once land is developed with a certain type of land use, reversion to open space for conservation, resource management, or other purposes is highly unlikely. An irreversible commitment of non-renewable natural resources is inherent in any development project, or in the case of the General Plan Update, numerous development projects over a long period of time. Implementation of the General Plan Update represents a long-term commitment to the consumption of energy for electricity, water and space heating, water supply and treatment, industrial processes, as well as fuels to power various modes of mechanized transportation. In this regard, the City Council finds that development of the General Plan Update would result in the continued commitment to the consumption of such resources.

Section 7: Resolution Regarding Growth-Inducing and Urban Decay Impacts

A. Growth-Inducing Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires an evaluation of growth-inducing impacts that may result from a proposed project. Growth-inducing effects include ways in which the proposed General Plan Update could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The proposed General Plan Update is specifically intended to provide for the orderly growth of the planning area to achieve economic, environmental, and quality of life benefits. Nothing in the General Plan Update proposes new infrastructure systems to facilitate growth of undeveloped areas that were not proposed in the current General Plan. There are no proposed policies, regulations, or ordinances that are

part of the project or implied by the General Plan Update Program that will encourage or enable significantly higher levels of growth than have been anticipated in regional forecasts by SCAG. In fact, growth projections fall slightly below those of SCAG. Improvements to the road, storm drain, potable water, and sewer systems, including those listed in this EIR, are intended to achieve desired levels of service as growth occurs, rather than facilitate growth beyond what is planned for in the existing General Plan. Based on the preceding and on the entirety of the record of proceedings, the City consequently finds that no significant growth-inducing effects would result from implementation of the General Plan Update.

B. Urban Decay Impacts

The General Plan Update is not anticipated to contribute to urban decay, as the General Plan Update will not directly result in the loss of existing commercial or industrial business or create building vacancies. The General Plan Update would continue to contribute to the community's economic base by providing for additional housing for all income levels, create a better balance of residential and non-residential uses in the community, promote organized and pedestrian-friendly commercial development and protect natural resources. Implementation of the General Plan will result in a more inclusive community, maintain a balance between housing and employment and foster a stable economic base and diverse employment opportunities. Based on the preceding and on the entirety of the record of proceedings, the City consequently finds that no significant physical effects from urban decay would result from implementation of the General Plan Update.

Section 8: Resolution Regarding Alternatives

Alternatives Considered

The following is a discussion of the alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in the Draft EIR.

An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are infeasible, unreasonable, or overly speculative. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.) There is no standard set forth in the CEQA Guidelines for the number of alternatives that must be addressed. Instead, the CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[a].) The range of alternatives is determined on a case-by-case basis depending on the unique characteristics of the project location, the project objectives, the environmental setting, and the potentially significant impacts that are associated with the Project. Among the

factors that are used to consider project alternatives for detailed consideration in an EIR are whether they would meet most of the basic project objectives, be feasible, and whether they would avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental impacts of the project. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[c]) Several alternatives were eliminated during the scoping/planning process either because they were deemed infeasible or because they were inferior as compared to the proposed project.

The following objectives have been established for the Proposed Project:

- a. Replace the current Land Use, Circulation, and Housing Elements with new elements that reflect the goals and aspirations of the community through 2030.
- b. Ensure the General Plan Update achieves compliance with all applicable state laws and regulations.
- c. Ensure development, use, and maintenance of public and private lands will always:
 - i. respect Colton’s heritage and historic resources,
 - ii. protect Colton’s traditional suburban development pattern and residential neighborhoods while accommodating new, more urban approaches to development,
 - iii. provide opportunities for diverse businesses that generate revenue and employment, and
 - iv. promote high-quality design.
- d. Accommodate circulation and mobility options beyond the automobile. In all infrastructure and development planning decisions, the City looks to:
 - i. provide for the integration of automobiles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians within our established street network using the Complete Street system,
 - ii. provide greater connectivity and reduce congestion on our street network, and

- iii. promote efficient and high quality transit use, including bus rapid transit routes and Metrolink stations in Colton, and
- e. Accommodate freight train operations that serve businesses in the City while striving to protect residential neighborhoods from the impacts of rail operations.
- f. Ensure that the City can meet its goals for the preservation and production of housing, provide capacity to meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation for the 2008-2014 planning period, and provide equal access to housing for all.

Alternatives Considered but Rejected

Two alternatives (Limit Residential Growth Capacity and Alternative Location) were considered but rejected from further analysis based on the General Plan Update objectives. Although the “No Project” alternative also did not meet most of the objectives, it must still be analyzed pursuant to CEQA. All other alternatives were determined to meet some of the objectives and were further analyzed.

Alternative 5 – Limit Residential Growth Capacity

Substantial Evidence

This alternative would limit the overall potential residential units in the planning area for the purpose of reducing the demand for recreational services and facilities. Alternative 5 would not reflect the goals and aspirations of the community, comply with state law, accommodate more urban approaches to development, nor provide for sufficient housing to meet the 2008-2014 RHNA and would thus not meet most of the objectives.

Finding

The City Council rejects this alternative on the bases (1) that it would not meet any of the project objectives; (2) it would not comply with state law and so is not feasible; (3) that either of these bases individually justifies the rejection of this alternative; and (4) thereby finds that it was not required to be analyzed in further detail in the EIR.

Alternative 6 – Alternative Location

Substantial Evidence

The goals and policies of the Colton General Plan Update are specific to the geographic context of the Colton planning area. The City has no land use or other governmental authority outside of its jurisdictional limits and its Sphere of Influence, as designated by the San Bernardino County Local Agency Formation

Commission. Because the Alternative Location scenario does not meet any project objectives, it is infeasible and has been rejected.

Finding

The City Council rejects this alternative on the bases (1) that it would not meet any of the project objectives; (2) that this basis justifies the rejection of this alternative; and (3) thereby finds that it was not required to be analyzed in further detail in the EIR.

Alternatives Analyzed

Alternative 1: “No Project” Alternative – Assumes that no new General Plan Update would be adopted and the current General Plan would remain in effect.

Alternative 2: Limit Residential Intensity in the Downtown Area – This alternative is designed to reduce the volume of traffic generated within the downtown area compared to the General Plan Update to reduce impacts to certain intersections within the planning area.

Alternative 3: Increase Residential Intensity – This alternative is designed to increase the amount of potential residential units in already designated residential areas in the planning area for purposes of consistency with long-term population growth projections.

Alternative 4: Change Industrial Designated Properties – This alternative is designed to increase potential residential units in areas currently designated for non-residential land uses for purposes of consistency with long-term population growth projections.

Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

Continuation of the existing General Plan policies (Alternative 1) would not significantly alter the current General Plan policies, most of which have been replicated and strengthened in the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternative 2 would reduce the residential densities within the downtown area and would thus result in the preservation of current conditions. Redevelopment of aging properties might not be encouraged or accomplished.

Alternative 3 would increase residential intensities in the southern portion of the City and would thus result in a change in the character of the area and its visual impact. This area currently includes rugged hillside areas that would have to be

graded substantially to support residential development; such grading would substantially alter the visual character.

Alternative 4 would allow new residential land uses to be developed within the South Colton neighborhood, which has a mix of industrial and residential uses. The shift to more residential development would change the visual character of the area.

Agricultural Resources

The planning area currently has three areas, totaling approximately 12.6 acres, which are designated by the California Department of Conservation as Important Farmland. The existing Specific Plan that addresses properties so designated would not be altered by any of the alternatives. Thus, impacts of all the alternatives would remain the same as those associated with the proposed General Plan Update (less than significant).

Air Quality

Alternative 1 would keep existing land use designations, which would be consistent with the projections associated with the current 2007 AQMP. However, the population capacity of the existing General Plan would not provide for the anticipated growth per SCAG which the 2012 AQMP is based on. This is similar to the impacts of the proposed General Plan Update, but the existing General Plan provides for slightly greater population capacity compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have slightly reduced impacts compared to the General Plan Update, but still remain significant and unavoidable.

Alternative 2, decreasing residential densities in the downtown area, would likely reduce the build-out population. Due to the decrease in population, it would result in an inconsistency with the existing 2007 and proposed 2012 AQMP, similar to but greater than the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternative 3 would allow for additional residential intensity, which would result in additional population capacity. The additional population capacity would result in consistency with the proposed 2012 AQMP to not interfere with its implementation and thus result in reduced, less than significant impacts compared to the significant impacts associated with the General Plan Update.

Alternative 4 would allow for residential land uses instead of industrial land uses in the South Colton neighborhood, which would increase the population capacity and decrease the non-residential and employment capacities. The additional population capacity would result in a consistency with the proposed 2012 AQMP to not interfere with its implementation and thus result in reduced, less than significant impacts compared to the proposed General Plan Update's significant impacts. In

addition, the shift to residential instead of industrial land uses would reduce the likelihood of operational toxic air emissions impacting nearby residential or other sensitive land uses.

Biological Resources

Impacts to biological resources would be slightly increased under the current General Plan because the current General Plan does not include any notable safeguards unique to the City for biological resources. Although the proposed General Plan Update does not include any substantial protections for biological resources beyond existing regulations, the proposed land use plan does designate identified Habitat Conservation Plan area for the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly as Open Space, instead of Industrial designation of the current General Plan.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would allow development in the same areas as is allowed by the proposed General Plan Update, although at varying intensities. Therefore, impacts to biological resources would likely be similar. In addition, these alternatives would also retain the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly area as open space.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 1 would preserve the existing land use plan as well as the existing Cultural Resources Preservation Element and its policies, as does the proposed General Plan Update. No substantial additional policies are proposed with the General Plan Update that would impact cultural resources. Thus, impacts of the current General Plan would be similar to those of the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would allow development in the same areas as is allowed by the proposed General Plan Update, although at varying intensities. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources would likely be similar.

Geology and Soils

Alternative 1, 2, and 4 would not have significantly different impacts from the proposed General Plan Update because the same areas are proposed for development, although at varying intensities. Development pursuant to each alternative would generally rely on existing regulations and measures to address any potential impacts relative to geology and soils.

Alternative 3 proposes substantially greater residential intensities (maximum 16 dwelling units per acre) in an area designated by the proposed General Plan Update for low residential intensities (maximum 2 dwelling units per acre). In addition, the area of general change is an area with steep slopes, which under Alternative 3 may present increased landslide hazards compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Alternative 1 could produce significant changes in greenhouse gas emissions, resulting in impacts on climate change, similar to the proposed General Plan Update. The proposed General Plan Update provides new policies on energy conservation that would limit greenhouse gases, as well as referencing implementation of current greenhouse gas reduction regulations. Alternative 1 would keep the existing land use designations, which the population capacity of the existing land use designations would not provide for the anticipated growth per SCAG, which would potentially interfere with the greenhouse gas reduction measures included in SCAG's RTP/SCS as well as CARB's Scoping Plan. This is similar to the impacts of the proposed General Plan Update. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have similar slightly reduced impacts compared to the General Plan Update.

Alternative 2, decreasing residential densities in the downtown area, would likely reduce the build-out population. Due to the decrease in population, it would result in an inconsistency with the 2012 SCAG RTP/SCS, similar to but greater than the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternative 3 would allow for additional residential intensity, which would result in additional population capacity. The additional population capacity would result in consistency with the 2012 SCAG RTP/SCS to not interfere with its implementation and thus result in reduced, less than significant impacts compared to the proposed General Plan Update's significant impacts.

Alternative 4 would allow for residential land uses instead of industrial land uses in the South Colton neighborhood, which would increase the population capacity and decrease the non-residential and employment capacities. The additional population capacity would result in consistency with the 2012 SCAG RTP/SCS to not interfere with its implementation and thus result in reduced, less than significant impacts compared to the proposed General Plan Update's significant impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 1 would retain the existing land use plan. The proposed General Plan Update has modified land use policy to improve conditions where residential uses interface directly with railroad traffic and industrial uses. In addition, the proposed General Plan Update includes policies regarding truck routing performance standards that Alternative 1 would not include. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have greater impacts due to location of residences to industrial uses, rail lines, and trucks potentially transporting hazardous materials.

Alternative 2 would not have significantly different impacts from the proposed General Plan Update because the same areas are proposed for development that could be affected from existing non-wildfire hazards, although at varying intensities. Development pursuant to each alternative would generally rely on existing regulations and measures, as well as the policies in the current Safety Element, as well as the additional truck route policies noted previously to address any potential impacts from hazards or hazardous materials.

Alternative 3 proposes substantially greater residential intensities (maximum 16 dwelling units per acre) in an area designated by the proposed General Plan Update for low residential intensities (maximum 2 dwelling units per acre). In addition, the area of general change is an area with Very High rated Fire Hazard Severity Zone, which under Alternative 3 may present increased wildfire hazards compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternative 4 would also propose development in similar areas as the proposed General Plan Update, but would reduce the amount of industrial development, thus reducing the potential for operational hazardous emissions, handling, and transporting that could impact the planning area.

Hydrology and Water Quality

All of the alternatives would generally allow development to occur similar to the proposed General Plan Update, although at varying intensities. This variation in intensity would not substantially alter the impacts from or to flooding, water quality, or on groundwater supplies. All relevant policies addressing these potential impacts in the existing Safety Element would remain, as would any relevant standard regulations.

Land Use and Planning

As mentioned in Biological Resources, Alternative 1 would retain the existing land use plan and would retain an area within the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Habitat Conservation Plan for industrial development, whereas the proposed General Plan Update and Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would designate this area as Open Space. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have greater impacts and Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would have similar impacts related to Habitat Conservation Plans compared to the proposed General Plan Update. No other Natural Community Conservation Plans exist within the planning area; therefore, none of the alternatives would affect such plans.

None of the alternatives or the proposed General Plan Update would result in the division of an established community since they retain similar development patterns and road networks.

Mineral Resources

Various areas exist throughout the planning area where available data indicates there are known or potential significant mineral resources. Except for at the existing Slover Mountain mining site, existing zoning, property size, and surrounding development generally would preclude mineral extraction operations from occurring where known or potential mineral resources are identified. All of the alternatives, like the proposed General Plan Update, accommodate development generally in the same areas. Each of the alternatives would thus similarly impact the availability or loss of known or potential mineral resources as the proposed General Plan Update.

Noise

Under Alternative 1, the existing General Plan would result in growth in traffic and traffic noise similar to the proposed General Plan Update, although likely at a greater level due to greater traffic volumes that would be anticipated from a greater residential and non-residential development capacity. However, the existing General Plan would not include the new roadways and roadway alignment that are included in the proposed General Plan Update. As analyzed in Section 4.12 (Noise), these new roadways and roadway alignments will result in potentially significant impacts to nearby residential land uses from long-term operational impacts, in addition to the short-term impacts for construction of the roadways. Although mitigation is anticipated to address these potentially significant impacts, the existing General Plan would not include these roadways and would thus have reduced noise impacts compared to the proposed General Plan Update on these sensitive receptors, despite the overall greater incremental increase in noise impacts.

Alternative 2 would result in a decreased development capacity and therefore incrementally reduced traffic and traffic noise impacts. This alternative would also include the added roadways and roadway realignments similar to the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in an increased development capacity and therefore incrementally increased traffic and traffic noise impacts. This alternative would also include the added roadways and roadway realignments similar to the proposed General Plan Update.

Population and Housing

Similar to the proposed General Plan Update, each of the alternatives would accommodate population growth via land use policies that support residential development as demanded by the market. However, Alternatives 3 and 4 are designed to accommodate the projected population growth by SCAG, whereas Alternatives 1 and 2 and the proposed General Plan Update do not. By

accommodating the projected growth, and not indirectly inducing growth outside of the City, Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in reduced impacts compared to the proposed General Plan Update. Although Alternative 1 would not provide the capacity to provide for the projected growth, it does provide for slightly greater capacity compared to the proposed General Plan Update, thus it would have a slightly reduced impact. Alternative 2 would have an even lower population capacity compared to the proposed General Plan Update, thus it would have an increased impact related to indirect induced population growth.

Like the proposed project, none of the alternatives would result in the displacement of housing units or people.

Public Services

None of the alternatives would result in significantly different impacts on public services since existing policies, as well as those proposed by the General Plan Update, require appropriate levels of service, including expansion of those levels, for the current and future residents and business community.

Recreation

Although impacts from each of the alternatives and the proposed General Plan Update on recreation facilities would be addressed through existing policies and fees, Alternative 2 proposes reduced dwelling units and Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 propose increased dwelling units. These alternatives would produce, respectively, reduced and potentially greater impacts on recreation facilities compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

Transportation and Traffic

Alternative 1, keeping the existing land use designations, would allow for greater residential and non-residential development within the planning area compared to the proposed General Plan Update, thus generally generating more trips and traffic congestion. However, Alternative 1 generally would allow for decreased intensities closest to the most severely impacted intersections of Colton Avenue/10th Street/G Street and Mount Vernon Avenue/Interstate-10 Ramps compared to the proposed General Plan Update, which was determined to have unavoidable significant impacts with mitigation. Therefore, Alternative 1 would likely have reduced impacts related to these intersections, although potentially still at significant levels. Alternative 1 would also not include policies added with the updated Mobility Element related to establishing needed citywide connections and alternative modes of transportation. In this regard, impacts could be greater than those associated with the project.

Similarly, Alternative 2 specifically proposes decreased intensities closest to the most severely impacted intersections of Colton Avenue/10th Street/G Street and Mount Vernon Avenue/Interstate-10 Ramps compared to the proposed General Plan

Update, which was determined to have unavoidable significant impacts. Therefore, Alternative 2 would likely have reduced impacts related to these intersections, although potentially still at significant levels. This alternative would also maintain all other policies proposed in the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternatives 3 and 4 would have increased levels of residential development compared to the proposed General Plan Update, at the expense of reduced nonresidential development. Generally, on an acreage basis, nonresidential uses produce more vehicle trips daily and during peak travel periods. Thus, these alternatives could reduce traffic volumes at the impacted locations. These alternatives would also maintain all other policies proposed in the proposed General Plan Update.

All other impacts related to air traffic patterns, traffic hazards, emergency access, and parking of each of the alternatives would be similar to those of the proposed General Plan Update (less than significant).

Utilities and Service Systems

Alternative 1 overall proposes greater potential development and would thus have a greater impact on utilities compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternative 2 proposes decreased intensities and would thus have a reduced impact on utilities compared to the proposed General Plan Update.

Alternatives 3 and 4 would have increased levels of residential development but less nonresidential development; impact would be similar to that associated with the proposed General Plan Update.

Table 5.4-1 offers a comparison of each Alternative’s ability to meet the project’s objectives.

**Table 5.4-1
Objectives Screening**

No.	Alternative	Meets Objective?					
		a	b	c	d	e	f
1	No Project*	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
2	Limit Downtown Residential	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3	Increase Residential Intensity	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
4	Industrial to Residential	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
5	Reduced Residential Capacity	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
6	Alternative Location	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Hogle-Ireland 2012

General Plan Update

Table 5.5-1 provides a comparison of impacts of each alternative as compared to the project

**Table 5.5-1
Impact Comparison Summary Matrix**

Impacts	Proposed General Plan Update	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Aesthetics	NO/L	=	=	>	=
Agricultural Resources	NO/L	=	=	=	=
Air Quality	SU	<	>	<	<
Biological Resources	S/M	>	=	=	=
Cultural Resources	S/M	=	=	=	=
Geology and Soils	NO/L	=	=	>	=
GHG and Climate Change	SU	>	>	<	<
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	S/M	>	=	>	<
Hydrology and Water Quality	NO/L	=	=	=	=
Land Use and Planning	NO/L	>	=	=	=
Mineral Resources	NO/L	=	=	=	=
Noise	S/M	<	<	>	>
Population and Housing	NO/L	<	>	<	<
Public Services	NO/L	=	=	=	=
Recreation	S/M	>	<	>	>
Transportation and Traffic	SU	<	<	=	=
Utilities and Service Systems	NO/L	>	<	=	=
Key: SU Significant and unavoidable Impacts S/M Less than significant Impacts with mitigation Incorporated NO/L No Impact or less than significant Impact > Impacts are greater than proposed project = Impacts are similar to proposed project < Impacts are less than proposed project					

Findings

Alternative 1 – No Project

The City Council rejects this alternative on the basis that (1) it fails to meet most of the basic project objectives; (2) is unable to avoid significant effects of the project; and (3) finds that any of these grounds provide sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Therefore, it is eliminated from further consideration.

Alternative 2 – Limit Downtown Residential

The City Council rejects this alternative on the basis that (1) it fails to meet many of the basic project objectives; (2) is unable to avoid significant effects of the project; (3) would cause an increase in the level of significance of impacts above those caused by the project; and (4) finds that any of these grounds provide sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Therefore, it is eliminated from further consideration.

Alternative 3 – Increase Residential Intensity

The City Council rejects this alternative on the basis that (1) it fails to meet one of the basic project objectives; (2) is unable to avoid significant effects of the project; (3) would cause an increase in the level of significance of impacts above those caused by the project; and (4) finds that any of these grounds provide sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Therefore, it is eliminated from further consideration.

Alternative 4 – Industrial to Residential

The City Council rejects this alternative on the basis that (1) it fails to meet one of the basic project objectives; (2) is unable to avoid significant effects of the project; and (3) finds that any of these grounds provide sufficient justification for rejection of this alternative. Therefore, it is eliminated from further consideration.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The primary environmental impacts will come as development occurs whether or not the General Plan Update is adopted and whether or not any of the alternatives is selected over the proposed General Plan Update. Alternative 1 reduces impacts in more categories compared to the proposed General Plan Update, including to those sections found to be significant (Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Traffic) under the proposed General Plan Update. Impacts under these categories would still likely remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 1. However, pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, when the environmentally superior alternative is the *No Project* alternative, another

environmentally superior alternative must be selected among the remaining alternatives. In addition, alternatives which reduce significant impacts to less than significant levels are deemed to be environmentally superior to those that just reduce significant impacts or reduce already less than significant impacts.

Based on these criteria, Alternative 4 is the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts to less than significant levels. Alternative 4 would also reduce impacts with respect to Hazards and Hazardous Materials and Population and Housing, but result in greater impacts for Recreation and Utilities and Service Systems.

The City rejects this alternative on the basis that it fails to meet all the General Plan Update objectives, increases environmental impacts for Noise and Recreation despite reducing impacts for Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions to less than significant levels, and is infeasible for policy reasons. The City finds that either of these grounds provides sufficient justification for rejection this alternative and therefore it is rejected in favor of the General Plan Update.

Section 9: Resolution Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations

The City Council hereby declares that, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City Council has balanced the benefits of the Project against any unavoidable environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the Project. Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, if the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, those impacts may be considered "acceptable."

The City Council hereby declares that the EIR has identified and discussed significant effects which may occur as a result of the Project. With the implementation of the Mitigation Measures discussed in the EIR and adopted by this Resolution, these effects can be mitigated to a level of less than significant except for the single unavoidable significant impact discussed in Section 4 above.

The City Council hereby declares that it has made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the potential impacts resulting from the Project.

The City Council hereby declares that to the extent any Mitigation Measures recommended in the EIR would not be incorporated, such Mitigation Measures are infeasible because they would impose restrictions on the Project that would prohibit the realization of specific economic, social and other benefits that this City Council finds outweigh the unmitigated impacts.

The City Council further finds that except for the Project, all other alternatives set forth in the EIR are infeasible because they would prohibit the realization of Project objectives and/or specific economic, social and other benefits that this City Council finds outweigh any environmental benefits of the alternatives.

The City Council hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant environmental effect of the Project to the extent feasible by adopting the Mitigation Measures contained in this Resolution, having considered the entire administrative record on the Project, and having weighed the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable adverse impact after mitigation, the City Council has determined that each of the following social, economic, and environmental benefits of the Project separately and individually outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse impact and render those potential adverse environmental impacts acceptable based upon the following overriding considerations:

- A. Framework for Projected Growth.** The General Plan Update provides a strategic framework to accommodate a reasonable share of projected

regional population growth at intensities that are appropriate with respect to existing development, environmental resources, community character, available services, and available infrastructure. (Goal LU-1)

B. Community Sustainability. The General Plan Update promotes sustainable development through goals and policies that balance the need for adequate infrastructure, housing, and economic vitality with the need for resource management, environmental protection, and preservation of quality of life for residents in the City. (Goal LU-4)

C. Realistic Land Use Pattern. The General Plan Update provides a land use map that accounts for existing development, physical constraints, hazards, and incompatible uses and assigns densities and use types accordingly to ensure that communities and neighborhoods remain safe and livable. (Goal LU-1, LU-6, LU-7)

D. Air Quality and Climate Change. The General Plan Update addresses adverse environmental effects associated with regional air quality and global climate change by facilitating sustainable development, promoting energy efficiency, and analyzing and reducing air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions from development. (Goal LU-4)

E. Balanced Transportation System. The Mobility Element Update benefits the community by providing a foundation for a balanced transportation system that efficiently moves people and goods, supports economic development, and preserves residential neighborhoods while minimizing safety hazards and environmental impacts. This will be accomplished by participating in and complying with regional transportation planning efforts, coordinating with adjacent jurisdictions, supporting alternative modes of transportation, ensuring consistency in roadway construction, using intelligent transportation system measures, establishing truck routes, and supporting emergency response. (Goals M-1, M-2, M-3)

F. Improved Roadway Performance. The Mobility Element Update provides for a roadway network that will adequately support existing, proposed, and future land uses within the City. This is accomplished through the adoption of network performance standards, network monitoring, acquisition of necessary rights-of-way, requiring improvements and mitigation from new development, and limiting driveway access. (Goals M-3, M-4)

G. Neighborhood Traffic Management. Residential neighborhoods will be protected from impacts related to non-residential traffic cut-through through

the Mobility Element Update by providing for traffic calming devices and roadway designs that detour traffic from residential areas. (Goal M-3)

H. Public Transportation. The Circulation Element Update provides for a balanced and integrated multi-modal transportation system. This is accomplished by supporting public transit and ride-sharing programs, providing for use of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and exploring the potential for a transit center and system within the City. (Goal M-2, M-4)

I. Improved Air Quality and Reduced Vehicle Miles Traveled. The proposed Mobility Element Update will maximize transportation demand management strategies thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled. This will improve regional air quality and reduce the City's contribution of greenhouse gas emissions by requiring features such as transit facilities, park-and-ride sites, bus shelters, bicycle racks and lockers, and preferential ride-sharer parking. The Mobility Element Update also requires employers to provide incentives to use alternative transportation options for employees and supports traffic management strategies such as flex-time and staggered scheduling. (Goal M-2, M-4)

J. Adequate Public Services and Facilities. The General Plan Update establishes a park provision standard for the community and seeks to preserve existing recreational and open space uses and seeks to continue to provide adequate and review levels of recreational and other public services and facilities to the community. (Goal LU-12, LU-14)

K. Enhancement of Local Economy. The General Plan Update enhances the local economy and provides opportunities for future jobs and business development commensurate with forecasted growth by planning for commercial development near existing businesses, transportation hubs and walkable residential areas. (Goal LU-3, LU-8, LU-10)

L. State Mandate. The City is legally required to update its General Plan, pursuant to California Government Code Section 65302(b).

Exhibit B to City Council Resolution No. R-60-13

City of Colton General Plan
Land Use, Mobility, and Housing Elements

Final Environmental Impact Report
SCH No. 2012031037

**Mitigation Monitoring and
Reporting Program**

June 2013

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
Biological Resources Mitigation Measures						
4.4.A-1	A biological resources assessment shall be prepared for any land use plan or development proposal located on any undeveloped land within a Critical Habitat designation or identified in the General Plan Environmental Impact Report as dry herbaceous, hardwood forest-woodland, shrub, or giant reed-pampas grass vegetation communities or mapped Delhi sands habitat. This assessment shall identify the habitat types and quality, identify species occurrence and distribution, determine the specific impacts to biological resources and characterize the biological significance of those impacts, and define measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any significant impacts attributable to a proposed project. The reduction in impacts may include a redesign of the project. The compensation may include creating and/or preserving in perpetuity equivalent or better quality habitat at a minimum 1:1 ratio, as will be determined through project-specific analysis. The biological resources assessment shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and submitted to the Development Services Director for review/approval in consultation with the biologist in consultation with the biologist and other as appropriate to the project. The biological resources assessment shall be included in the CEQA compliance documentation for all such proposals.	Prior to entitlement approval	Submittal and approval of assessment by Development Services Director in consultation with qualified biologist	Development Services		

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
<p>4.4.A-2</p> <p>A focused survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified professional biologist for any new development project proposed on a vacant site of two acres or larger, with a landscape of annual and perennial grasslands, desert, or arid scrubland with low-growing vegetation or agricultural use or vegetation. The purpose of the survey is to determine if burrowing owls are foraging or nesting on or adjacent to the project site. If surveys confirm that the site is occupied habitat, mitigation measures to minimize impacts to burrowing owls, their burrows, and foraging habitat shall be identified. The results of this survey, including any mitigation recommendations, shall be incorporated into the project-level CEQA compliance documentation. Owl surveys and approaches to mitigation shall be in accordance with the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation, issued by the California Department of Fish and Game on March 7, 2012.</p>	Prior to entitlement approval	Submittal and approval of assessment by Development Services Director in consultation with qualified biologist	Development Services			
Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures						
<p>4.5-1</p> <p>Future development proposals subject to environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are subject to the following provisions at the expense of the project proponent, as directed by the Development Services Director.</p> <p>Paleontological Assessment. In areas containing middle to late Pleistocene era sediments (Qof) where it is unknown if paleontological resources exist, prior to grading an assessment shall be made by a qualified paleontological professional to establish the need for paleontologic monitoring. Should paleontological monitoring be required after recommendation by the professional paleontologist and approval by the Development Services Director, paleontological monitoring shall be implemented.</p>	Prior to entitlement approval	Submittal and approval of assessment by Development Services Director in consultation with qualified specialist	Development Services			

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
<p>Paleontological Monitoring. A project that requires grading plans and is located in an area of known fossil occurrence or that has been demonstrated to have fossils present in a paleontological field survey or other appropriate assessment shall have all grading monitored by trained paleontologic crews working under the direction of a qualified professional, so that fossils exposed during grading can be recovered and preserved. Paleontologic monitors shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed, to avoid construction delays, and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. Monitors shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Monitoring is not necessary if the potentially fossiliferous units described for the property in question are not present or if present are determined upon exposure and examination by qualified paleontologic personnel to have low potential to contain fossil resources. Should significant paleontological resources be discovered, paleontological recovery, identification, and curation shall be implemented.</p>	During grading activities	Presence of paleontological monitor, as checked in the field	Development Services			
<p>Paleontological Recovery, Identification, and Curation. Qualified paleontologic personnel shall prepare recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. Qualified paleontologic personnel shall identify and curate specimens into the collections of the Division of Geological Sciences, San Bernardino County Museum or a similar established, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable paleontologic storage. The paleontologist must have a written repository agreement in hand prior to the initiation of mitigation activities. This measure is not considered complete until curation into an established museum repository has been fully completed and documented.</p>	During grading activities	Evidence provided by San Bernardino County Museum or other approved organization that materials have been received for curation of identified and recovered resources	Development Services			

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
<p>Paleontological Findings. Qualified paleontologic personnel shall prepare a report of findings with an appendix itemized of specimens subsequent to implementation of paleontological recovery, identification, and curation. A preliminary report shall be submitted to and approved by the Development Services Director before granting of building permits, and a final report shall be submitted to and approved by the Development Services Director before granting of occupancy permits.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits for preliminary report</p> <p>Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for final report</p>	<p>Preparation of preliminary and final Resource Recovery Report</p>	<p>Development Services</p>			
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measures						
<p>4.A.D</p>	<p>Applications for new development projects requiring City discretionary approval shall include the results of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), prepared in accordance with the latest ASTM protocol for such assessments. If the Phase I ESA indicates some evidence of site contamination exists that could require cleanup to avoid danger to people or damage to the environment, a Phase II level review shall be completed to fully characterize the nature and extent of such contamination, and the scope of required clean up procedures. The results of the Phase II assessment shall be considered as part of the CEQA compliance process prior to any action on the project.</p>	<p>Prior to entitlement approval</p>	<p>Submittal and approval of appropriate assessments</p>	<p>Development Services</p>		
Parks and Recreation Mitigation Measure						
<p>4.15-1</p>	<p>Either as part of a parks master plan or other method, the City will identify residential neighborhoods that are not well served by public parks, and will establish a long-range strategy for meeting the goals of: a) providing five acres of park space per 1,000 residents and b) having a City park within one-half mile of every residential neighborhood. In addition to using Quimby Act and Development Impact Fees to fund parkland acquisition and enhancements, the City will seek grant funds to finance these initiatives.</p>	<p>Subsequent update to the Parks Master Plan</p>	<p>Identification of underserved residential neighborhoods, established strategy for meeting park goals</p>	<p>Community Services, Development Services</p>		

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
Traffic and Circulation Mitigation Measures						
4.16-1	To address projected LOS F conditions at the study intersections identified in Table 4.16-4 and the roadway segments identified in Table 4.16-5 of the EIR, improvements as identified in the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) will be funded through established development impact fees and other improvements will be addressed by individual developments that affect each intersection or roadway as identified by a project-specific traffic study during the entitlement process.	Prior to entitlement approval and prior to occupancy	Analysis of individual development impacts on intersections and roadways Payment of development impact fees	Development Services, Public Works		
4.16-2	Colton Avenue between Fairview Avenue and Mt. Vernon Avenue The City will increase the roadway capacity to a four-lane cross-section. This configuration would affect existing bicycle path and service road segments. Alternatively, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization, and add additional traffic signals as warranted with future development. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees, and available state and federal grants.	As funding is available and as warranted by future development	Street improvements funded and completed	Development Services, Public Works		
4.16-3	La Cadena between C Street and Valley Boulevard As part of a broader citywide program, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization and add new traffic signals to unsignalized intersections as warranted with future development. This condition will be monitored over time and implemented as warranted. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees and available state and federal grants.	As warranted by future development and as funding is available	Implemented signal synchronization and installation of new traffic signals	Development Services, Public Works		

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
<p>4.16-4</p> <p>Mount Vernon Avenue between the I-10 freeway and M Street The City will increase roadway capacity to a four-lane cross-section. As this is a major capital improvement project that would affect the interchange ramp intersection with I-10, the bridge over railroad corridor/yard, and potentially the bridge over the Santa Ana River to the south of this segment, this is a long-term project that will require outside funding and coordination with the railroads, Caltrans, SANBAG, and possibly other agencies. The City will monitor conditions to determine when the improvements are warranted and schedule this improvement as part of a future Capital Improvement Plan. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees, the railroads, and available state and federal grants.</p>	As funding is available and as warranted by traffic conditions	Street improvements funded and completed	Development Services, Public Works			
<p>4.16-5</p> <p>Mount Vernon Avenue between I-215 and the Grand Terrace City limits Provision of additional lanes, to a four-lane cross-section, may not be feasible due to challenging geography. Thus, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization, linked into Grand Terrace and Colton traffic signals. Funding sources will include developer mitigation fees (in Colton and Grand Terrace) and available state and federal grants.</p>	As funding is available	Implemented signal synchronization	Development Services, Public Works			
<p>4.16-6</p> <p>Reche Canyon Road south of Washington Street The provision of additional lanes, to a six-lane cross-section in addition to planned corridor improvements, may not be feasible due to adjacent residential neighborhoods. Thus, as traffic signals become necessary with future residential development, the City will provide advanced corridor signal synchronization. Funding sources will include SANBAG, developer mitigation fees, and available state and federal grants.</p>	As funding is available and as warranted by future development	Implemented signal synchronization for new traffic signals	Development Services, Public Works			

COLTON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: LAND USE, MOBILITY, AND HOUSING ELEMENTS						
Environmental Impact Report: Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
<p>4.16-7</p> <p>To implement Policy M-7.2 of the Mobility Element, the City of Colton shall attempt to enter into an agreement with the Cities of Riverside and/or Grand Terrace establishing a fair-share fee program for the purpose of funding necessary traffic improvements at any intersection immediately adjacent to the mutual boundaries of the Cities of Colton, Grand Terrace, and Riverside that is significantly impacted on a cumulative basis. Projects within each city shall be responsible for paying their fair share towards such improvements. In recognition that each city affects the other's roadway network, such fair share fee program shall cover improvements and intersections within all three cities. Such a fair share fee program shall be established after the commissioning of a traffic study and nexus study (jointly funded by the participating cities) to specifically identify the nature, location, timing, and cost of all improvements necessary in ensure that cumulative significant impacts are all adequately addressed and mitigated, and the fair share fee program shall require the implementation of identified improvements at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>As funding is available for fair-share traffic study and nexus study</p>	<p>Established and implemented fair-share fee program</p>	<p>Development Services, Public Works</p>			

1 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**)
2 **COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO**) ss
3 **CITY OF COLTON**)

4 **CERTIFICATION**

5 **I, EILEEN C. GOMEZ**, City Clerk of the City of Colton, California, do hereby
6 certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of **RESOLUTION NO. R-60-13**,
7 duly adopted by the City Council of said City, and approved by the Mayor of said City, at
8 its Regular Meeting of said City Council held on the **20th day of August, 2013**, and that it
9 was adopted by the following vote, to wit:

10 AYES: COUNCILMEMBER Toro, Gonzales, Oliva, Suchil
11 NOES: COUNCILMEMBER None
12 ABSTAIN: COUNCILMEMBER Bennett, Navarro and Mayor Zamora
13 ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBER None
14

15 **IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official
16 seal of the City of Colton, California, this _____ day of _____, 20____.

17
18
19
20 _____
21 EILEEN C. GOMEZ, CMC
22 City Clerk
23 City of Colton

24 (SEAL)
25
26
27
28