

---

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123, this section of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. More detailed information regarding the project and its potential environmental effects is provided in the following sections of this Specific Plan Draft EIR. Also included in this Summary of the Specific Plan Draft EIR is an overview of the purpose of the Draft EIR, scope of the project, a description of the lead, responsible and trustee agencies of the Draft EIR, an overview of the background of the project, a description of the public review process for the Draft EIR, an overview of the Alternatives to the project evaluated in the Draft EIR, description of insignificant and significant environmental impacts, and a general overview of the EIR organization.

### A. Purpose of the Draft EIR

This Draft EIR is a Specific Plan EIR and therefore a project-level EIR, as defined by Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines and, as such, serves as an informational document for the general public and Project decision-makers. The City of Ontario (City) has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed project and, as the Lead Agency, is responsible for the preparation and distribution of this Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Statute Section 21067. This Specific Plan Draft EIR shall be used in connection with all other permits and all other approvals necessary for the construction and operation of the proposed project. This Draft EIR shall be used by the City Planning Department and all other responsible public agencies that must approve activities undertaken with respect to the project.

This document evaluates the environmental impacts determined by the City to be potentially significant and discusses the manner in which the project's significant effects can be reduced or avoided through the implementation of mitigation measures. Impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level below significance are considered significant unavoidable adverse impacts. In accordance with Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this Specific Plan Draft EIR also includes an examination of the effects of cumulative development in the vicinity of the proposed project. Cumulative development includes all anticipated future projects that, in conjunction with the proposed project, may result in a cumulative impact. In addition, this Draft EIR evaluates the extent to which environmental effects could be reduced or avoided through the implementation of feasible alternatives to the proposed project. Furthermore, the City is responsible for certifying the Draft EIR and adopting any mitigation measures needed to address the proposed project's significant environmental impacts. For projects that result in any unmitigated or under-mitigated significant environmental effects, the City may, after making a series of findings, certify the Draft EIR upon adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

To gain the most value from this report, certain key points recommended in the CEQA Guidelines should be kept in mind:

- This report should be used as a tool to give the reader an overview of the possible ramifications of the proposed Ontario Grand Park Specific Plan. It is designed to be an “early warning system” with regard to potential environmental impacts and subsequent effects on the community’s environmental resources.
- A specific environmental impact is not necessarily irreversible or permanent. Most impacts, particularly in more developed urban areas, can be wholly or partially mitigated by incorporating changes recommended in this report.

This report, while a summary of facts, reflects the professional judgment of the author. Therefore, the reader will have to individually weigh the facts that it reports.

## **B. Scope of the EIR**

In accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. An Initial Study was prepared for the project and distributed for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on June 14, 2012 for a 30-day review period ending on July 18, 2012. The following written correspondence was received:

- City of Fontana
- Omnitrans
- San Bernardino County, Department of Public Works
- Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- State of California, Department of Conservation
- State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- State of California, Department of Toxic Substances Control
- State of California, Governors Office of Planning and Research

The Initial Study is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons that each topical area is or is not analyzed further in the Draft EIR. The City determined through the Initial Study that the project would result in potentially significant impacts in the following issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Public Services
  - Fire Services
  - Police Services
  - Schools
  - Library Services
  - Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
  - Water Supply
  - Wastewater
  - Solid Waste

The City determined through the Initial Study that the proposed project would not have the potential to cause a significant impact on Mineral Resources or Population and Housing. Therefore, these areas are not examined in this Draft EIR. Refer to Section G of this section for a summary and the project’s Initial Study, which is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

### **C. Lead, Responsible and Trustee Agencies**

According to State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15367, a Lead Agency is “...the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” A lead agency may disapprove a project because it has significant environmental effects,

requires changes in a project to reduce or avoid a significant environmental effect, and approve a project despite its significant environmental effects if the proper findings and statement of overriding considerations are adopted. In this case, the Lead Agency for this Draft EIR is the City because it holds principal responsibility for approving the project. With respect to State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091, Lead Agencies must prepare written findings of fact to report a project's environmental impacts that are considered significant and cannot be mitigated. However, if the Lead Agency determines that a proposed project's benefits outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental effects, the City would be required to draft a statement of overriding considerations to explain these contributions. This balances a proposed project's social, economic, legal, and technical benefits against the unavoidable environmental risks. A responsible agency refers to a public agency other than the lead agency that has discretionary approval over the project. A trustee agency is a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project, which are held in trust for the people of the state.

## **D. Proposed Project**

### **a. Project Location**

The project site is located south of Edison Avenue, west of Haven Avenue, north of Eucalyptus Avenue (future Merrill Avenue), and east of Archibald Avenue in the City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California. The City is located in the southeastern portion of San Bernardino County. The City is located approximately 40 miles from downtown Los Angeles, 20 miles from downtown San Bernardino, and 30 miles from Orange County. Regional access to the project site is provided via the Ontario Freeway (Interstate 15) located approximately 1.5 miles east of the site, Euclid Avenue (State Route 83) located approximately 3.3 miles west of the site, and the Pomona Freeway (State Route 60), approximately 2.3 miles to the north. Other primary roadways in the vicinity of the site include Riverside Drive to the north, South Milliken Avenue and Hamner Avenue to the east, and Remington Avenue to the south. In addition, the Cucamonga Creek Channel, which flows south into the Prado Flood Control Basin, is located west of the site.

### **b. Project Description**

The City annexed approximately 8,200 acres of land from what was once known as the San Bernardino Agricultural Preserve on November 30, 1999. While land use authority was once under control of San Bernardino County, the preparation of a program-level Environmental Impact Report brought land use authority under the control of the City.

In 1998, the City adopted the New Model Colony (NMC) General Plan Amendment for the portion of the City known at that time as the Sphere of Influence (SOI). This amendment established a comprehensive development strategy for the future development of the SOI that included 30 sub-planning areas known as subareas. Following this, the City adopted The Ontario Plan (TOP) in 2010 that serves as the general plan for the entire City including the NMC. The accompanying TOP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the City at the same time.

Distinguished Homes (the “Applicant”) proposes the Grand Park Specific Plan (the “proposed project”) within the New Model Colony General Plan on an approximately 320-acre site in the City. The proposed project would develop a residential community within a larger master planned community by providing a broad array of spaces, including residential neighborhoods, parks and recreational facilities, and schools. Specifically, existing agricultural uses would be removed and the site would be with a variety of housing types including single- and multi-family dwelling units, an elementary school, a high school, and the Grand Park. Upon build out of the Specific Plan, the project site would be developed with up to 1,327 residential units in a variety of housing types and densities, an elementary school, a high school, and the Grand Park.

**c. Project of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance**

Types of projects that are considered to be of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance are listed in the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15206. As such, the environmental documentation will be reviewed by appropriate state agencies through the State Clearinghouse of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, and the area council of governments in which the site is located.

The Grand Park Project is considered a project of Statewide, Regional, or Areawide Significance because the project has the potential to cause significant environmental affects extending beyond the City limits and the San Bernardino County boundary, and the project proposes residential development of more than 500 dwelling units.

**E. Public Review Process**

The City circulated an NOP for a 30-day review period, beginning June 14, 2012 and ending July 18, 2012. In addition, a public scoping meeting was conducted on July 12, 2012 at 6pm at the Ontario Police Department Community Room, located at 2500 South Archibald Avenue in the City. The NOP, letters, and comments received during the comment period as well as comment sheets from the public scoping meeting are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. In addition, this Draft EIR will be released for a 45-day public comment period. Following the public comment period a Final EIR will be prepared that will include responses to the comments raised regarding the Draft EIR.

**F. Summary of Alternatives**

**a. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build**

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the Guidelines states that, “In certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained.” Accordingly, this Alternative provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the proposed project in contrast to the environmental impacts that could result from not approving, or denying, the proposed project. Because the City

Planning Commission and/or City Council has discretionary authority over a proposed project and could choose to deny it, the environmental impacts of that action must be disclosed. As a result of this potential decision, the project site could remain in its current state and condition for an undetermined period of time and not be the subject of any further development proposals. Evaluation of this Alternative will determine if any significant impacts identified with the proposed project would be eliminated or if any less than significant impacts would be further reduced.

Implementation of the No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in new environmental impacts and overall would result in a reduced level of impact when compared to the proposed project. Additionally, all of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project would be avoided under this Alternative. However, under the No Project/No Build Alternative, none of the objectives established for the project would be attained.

**b. Alternative 2: Maximum Density Allowed by TOP**

The Maximum Density as Allowed by TOP Alternative is intended to evaluate the potential for the maximum density as allowed by TOP. The proposed project allows up to 1,327 attached and detached low-density, medium-density and high-density dwelling units on approximately 320 acres, along with an elementary school site and high school site, and the Grand Park. Under this Alternative, all aspects of the proposed project would remain the same including the land uses and distribution on the site, but the overall residential density would increase up to approximately 1,800 low- medium- and high-density residential units. Implementation of the Maximum Density Alternative would result in new environmental impacts compared to the No Project/No Build Alternative and overall would result in a slightly increased level of impact when compared to the proposed project. Under the Maximum Density Alternative, all of the objectives established for the project would be attained.

**c. Alternative 3: Reduced Density**

The Reduced Density Alternative is intended to evaluate the potential for reduced environmental impacts associated with an approximate 25 percent reduction in the number of residential dwelling units proposed on the site. The proposed project allows up to 1,327 attached and detached low-density, medium-density and high-density dwelling units on approximately 320 acres, along with an elementary school site and high school site, and the Grand Park. Under this Alternative, the land use distribution on the site would remain, but the overall residential density would be reduced by 25 percent, resulting, for example, in the elimination of one of the High-Density planning areas resulting in the potential for development of up to 995 residential units. Implementation of the Reduced Density Alternative would result in new environmental impacts compared to the No Project/No Build Alternative and overall would result in a slightly decreased level of impact when compared to the proposed project. Under the Maximum Density Alternative, not all of the objectives established for the project would not be attained.

**d. Alternative 4: Agricultural Retention**

The Agricultural Retention Alternative preserves the residential, school, and parkland uses, but includes an agriculture land use. The City's Agricultural Overlay Zoning District (AOZD), contained in section 9-1.2700 of the Ontario Municipal Code, allows existing agricultural uses within the NMC to continue on an interim basis until such time as development is proposed and includes dairies as a conditionally permitted use among the many agricultural land uses. The existing dairy represents the most likely land use that could be allowed to continue on the site under this alternative. Therefore, for purposes of this alternative evaluation, the existing dairy, occupying approximately 80 acres, would be retained. The proposed school sites, totaling approximately 60 acres would be retained. The proposed park would be retained and reduced in size to approximately 90 acres. The proposed low- and medium-density residential would be replaced with high-density residential and this land use would occupy approximately 90 acres. All other components of the proposed project would remain the same.

There are no data presented in the NMC Final EIR that address the economic viability of some of the identified agricultural uses on a relatively small portion of land that would ultimately be surrounded by urban development.

**e. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Of the alternatives analyzed in the EIR, the No Project Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would reduce several of the impacts occurring under the proposed project to no impact or levels that are less than significant. However, this Alternative would not meet any of the identified objectives established for the proposed project.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines requirement to identify an environmentally superior alternative from the remaining alternatives a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that the Reduced Density Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. This Alternative would reduce more of the project impacts than any of the other remaining alternatives but would not fully meet all of the project objectives.

**G. Environmental Issues Determined To Be Not Significant****a. Mineral Resources**

The project site has no known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and residents within the city. Hence, there is no loss of availability of any locally important mineral resource because the project site is not designated as a mineral resource area. As such, there be would no impacts to mineral resources.

**b. Population and Housing**

Although the Grand Park Specific Plan proposes residential development that represents growth, this growth was anticipated and planned for as part of the overall NMC development

as evaluated in TOP EIR. The development of the proposed Grand Park project is consistent with the NMC growth and, as a result, no new impacts related to substantial growth would occur.

## **H. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The following table provides a summary of the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed project. This table references the environmental impact, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance after mitigation. Environmental issues evaluated in the Initial Study that were determined to be below the level of significance (i.e., no impact or less than significant) are not included in this table. The topical environmental issues evaluated in the Draft EIR occur first in the table and reference the Draft EIR section number after each environmental issue heading. Environmental issues evaluated in the Initial Study follow those evaluated in the Draft EIR and are so identified in parentheses following each environmental issue heading.

A thorough discussion and analysis of project impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and identification of significant, unavoidable adverse impacts are presented in Section IV of this document.

**Table I-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>IV.B - Agricultural Resources</b>		
Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No feasible mitigation measures on or off the project site were identified or put forth that would eliminate this potentially significant impact altogether or reduce it below the level of significance.	Significant and unavoidable. The NMC Final EIR identified the conversion of agricultural land within the NMC as a significant and unavoidable impact and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.
Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b> The project would add to cumulative impacts in regard to loss of farmland occurring throughout the region and the NMC.	No feasible mitigation measures on or off the project site were identified or put forth that would eliminate this potentially significant impact altogether or reduce it below the level of significance.	Significant and unavoidable. The NMC Final EIR identified the conversion of agricultural land within the NMC as a significant and unavoidable impact and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations.
<b>IV.C - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas</b>		
Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>	<p><b>AQ-1.</b> During project construction, the following measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Ontario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Prior to the year 2017, off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet or exceed United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 3 off-road emissions standards.</li> <li>b) In the year 2017 and after, off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall implement one of the following: meet EPA Tier 4 emissions standards, meet EPA Tier 4 Interim emissions standards, or meet EPA Tier 3 standards with California Air Resources Board verified Level 3 filters to reduce 85 percent diesel particulate matter. If a good faith effort to rent equipment within 200 miles of project has been conducted, the results of which are submitted to the City, but has been unsuccessful in obtaining the necessary construction equipment, then Tier 3 equipment can be used.</li> <li>f) Onsite electrical hook ups to power grid shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, where feasible, to reduce the need for diesel powered electric generators.</li> <li>g) The project shall demonstrate compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 concerning fugitive dust and provide appropriate documentation to the City of Ontario.</li> </ul>	<p>Significant and unavoidable.</p>

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p><b>AQ-2.</b> In order to minimize traffic congestion and delays that increase idling and acceleration emissions, prior to issuance of any grading permits the developer shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Specify to the satisfaction of the City Building Department the location of equipment staging areas, stockpiling/storage areas and construction parking areas; and,</li> <li>b) Specify to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department the proposed construction traffic routes utilizing nearest truck routes in conformance with the California Vehicle Code and Ontario Municipal Code.</li> </ul> <p>If required by the City, the developer shall provide a traffic control plan that incorporates the above location and route information, as well as any safe detours around the construction site and any temporary traffic control (e.g. flag person) during construction-related truck hauling activities.</p> <p><b>AQ-3.</b> The following measures shall be applied to all projects during construction of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Use paints with a volatile organic compound (VOC) content 10 grams per Liter or lower for both interior surfaces.</li> <li>b) Recycle leftover paint. Take any left over paint to a household hazardous waste center; do not mix leftover water-based and oil-based.</li> <li>c) Keep lids closed on all paint containers when not in use to prevent VOC emissions and excessive odors.</li> </ul>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>d) For water-based paints, clean up with water only. Whenever possible, do not rinse the clean up water down the drain or pour it directly into the ground or the storm drain. Set aside the can of clean up water and take it to the hazardous waste center (<a href="http://www.cleanup.org">www.cleanup.org</a>).</p> <p>e) Use compliant low VOC cleaning solvents to clean paint application equipment.</p> <p>f) Keep all paint and solvent laden rags in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.</p> <p><b>AQ-4.</b> During operation, the following land use and building mitigation measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Ontario that would assist in reducing both criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>a) Require that new development projects prepare a demolition plan to reduce waste by recycling and/or salvaging nonhazardous construction and demolition debris.</p> <p>b) Require that new developments design buildings to be energy efficient by siting buildings to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping, and sun screening to reduce energy required for cooling</p> <p>c) Mitigate climate change by decreasing heat gain from pavement and other hard surfaces associated with infrastructure.</p> <p>d) Require the use of Energy Star appliances and fixtures in discretionary new development.</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>e) Encourage the performance of energy audits for residential and commercial buildings prior to completion of sale, and that audit results and information about opportunities for energy efficiency improvements be presented to the buyer</p> <p>f) Require the installation of outdoor electrical outlets on buildings to support the use, where practical, of electric lawn and garden equipment, and other tools that would otherwise be run with small gas engines or portable generators.</p> <p>g) Implement enhanced programs to divert solid waste from landfill operations</p> <p>h) Create and preserve distinct, identifiable neighborhoods whose characteristics support pedestrian travel, especially within, but not limited to, mixed-use and transit oriented development areas</p> <p>i) Provide continuous sidewalks with shade trees and landscape strips to separate pedestrians from traffic.</p> <p><b>AQ-5.</b> During operation, the following transportation mitigation measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Ontario that would assist in reducing both criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>a) Provide safe and convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists to, across, and along major transit priority streets. Encouraging new construction to include vehicle access to properly wired outdoor receptacles to</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>accommodate ZEV and/or plug in electric hybrids (PHEV).</p> <p>b) Reduce required road width standards wherever feasible to calm traffic and encourage alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>c) Add bicycle facilities to city streets and public spaces, where feasible.</p> <p>d) Ensure new development is designed to make public transit a viable choice for residents</p> <p>e) Ensure transit stops and bus lanes are safe, convenient, clean, sheltered, well-lit, and efficient.</p> <p>f) Provide access for pedestrians and bicyclist to public transportation through construction of dedicated paths, where feasible</p> <p>g) Require all new traffic lights installed be energy efficient traffic signals.</p> <p><b>AQ-6.</b> During operation, the following landscape and water conservation mitigation measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Ontario that would assist in reducing both criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>a) Reduce per capita water consumption consistent with state law by 2020.</p> <p>b) Promote the use of recycled water, including grey water systems for residential irrigation.</p> <p>c) Implement building design guidelines and criteria developed by the City to promote water efficient building design, including minimizing the amount of non-roof impervious surfaces around the building(s).</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Ensure water-efficient infrastructure and technology are used in new construction, including low-flow toilets and shower heads, moisture-sensing irrigation, and other such advances.</li> <li>e) Require the use of reclaimed water for landscape irrigation in all new development and on public property where such connections are within the service boundaries of the City's reclaimed water system.</li> <li>f) Require all new landscaping irrigation systems installed within the project to be automated, high-efficient irrigation systems to reduce water use and require use of bubbler irrigation; low-angle, low-flow spray heads; or moisture sensors.</li> <li>g) Requiring planting drought-tolerant and native species, and covering exposed dirt with moisture-retaining mulch or other materials such as decomposed granite.</li> <li>h) Promote planting of deciduous or evergreen low-VOC producing shade trees emphasizing native trees and vegetation.</li> </ul>	
Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6, above.	Less than significant.
Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-6 above.	Less than significant.
Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>IV.D - Biological Resources</b>		
<p>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the CDFG or USFWS.</p>	<p><b>Burrowing Owl</b>  <b>BIO-1.</b> Suitable habitat for burrowing owl (BUOW) is present on the site, therefore, prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall have a biologist conduct focused protocol surveys for BUOW to map the location of suitable burrows, if any, and to formally determine presence or absence on the project site. Four focused surveys shall be conducted with at least one survey between 15 February and 15 April, and three surveys, at least three weeks apart, between 15 April and 15 July, with at least one survey after 15 June. The first focused survey can coincide with mapping of suitable burrows.</p> <p>If no BUOW are found but suitable habitat is still present, repeat pre-construction surveys should be conducted not more than 30 days prior to initial ground-disturbing activity.</p> <p>If BUOW is found during the focused surveys, the following mitigation measures should be implemented prior to the BUOW nesting season (February 1 through August 31).</p> <p><b>Avoidance:</b> No disturbance should occur within 160 feet (50 m) of occupied burrows during the non-breeding season, which extends between September 1 and January 31. No disturbance should occur within 250 feet (75 m) during the breeding season. In addition, a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat must be preserved</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>contiguous with occupied burrow sites for each pair of breeding burrowing owls (with or without dependent young) or single unpaired resident bird.</p> <p><b>On-site mitigation:</b> If the avoidance requirements cannot be met, then passive relocation should be implemented; this measure can only be implemented during the non-breeding season. Passive relocation is conducted by encouraging owls to move from occupied burrows to alternate natural or artificial burrows that are beyond 160 feet (50 m) from the impact area and are within or contiguous to a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat for each pair relocated. On-site habitat should be preserved in a conservation easement and managed to maintain BUOW habitat. Owls should also be excluded from burrows in the immediate impact area and within a 160-foot (50 m) buffer of the impact area by installing one-way doors in burrow entrances. These exclusion doors must be left on the burrows for 48 hours to ensure that owls have left the burrows before excavation occurs. One alternate natural or artificial burrow should be provided for each burrow that will be directly impacted. The impact area should be monitored for 1 week to ensure owl use of alternate burrows before excavation begins. When possible, burrows should be manually excavated and refilled to prevent re-occupation of burrows in the impact area.</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation								
	<p><b>Off-site mitigation:</b> If the project will impact suitable habitat on-site below the threshold level of 6.5 acres per relocated pair or single bird, the habitat should be replaced off-site. Off-site habitat must be suitable and approved by CDFG, and the land should be placed in a conservation easement in perpetuity and managed for BUOW habitat. Off-site habitat preservation should be provided as summarized in the table below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="745 646 1302 1182"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="745 646 1081 797">Mitigation Type</th> <th data-bbox="1081 646 1302 797">Mitigation Ratio per pair or single BUOW</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="745 797 1081 914">Replacement of occupied habitat with occupied habitat</td> <td data-bbox="1081 797 1302 914">1.5 times 6.5 (9.75) acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="745 914 1081 1065">Replacement of occupied habitat with habitat contiguous to currently occupied habitat</td> <td data-bbox="1081 914 1302 1065">2 times 6.5 (13.0) acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="745 1065 1081 1182">Replacement of occupied habitat with suitable unoccupied habitat</td> <td data-bbox="1081 1065 1302 1182">3 times 6.5 (19.5) acres</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Nesting Birds</b>  <b>BIO-2.</b> The project applicant will have a biologist prepare a pre-construction nesting bird survey, which will be required prior to any vegetation removal or ground disturbance activities. Any activity that may potentially cause</p>	Mitigation Type	Mitigation Ratio per pair or single BUOW	Replacement of occupied habitat with occupied habitat	1.5 times 6.5 (9.75) acres	Replacement of occupied habitat with habitat contiguous to currently occupied habitat	2 times 6.5 (13.0) acres	Replacement of occupied habitat with suitable unoccupied habitat	3 times 6.5 (19.5) acres	
Mitigation Type	Mitigation Ratio per pair or single BUOW									
Replacement of occupied habitat with occupied habitat	1.5 times 6.5 (9.75) acres									
Replacement of occupied habitat with habitat contiguous to currently occupied habitat	2 times 6.5 (13.0) acres									
Replacement of occupied habitat with suitable unoccupied habitat	3 times 6.5 (19.5) acres									

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<p>a nest failure, requires a biological monitor including soil sampling, and tree removal.</p> <p>Removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat shall be conducted outside the avian nesting season. The nesting season generally extends from early February through August, but can vary slightly from year to year based upon seasonal weather conditions.</p> <p>If suitable nesting habitat must be removed during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey to identify any potential nesting activity. If active nests are observed, construction activity must be prohibited within a buffer around the nest, as determined by a biologist, until the nestlings have fledged. Because the proposed project will result in the loss of eucalyptus tree windrows, which provide potential foraging and nesting habitat for raptors, the proposed project will be subject to paying mitigation fees for the cumulative losses of raptor nesting and foraging habitat will mitigate the impact below a level significance.</p>	
<p>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the City or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the CDFG or USFWS.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (possibly including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Implementation of the project in combination with the other related projects would result in the conversion of agricultural land uses to urban uses and elimination of the majority of windrows that, when used together, provide foraging habitat for migratory birds.	Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, above.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.E - Cultural Resources</b>		
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<b>CUL-1.</b> Prior to demolition of the structure complex located at 10084 Eucalyptus, the complex shall be recorded onto DPR523 forms.	Less than significant.
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<b>CUL-2.</b> Cultural resource mitigation monitoring is required, within the constraints found in Mitigation Measure CUL-2 during all project-related earthmoving in the Specific Plan. The monitoring must be headed by a City-approved Project Archaeologist, who may choose to use qualified field representatives (Inspector) during earthmoving. The Project Archaeologist must	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>create a mitigation-monitoring plan prior to a City approved pregrade meeting. The mitigation monitoring plan document must contain a description of how and where historical and/or prehistoric artifacts will be curated if found during monitoring by the archaeological Inspector.</p> <p><b>CUL-3.</b> Mitigation/monitoring by a qualified archaeological Inspector should take place on the project site once project-related excavations reach 4 feet below current grade, except within parcel #0218-241-15, where Inspections should begin once 2 feet below current grade.</p> <p><b>CUL-4.</b> If, during the implementation of E.2-2, any historic or prehistoric cultural resources are inadvertently discovered by the archaeological Inspector, the find(s) must be blocked off from further construction-related disturbance by at least 50 feet, and the Project Archaeologist must then determine whether the find is a historic resource as is defined under §15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. If the find(s) is not found to be a historic resource, it must be recorded onto DPR523 form sets and project-related excavation can then continue. If the find(s) is determined to be a historic resource, appropriate measures associated with impacts to such resources could include avoidance, capping, incorporation of the site in greenspace, parks or open space, or data recovery excavation of the find(s). No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect or appropriately mitigate the significant resource. Any archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.</p> <p><b>CUL-5.</b> Once project-related excavations reach 15 feet in any one location in the Specific Plan, the City of Ontario shall require that a qualified Paleontologist be brought to the area(s) that have been cut at that depth and inspect the cut(s) to determine if the potential for impacts to fossil resources has risen from “low” to “moderate.” If the potential for impacts has indeed risen to “moderate,” then the City shall require that a qualified Paleontological Inspector monitor all cuts until all deep excavations are completed. Mitigation for impacts to any vertebrate finds shall follow all professional standards and any finds shall be offered to a museum the City names.</p>	
Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-5, above.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Implementation of the proposed project with the related projects has the potential to eliminate historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-2 through CUL-5, above.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>IV.F - Geology and Soils</b>		
<p>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</li> <li>- Strong seismic ground shaking?</li> </ul>	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<p><b>GEO-1.</b> Future development of urban uses on-site shall implement all applicable recommendations contained the geotechnical reports related to design, grading, and construction, to the satisfaction of the City Building Department, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During construction activities, the developer shall be required to perform removal and recompaction of compressible surficial soils for surficial materials with depths of five to eight feet below the existing ground surface in order to mitigate excessive materials settlement. Deeper removals shall be necessary in areas located between boreholes and test pits. Ultimate removal depths shall be determined based on observation and</li> </ul>	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>testing by the geotechnical consultant during grading operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to grading activities, the developer shall remove all manure and organic-rich soil and dispose of it off-site. In addition, additional testing of organic-rich soils shall be performed following removal of the manure to more accurately determine the actual depth and extent of excessive organic-rich soil that may also require removal from the remainder of the project site. Removals shall be monitored by the geotechnical consultant of record.</li> <li>• Prior to grading operations, the developer shall export existing manure and organic-rich topsoil, as well as vegetation, off the property. For any remaining soils, exhibiting any organic content greater than one percent shall be thoroughly mixed with other soils during remedial grading.</li> <li>• During grading activities, contingencies shall be made for balancing earthwork quantities based on actual shrinkage and subsidence.</li> <li>• Design and construct structures according to Chapter 16 of the 2010 California Building Code.</li> <li>• Rocks exceeding 12 inches in diameter shall be reduced in size or removed from the project site.</li> <li>• Reinforced steel in contact with soil shall use Type II Modified Portland Cement in combination with a 3-inch concrete cover.</li> </ul>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b>            Future development within the NMC would result in the conversion of predominantly agricultural uses to urban uses, consistent with the vision of the NMC General Plan. This would contribute to a cumulative increase in the number of people and amount of structures exposed to similar geologic hazards previously described. While these impacts are expected to be potentially significant, development of these subareas will require geotechnical studies, similar to those completed for the proposed project that would include mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measure GEO-1, above.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.G - Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>		
Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials;	<b>HAZ-1.</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall hire a qualified environmental consultant to excavate and dispose of contaminated soils, or treat in-situ (in place), in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. If during grading activities additional contamination is discovered, grading within such an area shall be temporarily halted and redirected around the area until the appropriate evaluation and follow-up measures are implemented so as to render the area suitable for grading activities to resume.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p><b>HAZ-2.</b> Prior to demolition and/or renovation activities, all fluorescent light ballasts and pole-mounted transformers shall be inspected for PCBs. Any PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts and/or transformers shall be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.</p> <p><b>HAZ-3.</b> During removal of on-site gasoline and diesel USTs, soil sampling shall be conducted below and in the immediate vicinity of the UST and associated piping. The Project Applicant shall submit the results of the soil survey to the City of Ontario (City) Building Department. If soil contamination is found, it shall be removed or remediated in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.</p> <p><b>HAZ-4.</b> Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project Applicant shall submit verification to the City Building Department that an asbestos survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the project site. If asbestos is found, the Project Applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403.</p> <p><b>HAZ-5.</b> Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project Applicant shall submit verification to the City Building Department that a lead-based paint survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the project site. If lead-based</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>paint is found, the Project Applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations for proper removal and disposal of the lead-based paint.</p> <p><b>HAZ-6.</b> Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, the Project Applicant shall hire a qualified environmental consultant to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and methane gas survey for the Lee Property (Property B) and the Morris Property (Property F) not previously investigated. The applicant shall adhere to and implement all applicable recommendations in the Phase I and methane reports to address any potential hazards in these portions of the project area.</p> <p><b>HAZ-7.</b> The Project Applicant shall implement all applicable recommendations for grading activities contained in the methane soil gas reports prepared for the properties within proposed Specific Plan area to the satisfaction of the City Building Department. This shall include a post-construction soil gas investigation and installation of methane mitigation systems where post-grading methane levels exceed 5,000 ppm (0.5 percent), should any such levels occur.</p>	
Create a hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;	Refer to Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-7, above.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area (refer to Section VI, Other Environmental Considerations);	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Implementation of the proposed plan will provide for a variety of residential, commercial, light industrial, and open space related uses. In general, the types of uses allowed do not include those that would result in the generation of substantial quantities of hazardous wastes or toxic materials. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations concerning the handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. As related projects in the project vicinity will be required to mitigate their own hazardous materials impacts, no significant cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials are anticipated.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-7, above.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>IV.G - Hydrology and Water Quality</b>		
<p>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</p>	<p><b>a) Hydrology and Drainage</b>  <b>HWQ-1.</b> Local storm drain facilities shall be sized to convey the 10- and/or 100-year storm event per a final drainage plan reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, or per the requirements of other applicable agencies.</p> <p><b>HWQ-2.</b> The project applicant(s) shall obtain approval from affected public agencies for the storm drain connection from the on-site collection system to NMC Master Plan storm drain facilities.</p> <p><b>b) Construction Water Quality</b>  <b>HWQ-3.</b> The project applicant(s) for future development projects shall prepare and submit a Notice of Intent to comply with the Construction General Permit to the California State Water Resources Board.</p> <p><b>HWQ-4.</b> The project applicant(s) shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) per requirements of the Construction General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.</p> <p><b>HWQ-5.</b> Project-related construction activities shall implement stormwater quality BMPs, as required by the project’s SWPPP, which may include, but are not limited to, any of the following: Employee and Subcontractor Training                      – Have a training session for employees and</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<p>subcontractors to understand the need for implementation and usage of BMPs.</p> <p><b>c) Operational Water Quality</b>  <b>HWQ-6.</b> The project applicant(s) shall prepare a WQMP addressing post-construction water quality BMPs.</p>	
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?)	Refer to Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-6, above.	Less than significant.
Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Refer to Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-6, above.	Less than significant.
Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Refer to Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-6, above.	Less than significant.
Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Refer to Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-6, above.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Refer to Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-6, above.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Affect the hydrology and water quality due to the conversion of rural agricultural lands to urban-type land uses, resulting in greater impervious surfaces and increased stormwater runoff. In particular, as much of the NMC and surrounding areas are currently undeveloped or in agricultural use, flows of floodwaters in the area would increase with urban development. Increased stormwater flows to the Prado Basin from the NMC would result in significant cumulative impacts when considered along with flows of floodwaters from surrounding past, present, and future area projects due to flooding. If 100 percent of the excess flows from the NMC can be detained within the NMC, then released at a rate that does not exceed existing storm flows, cumulative impacts related to flood would be reduced to below a level of significance. The proposed Master Plan of Drainage would aid in achieving this standard.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures HWQ-1 through HWQ-6, above.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.H - Land Use and Planning</b>		
Physically divides an established community;	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Implementation of projects within the NMC would be required to prepare specific plans consistent with The Ontario Plan and NMC.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<b>IV.J - Noise</b>		
<p>Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p>	<p><b>b) Operation Mitigation Measures</b> The following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the noise impacts from the proposed project:</p> <p><b>E-4.</b> Active recreational uses that are likely to draw cheering crowds, elicit loud play, or have amplified game announcements (i.e., stadiums, soccer fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, etc.) shall be located within the park’s interior and away from surrounding residential and “noise sensitive” uses.</p> <p><b>E-5.</b> Educational and recreational land uses (including educational campus, parks, and stadiums) shall be designed in such a manner that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• locate and orient vehicle access points away from residential and/or noise sensitive parcels.</li> <li>• locate loading and shipping facilities away from adjacent noise sensitive uses;</li> <li>• incorporate structural building materials that mitigate sound transmission;</li> <li>• minimize the use of outside speakers and amplifiers;</li> <li>• configure interior spaces to minimize sound amplification and transmission; and</li> <li>• incorporate fences, walls landscaping and</li> </ul>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>other noise buffers and barriers between incompatible uses, as appropriate.</p> <p><b>E-6.</b> Sound barrier walls or earth berms of sufficient height and length shall be provided to reduce exterior noise levels to 65 CNEL or lower at outdoor noise sensitive uses, including residential backyards/courtyards and school playgrounds. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, an acoustical analysis report shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant and submitted to the City Planning Department by the developer. The report shall specify the noise barriers' height, location, and types capable of achieving the desired mitigation affect.</p> <p><b>E-7.</b> Parks if placed in the development areas where noise from traffic exceeds or is forecasted to exceed 70 dBA CNEL shall incorporate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound barrier walls or earth berms of sufficient height and length shall be designed by a qualified acoustical consultant to reduce exterior noise levels to 70 CNEL or lower; or</li> <li>• Passive recreation areas, such as picnic tables, shall be located away from the roadway as far as possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>E-8.</b> Prior to the issuance of building permit, an acoustical analysis shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant for all new residential developments that are within 65 dBA CNEL or higher, for the purpose of documenting</p>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
	that an acceptable interior noise level of 45 dBA (CNEL) or below will be achieved with the windows and doors closed. The report shall be submitted at plan check to the City for approval.	
Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Refer to Mitigation Measures E-4 through E-8, above.	Less than significant.
A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Refer to Mitigation Measures E-4 through E-8, above.	Less than significant.
A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<p><b>a) Construction Mitigation Measures</b> Construction-related noise has the potential to result in significant impacts at sensitive receptors. Thus, the following measures are recommended to minimize construction-related noise impacts:</p> <p><b>E-1.</b> All project construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, be equipped with standard and properly operating and maintained mufflers.</p> <p><b>E-2.</b> Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas to be located as far as practical from existing residential units on and off the project site.</p> <p><b>E-3.</b> Whenever feasible, schedule the noisiest construction operations to occur together to avoid continuing periods of the greatest annoyance.</p>	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Cumulative impacts related to noise would be experienced in the region due to this project and other related projects resulting from traffic noise and other human activities. As the New Model Colony transitions from agriculture to urban uses and population increases, noise associated with traffic, schools, recreation, shopping and other activities will increase throughout the City. However, project would be required to develop and implement mitigation measures similar to the proposed project.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures E-4 through E-8, above.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.K.1 - Public Services: Police</b>		
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities, need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police services.	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Future cumulative development, similar to the project, may also require additional police staffing, equipment or facilities to ensure police</p>	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
<p>services are maintained at adequate levels. However, the OPD regularly evaluates police protection services throughout the City to ensure levels are maintained at adequate service levels and in compliance with City's current standards and TOP, adequate police services would be provided to City.</p>		
<b>IV.K.2 - Public Services: Fire</b>		
<p>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire facilities, need for new or physically altered fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire services.</p>	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> According to the EIR for TOP, future growth in accordance with TOP is expected to increase the demand for fire services throughout the city but especially in the NMC. The Development Impact Fee and Nexus Schedule (2005) recommends that two new stations would be built in the OMC to replace stations number 3 and 7 and that four new stations be built in the NMC. The funding needed to build these stations has been assessed and incorporated into the fee schedule and it would be adequate for the proposed development and relocation of stations.</p>	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>IV.K.3 - Public Services: Schools</b>		
Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, or the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for schools.	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b>            Future development in the project area and within the NMC would result in an increase of residential and student population, which may cumulatively impact existing public school facilities. Similar to the project, related projects would also be required to comply with SB 50, which requires the payment of fees to mitigate possible impacts on MVSD and CJUHSD facilities. As such, payment of the SB 50 fees by the related projects would ensure consistency of applicable regulations and full mitigation of all potential impacts.</p>	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.K.4 - Public Services: Parks and Recreation</b>		
Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Cumulative projects, in conjunction with the proposed project, are expected to increase demands for parks and recreational facilities in the area. However, other specific plans within the NMC are expected to provide parks and recreational facilities to meet future needs of area residents.	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.L - Transportation and Circulation</b>		
Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<p><b>L-1: Archibald Avenue / SR-60 WB Ramps</b> The project shall contribute fair share development impact fees towards the following improvements to be completed as part of the freeway interchange improvement project included in the SANBAG 2010-2040 Measure I Nexus Study. The City will determine the fair share contribution from the proposed project contingent upon need at the time of Grand Park Specific Plan approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an additional exclusive NB left-turn lane</li> <li>• Re-stripe the SB shared through/right-turn lane as an exclusive right-turn lane and provide an additional exclusive SB right-turn lane</li> </ul>	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-stripe the WB shared left-turn/through lanes as a shared left-turn/right-turn lane and provide an additional exclusive WB left-turn lane</li> </ul> <p><b>L-2: Archibald Avenue / SR-60 EB Ramps</b>                      The project shall contribute fair share development impact fees towards the following improvements to be completed as part of the freeway interchange improvement project included in the SANBAG 2010-2040 Measure I Nexus Study. The City will determine the fair share contribution from the proposed project contingent upon need at the time of Grand Park Specific Plan approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-stripe the NB shared through/right-turn lane as an exclusive right-turn lane</li> <li>• Provide an additional exclusive SB left-turn lane</li> <li>• Re-stripe the EB shared left-turn/through lanes as a shared left-turn/right-turn lane and provide an additional exclusive EB left-turn lane</li> </ul> <p><b>L-3: Traffic Signals</b>                      Contingent upon need at the time of Specific Plan approval, the project shall construct or pay prior to issuance of building permits its fair share towards the installation of traffic signals at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edison Avenue / A Street</li> <li>• Edison Avenue / Turner Avenue</li> <li>• Haven Avenue / Park Street</li> </ul>	

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archibald Avenue / Park Street</li> </ul> <p>The project shall pay its fair share towards the need to modify the existing traffic signal at the following location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archibald / Edison</li> </ul>	
Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Refer to Mitigation Measures L-1 and L-2, above.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> The cumulative growth associated with implementation of the various specific plans in the area has been incorporated into the traffic model and is represented by the 2015 Without Project Conditions traffic volumes. As shown in the previous analysis, project impacts, and therefore cumulative impacts, would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of applicable intersection improvements included as mitigation measures. Likewise, cumulative impacts to roadway segments would be less than significant, as the traffic model indicates that no significant roadway segment impacts would occur even with implementation of the proposed project and cumulative projects. Impacts related to emergency access, parking, and alternative transportation are site- and project-specific, and would vary from project to project. However, it is assumed that like the proposed project, future</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures L-1 and L-2, above.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
development projects pursuant to other specific plans in the NMC would be reviewed for consistency with applicable plans, policies, and regulations to ensure that adequate emergency access, parking, and alternative transportation facilities are provided to meet demands. Given compliance with applicable requirements, cumulative impacts related to emergency access, parking, and alternative transportation would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.		
<b>IV.M.1 - Utilities and Service Systems: Water Supply</b>		
Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b> As the proposed NMC would include the development of various uses, which are subject to Water Code Section 10912, the City prepared a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) in 2004. The WSA serves as written verification for all future development within the NMC.	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<b>IV.M.2 - Utilities and Service Systems: Wastewater</b>		
Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; or	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b> Implementation of the project in addition to the related projects in the NMC would increase the demand for wastewater treatment. However, as stated in the 2001 NMC Sewer Master Plan, proposed wastewater infrastructure and treatment facilities developed within the NMC would be designed to adequately serve the entire NMC planning area in that design standards were established for sizing adequate facilities that will collect the wastewater from the study area, and convey it to regional trunk sewers and treatment facilities.</p>	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

**Table I-1 (cont.): Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance After Mitigation</b>
<b>IV.M.3 - Utilities and Service Systems: Solid Waste</b>		
The project is not served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
The project does not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.
<p><b>Cumulative Impacts</b>  The project is anticipated to increase the amount of solid waste generated from the project area. Implementation of the project in addition to the related projects would increase the amount of solid waste generated. The City is required to divert 50 percent of solid waste through reduction, recycling, and composting according to AB 939. In addition, documentation of a minimum of a 15-year total amount of disposal capacity available for a landfill system is also required.</p>	No mitigation measures required.	Less than significant.

---

## I. EIR Organization

The Draft EIR is comprised of the following sections:

- **I. Summary.** This section describes the purpose of the Draft EIR, Draft EIR focus and effects found not to be significant, Draft EIR organization, project summary, areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, public review process, summary of alternatives, and a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures.
- **II. Project Description.** This section describes the project location, existing conditions, project objectives, project characteristics, and a description of the intended use of the Draft EIR.
- **III. Environmental Settings.** This section contains a description of the existing physical and built environment and a list of related projects anticipated to be built within the project vicinity.
- **IV. Environmental Impact Analysis.** This section contains the environmental setting, project and cumulative impact analyses, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding the level of significance after mitigation for each of the following environmental issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services (including police, fire, schools, parks and recreation), transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems (including water supply, wastewater and solid waste).
- **V. Alternatives.**
- **VI. Other Environmental Considerations.** This section provides a discussion of significant unavoidable impacts that would result from the proposed project and the reasons why the project is being proposed notwithstanding the significant unavoidable impacts. An analysis of the significant irreversible changes in the environment and potential secondary effects that would result from the proposed project is also presented here. This section analyzes growth-inducing impacts in which the project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Potential secondary effects caused by the implementation of the mitigation measures for the proposed project are also discussed. Last, a discussion of possible effects of the proposed project that were determined within the Initial Study not to be significant is provided.
- **VII. References.** This section lists all the references and sources used in the preparation of the Draft EIR.