Executive Summary

S.1 Introduction

Consistent with Section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides a programmatic analysis of the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the goals, policies, actions, and projected buildout of the following three planning documents:

- 2021 General Plan Update (GPU)
- 2021-2029 Housing Element Update
- Climate Action Plan (CAP)

These three separate planning documents are collectively referred to as the MoVal 2040 Project (project).

As described in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, program-level environmental review documents are appropriate when a project consists of a series of actions related to the issuance of rules, regulations, and other planning criteria. The project which is the subject of this EIR consists of long-term plans that will be implemented as policy documents guiding future development activities and related City of Moreno Valley (City) actions. The purpose of this program-level EIR is intended to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental impacts of the project. This program-level EIR also considers the availability of mitigation measures to minimize the project's significant impacts and evaluates reasonable alternatives to the project that may reduce or avoid one or more significant environmental effects.

A brief overview of each EIR chapter is provided below:

Executive Summary: Summarizes the EIR by providing an overview of the project, analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts that could result from the project, a list of mitigation measures identified to reduce or avoid such impacts, a review of the alternatives to the project, including the identification of an environmentally superior alternative to the project.

1.0 Introduction: Provides an overview of the applicable legal authority, introduces the purpose for the EIR and explains the EIR process and the intended uses of the EIR.

2.0 Environmental Setting: Provides a description of the project's regional context, location, and existing physical characteristics and land use within the Planning Area. More

detailed descriptions of the environmental context pertaining to specific environmental topics are provided in each section of Chapter 4: Environmental Analysis.

3.0 Project Description: Provides a detailed description of the project, including the purpose and objectives of the project and descriptions of each component of the project (2021 GPU, Housing Element Update, and CAP.

4.0 Environmental Analysis. Analyzes the environmental impacts of the project. Impacts are organized by the following topic areas:

- 4.1 Aesthetics
- 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- 4.3 Air Quality
- 4.4 Biological Resources
- 4.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources
- 4.6 Energy
- 4.7 Geology/Soils
- 4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- 4.9 Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- 4.10 Hydrology/Water Quality
- 4.11 Land Use/Planning
- 4.12 Mineral Resources
- 4.13 Noise
- 4.14 Population/Housing
- 4.15 Public Services and Recreation
- 4.16 Transportation
- 4.17 Utilities/Service Systems
- 4.18 Wildfire

Each topic area respectively provides a contextual description of the project's environmental setting, significance criteria, methodology, and potential impacts.

5.0 CEQA Mandated Analysis: Summarizes the project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, significant irreversible environmental changes, and growth-inducing impacts.

6.0 Project Alternatives: This chapter presents a reasonable range of alternatives to the project and includes the following:

- A discussion of the environmental impacts associated with each alternative
- A comparison of the relative impacts of each alternative to those of the project
- A discussion of the relationship of each alternative to the project's objectives, and
- Identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

7.0 EIR References: Lists documents and other information sources relied upon in the preparation of the EIR and identifies the persons and organizations that contributed to the preparation of the EIR.

S.2 Project Overview

The city of Moreno Valley (city) is located within the northwestern portion of Riverside County in the southern Inland Empire portion of the State of California. Moreno Valley is located approximately 63 miles east of downtown Los Angeles, 49 miles east of the city of Irvine, and 43 miles west of the city of Palm Springs. State Route 60 (SR-60), which runs through the northern portion of Moreno Valley (east and west direction), and Interstate 215 (I-215), which runs in proximity to the westerly city limits (north and south direction), serve to connect the city to other communities throughout the region. The city is accessible via public transportation by rail, through Metrolink located approximately one-half mile west of the city limits, and accessible via aircraft at the March Inland Port located at the March Air Reserve Base (MARB), which is located south and west of the city limits.

California Government Code Section 65300 et seq. mandates that all counties and incorporated cities prepare a general plan that establishes policies and standards for future development, housing affordability, and resource protection. State law encourages cities to keep general plans current through regular periodic updates. The project includes an update to the 2006 General Plan that would guide future land use decisions in Moreno Valley, provide a long-term vision for the city, and provide policies and implementing actions that would allow the city to achieve this vision over the life of the General Plan. The General Plan is the primary policy document guiding growth and development within the city through the planning horizon year of 2040. Together with the Zoning Ordinance and related sections of the Municipal Code, the 2021 GPU would serve as the basis for planning-related decisions made by City staff, the Moreno Valley Planning Commission, and the Moreno Valley City Council.

The project includes an update to the currently adopted 2014 Housing Element. The Housing Element is one of the state-mandated elements that must be included in the City's General Plan. State law mandates that the Housing Element include certain items, such as a Housing Needs Assessment; goals, policies, and objectives regarding housing in Moreno Valley; and implementation programs to work toward achieving such goals. As part of the project, the City will prepare a Sixth Cycle Housing Element Update to cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 through October 2029 and outline a plan for accommodating Moreno Valley's share of the regional housing need, currently determined to be a total of 13,627 newly constructed residential dwelling units. As required by the State of California, , the City must zone sufficient land for housing affordable to persons at all income levels.

The project includes preparation of a CAP. The CAP is a community-wide strategy for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the purpose of adapting to the effects of climate change. Preparation of the CAP includes establishing the City's GHG reduction targets as well as specific strategies and implementing actions to achieve these targets.

S.3 EIR Process

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated on March 9, 2020, and a scoping meeting was held on Saturday, March 14, 2020 at the City Hall – Council Chambers, located on

14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley, California. The NOP circulated for analysis of the project, related letters received, and comments made during the scoping meeting are included as Appendix A of this EIR. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review for a period commencing April 2, 2021 through May 17, 2021 (Public Review Period). The Draft EIR and all related appendices have been made available for public review and inspection during the Public Review Period at City Hall, located on 14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley, California, and on the Community Development Department's Current Projects webpage at:

http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/cdd/documents/about-projects.html

Copies of the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR were also available at the City's three public library branches , located :

- Main Branch, located at 25480 Alessandro Boulevard
- Mall Branch located at 22500 Town Circle
- Iris Plaza Branch located at 16170 Perris Boulevard

S.4 Areas of Controversy

Environmental impacts classified as significant and unavoidable have been identified in the resource topics of Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources, Noise, and Transportation, which may be controversial to the general public, agencies, or stakeholders. Table S-1 lists significant and unavoidable impacts, summarizes the results of the impact analysis, and lists applicable mitigation measures.

S.5 Project Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that the EIR compare the effects of a "reasonable range of alternatives" to the effects of the project. The CEQA Guidelines further specify that the project alternatives selected should attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project. The "range of alternatives" is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires the EIR to set forth only those project alternatives necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the City, as the Lead Agency, and to foster meaningful public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). CEQA generally defines "feasible" to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, while also taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

Project alternatives are evaluated in Chapter 6 of this EIR. The evaluations analyze the ability of each project alternative to further reduce or avoid the significant environmental effects of the project. Each major environmental topic that was determined to have significant impacts has been given consideration in the alternatives analysis. This EIR evaluates three project alternatives: the No Project Alternative (continuation of the existing 2006 General Plan), the Reduced Growth Alternative, and Redistributed Growth Alternative.

S.5.1 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed amendments to the adopted General Plan, Housing Element Update, and adoption of the CAP would not occur. Growth in the city would continue to be guided by the existing land use plans and programs. Specifically, a summary of existing land uses is provided in Table 4.11-1, with existing land uses shown on Figure 4.11-1. Under the No Project Alternative, development would continue to occur through site-specific rezoning and General Plan amendment actions, rather than through a comprehensively planned approach. The planned densities needed to accommodate the region's housing needs and provide the required levels of affordability would not occur. Planning for mobility infrastructure would continue as it currently exists, without a comprehensive mechanism to direct vehicle miles travelled reducing infrastructure in areas with the greatest potential to achieve citywide vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reductions.

S.5.2 Reduced Growth Alternative

The Reduced Growth Alternative would revise the proposed land use map to reduce the amount of employment growth compared to the project (see Figure 6-1). This alternative would reduce the maximum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) proposed within the Community Corridors along Sunnymead Boulevard, Alessandro Boulevard, Perris Boulevard, and Heacock Street. This would reduce the amount of non-residential development within these Community Corridors by approximately 10 to 15 percent compared to the project. This alternative would also remove the proposed Center Mixed Use within the District Specific Plan area, and reduce the footprint of the Downtown Center Concept Area by approximately 111 acres. Additionally, a portion of the proposed Highway Office/Commercial Concept Area located north of SR-60 would not receive this new designation; instead, the existing office and residential land use designations from the existing 2006 General Plan would remain.

S.5.3 Redistributed Growth Alternative

The Redistributed Growth Alternative would result in the same level of growth as the proposed plan, but would redistribute growth from the proposed Community Corridor Concept Areas to the Downtown Center Concept Area (see Figure 6-2). This alternative would reduce the maximum permitted density and intensity in the Community Corridor Concept Areas, thereby reducing future development proposed along Sunnymead Boulevard, Alessandro Boulevard, Perris Boulevard, and Heacock Street by approximately 10 to 15 percent compared to the project. The reduced growth capacity from these areas would be redistributed to the Downtown Center Concept Area located north of SR-60 with the existing office and residential land use designations from the existing 2006 General Plan being retained. Redistribution of land uses associated with this alternative would not alter the total amount of residential, commercial, and office land uses compared to the project.

S.5.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires an EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must identify an environmentally superior alternative from the other alternatives. However, the project itself may not be identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

The Redistributed Growth Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would incrementally reduce significant impacts associated with air quality, agricultural resources, biological resources, noise, and transportation. Although impacts related to cultural and tribal cultural resources would remain the same as this project, this alternative would reduce most significant impacts, but not to below a level of significance, while still meeting most objectives of the project. However, land within the Downtown Center is not housing ready, and would take more time and investment to accommodate housing units needed to achieve the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) targets compared to what could be achieved along the Community Corridors proposed under the project. Therefore, the Redistributed Growth Alternative is not recommended for adoption, since it would not likely achieve the same level of housing needed to satisfy the City's RHNA requirements within the City's mandated timeframe.

S.6 Summary Table

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis including the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project and proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid these impacts. Impacts and mitigation measures are organized by issue in Chapter 4, Environmental Analysis.

Table S-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Aesthetics		•	
Would the project have a substantial	Adherence to applicable Municipal Code design requirements and 2021 GPU policies	N/A	Less than Significant
adverse effect on a scenic vista?	would ensure that future development would not have a substantial adverse effect on a		
	scenic vista, and impacts would be less than significant.		
Would the project substantially damage	There are no state-designated or eligible scenic highways within the Planning Area. No	N/A	No Impact
scenic resources, including but not limited to	impact would occur.		
trees, rock outcroppings, and historic			
buildings within a State Scenic Highway?			
In non-urbanized areas, would the project	Adherence to applicable 2021 GPU policies and Municipal Code requirements would	N/A	Less than Significant
substantially degrade the existing visual	ensure that future development would not degrade the existing visual character or		
site and its surroundings (Public views of the	on plicable gaping and other regulations generating seenic quality, and impacts would be		
these that are experienced from publicly	loss than significant		
accessible vantage noints)? If the project is	less than significant.		
in an urbanized area would the project is			
conflict with annlicable zoning and other			
regulations governing scenic quality?			
Would the project create a new source of	Adherence to applicable state building standards and Municipal Code regulations	N/A	Less than Significant
substantial light or glare which would	aimed at protecting against the effects of light and glare on day and nighttime views in		
adversely affect daytime or nighttime views	the Planning Area would ensure that future development would not create a new		
in the area?	source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views		
	in the area, and impacts would be less than significant.		
4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources			
Would the project convert Prime Farmland,	Implementation of the GPU would impact Prime Farmland and Farmland of Local	The project, like the 2006 General Plan, does not propose any permanent	Significant and Unavoidable
Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide	Importance within proposed Concept Areas and would result in development of other	preservation of agricultural land, but allows agriculture as an interim use	
Importance (Farmland), as shown on the	agricultural lands that have the potential to convert additional Farmland to non-	prior to development. Thus, preservation of agricultural resources would	
maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland	farming uses. Although the conversion of Farmland was anticipated and evaluated	not be feasible as it would be inconsistent with General Plan goals and	
Mapping and Monitoring Program of the	under the 2006 General Plan EIR, some vacant FMMP designations remain that could	EIR project objectives.	
California Resources Agency, to non-	be converted to non-agricultural uses, which would be considered significant.		
agricultural use?			
Would the project conflict with existing	No conflicts with agricultural zoning would occur as the City does not have any	N/A	Less than Significant
zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson	exclusive agriculture zones and the project does not include any rezoning. No conflicts		
Act Contract?	with Williamson Act Contracts would occur as no land use changes are proposed within		
	Williamson Act Contracts would be less than significant		
Would the project conflict with existing	The City does not possess any zoning classifications for forestland timberland or	N/A	No Impact
zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land	timberland production zones. No impact would occur		No impact
(as defined in Public Resources Code Section			
12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public			
Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland			
zoned Timberland Production (as defined by			
Government Code Section 51104[g])?			
Would the project result in the loss of forest	The Planning Area does not possess any forestland. No impact would occur.	N/A	No Impact
land or conversion of forest land to non-			
forest use?			

Table S-1			
Threshold	Summary of Environmental	Impacts Mitigation Maggura	Significance After Mitigation
Inresnola Would the project involve at her shore for	Impact Discussion	The project like the 2000. Concered Plan descent reserves and the	Significance After Mitigation
the existing environment which due to	manner that would reduce the feasibility of agricultural production. Therefore, the	neservation of agricultural land, but allows agriculture as an interim use	Significant and Unavoluable
the existing environment, which, due to	manner that would reduce the leasibility of agricultural production. Therefore, the	prior to development. Thus, preservation of agricultural resources would	
achieves of Fermland to non agricultural	to non agricultural uses, which would be considered a significant impact	prior to development. Thus, preservation of agricultural resources would not be feesible as it would be inconsistent with General Plan goals and	
use or conversion of ferest land to non-ferest	to non-agricultural uses, which would be considered a significant impact.	FIR project objectives	
use?		Ent project objectives.	
4.3 Air Quality			
Would the project conflict with or obstruct	The project would not exceed the assumptions used to develop the AQMP, and the	N/A	Less than Significant
implementation of the applicable air quality	project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air		_
plan?	quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timeline attainment		
	of air quality standards. Therefore, the project would not conflict with implementation		
	of the AQMP, and impacts would be less than significant.		
Would the project result in a cumulatively	Construction	AQ-1: Applications for future development, wherein the Director of	Construction Emissions -
considerable net increase of any criteria		Community Development or his or her designee has determined a	Significant and Unavoidable.
pollutant for which the project region is	The scale and extent of construction activities associated with buildout of the Planning	potential for air quality impacts associated with construction, shall	Implementation of mitigation
nonattainment under an applicable federal	Area could exceed the relevant SCAQMD thresholds for some projects. Construction	prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project	measure AQ-1 would reduce
or state ambient air quality standards?	impacts would be potentially significant.	construction-related air quality impacts to the City for review and	criteria air pollutant emissions
		approval. The Director of Community Development or his or her designee	from construction-related
	Operation	shall make this determination based on the size of the project, whether	activities; however, construction
		the project would require a transportation impact analysis, or other	time frames and equipment for
	The project would not conflict with implementation of the AQMP, and emissions	criteria. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South	site-specific development projects
	associated with project buildout would be less than emissions associated with buildout	Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for	are not available at this time,
	of the existing 2006 General Plan. Therefore, the operation of the project would not	assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air	multiple development projects
	result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions, and impacts would be	pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD's	constructed at the same time
	less than significant.	adopted thresholds of significance, the City shall require that applicants	could result in significant
		for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce	construction-related emissions.
		air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified	
		measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction	Operational Emissions – Less
		adduments (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City	than Significant.
		and shall be verified by the Oity. Mitigation measures to reduce	
		• Beguire fugitive dust control measures that exceed SCAOMD's	
		• Require rugitive-dust control measures that exceed SCAQUID'S Bulo 403 requirements, such as:	
		\sim Use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion	
		• Apply water every four hours to active soil-disturbing	
		activities	
		\circ Tarp and/or maintain a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on	
		trucks hauling dirt sand soil or other loose materials	
		• Use construction equipment rated by the United States	
		Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year	
		2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission	
		limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower.	
		• Ensure that construction equipment is properly serviced and	
		maintained to the manufacturer's standards.	
		• Limit nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more	
		than five consecutive minutes.	
		• Limit on-site vehicle travel speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles	
		per hour.	
		• Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks	
		and equipment leaving the project area.	

Table S-1			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
		• Use Super-Compliant VOC paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the SCAQMD's website.	
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	CO Hot Spots The project would not result in an increase in traffic volumes at any intersection that would create or contribute to a CO hot spot. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with CO hot spots, and impacts would be less than significant. Toxic Air Emissions Construction: Considering the highly dispersive nature of DPM, ongoing implementation of USEPA and CARB requirements, and the fact that construction activities would occur intermittently and at various locations over the lifetime of project buildout, construction of future development would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to toxic air emissions, and impacts would be less than significant. Stationary Sources: Emissions of TACs would be controlled by SCAQMD through permitting and would be subject to further study and health risk assessment prior to the issuance of any necessary air quality permits under SCAQMD Rule 1401. Therefore, adherence with this regulatory framework would ensure that future development would not expose sensitive receptors to TACs associated with stationary sources within the Planning Area, and impacts would be less than significant. Mobile Sources: Consistent with the goals of CARB's handbook, the 2021 GPU proposes goals and policies to ensure site-specific planning and building design of future development would minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to mobile source emissions. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations associated with mobile source emissions, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Construction odors would be temporary, intermittent, and not expected to affect a substantial number of people. The project's proposed land use map and adherence to existing regulations would ensure that future development would not result in emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
4.4 Biological Resources	Puildout of the CDII would have the notantial to directly an indirectly invest	PIO 1. Applications for future development of a sector state (1)	Significant and Unid-bl
adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	candidate, sensitive, or special status species through removal of habitat that supports sensitive species. While future site specific environmental review and application of regulations are likely to ensure adverse impacts to sensitive species are reduced to less than significant, it is not possible to ensure that every impact will be fully mitigated at a program level of analysis. Therefore, impacts would be significant.	portions thereof), wherein the Director of Community Development or his or her designee has determined a potential for impacts to sensitive biological resources, shall be required to prepare a site-specific general biological resources, including any sensitive plant or wildlife species. The report shall identify the need for focused presence/absence surveys and identify the presence of state or federal regulated wetlands or waters. If potentially significant impacts to sensitive biological resources, including sensitive species and/or wetlands are identified, the report shall also	While implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would reduce impacts on sensitive and special status species, it is not possible to ensure that every future project could fully mitigate potentially significant impacts despite the applicable regulatory framework. Therefore, impacts to candidate,

	Table S-1			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation	
Threshold	Impact Discussion	ImpactsMitigation Measurerecommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a levelof significance.BIO-2: Applications for future development, wherein the Director of Community Development or his or her designee has determined a potential for impacts to mature trees and/or native vegetation suitable for nesting birds, shall be required to restrict removal of sensitive habitat and vegetation to outside the breeding seasons of any sensitive species identified within adjacent properties (typical bird breeding season is February 1–September 1. as early as January 1 for some raptors). If vegetation clearing must begin during the breeding season, a qualified biologist shall provide recommendations to avoid impacts to nesting birds which typically includes a pre-construction survey within 3 days of the start of construction to determine the presence of active nests. If active nests are found, avoidance measures shall be implemented to ensure protection of the nesting birds. Avoidance measures may include a no-activity buffer zone, typically 300 feet from the area of disturbance or 500 feet for raptors, established at the discretion of the qualified biologist in consultation with the City, If activity buffer zones are not feasible, temporary noise barriers may be installed to attenuate construction noise. Noise wall height and adequacy shall be supported by a noise analysis to determine the anticipated construction noise levels with attenuation measures as recommended by the biologist and approved by the City. Periodic noise monitoring shall be conducted during construction to ensure noise attenuation standards are met. Accepted noise levels are species dependent and existing ambient noise levels can play a factor in	Significance After Mitigation sensitive, or special status species would remain significant and unavoidable at this program level of review.	
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	Buildout of the GPU has the potential to impact a variety of riparian habitat types throughout the Planning Area. Future site-specific environmental review for development consistent with the GPU would ensure appropriate biological surveys are completed and would require adherence to applicable regulations and policies such as the MSHCP, state and federal wetland regulations, and policies in the Open Space and Resource Conservation Element of the GPU. While these regulations are likely to ensure adverse impacts to sensitive riparian habitats are reduced at the project level, at a program level of analysis it is not possible to ensure that every impact could be fully mitigated. Therefore, the project would have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on sensitive riparian habitats, and impacts would be significant	establishing baseline acceptable noise. Refer to mitigation measure BIO-1	Significant and Unavoidable. While implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would reduce impacts on riparian habitats, it is not possible to ensure that every future project could fully mitigate potentially significant impacts Therefore, impacts to riparian habitats would remain significant and unavoidable at this program level of review.	
Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	While subsequent development and redevelopment projects would be required to evaluate potential impacts on wetlands through project-level CEQA documentation and would be required to obtain applicable state and federal wetland permits, at a program level of analysis it is not possible to ensure that every impact would be fully mitigated. Therefore, the project would have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on wetlands, and impacts would be significant.	Refer to mitigation measure BIO-1	Significant and Unavoidable. While implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would reduce impacts on wetlands, it is not possible to ensure that every future project could fully mitigate potentially significant impacts. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitats would remain significant and unavoidable at this program level of review.	

Table S-1			
	Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	The proposed land use plan is consistent with regional conservation goals and linkages needed to maintain wildlife movement. Future development would be required to undergo a site-specific environmental review including compliance with MSHCP conservation goals for wildlife corridors and linkages. Impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Future projects would be required to comply with GPU policies that support protection of biologically significant habitats and demonstrate consistency with applicable local ordinances protecting biological resources. The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	The land use plan largely avoids MSHCP Conserved Lands, Criteria Cells, and Public/Quasi Public Lands. Any development within MSHCP Criteria Cells or other conserved status lands would require a discretionary review including a site-specific biological analysis including demonstrating compliance with MSHCP conservation goals. Project-specific environmental review and required compliance with the MSHCP and other applicable plans would ensure consistency with applicable habitat conservation plans. Impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
4.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources			
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Analysis of impacts from future development on the built-environment would be required at the project level. Any alteration, relocation, demolition, or excessive groundborne vibration associated with future development that would affect historic buildings, structures, objects, landscapes, and sites would represent a significant impact to historical resources. Therefore, future projects would have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on historical resources, and impacts would be significant.	CUL-1 : Prior to the issuance of any permit for a future development site- specific project that would directly or indirectly affect a building/structure in excess of 50 years of age, the City or a qualified architectural historian shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation shall be based on criteria such as age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in the CEQA guidelines. If the evaluation determines that building/structure is not historic, no further evaluation or mitigation would be required. If the building/structure is determined to be historically significant, the preferred mitigation would be to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize or mitigate harm to the resource shall be taken per recommendations of the qualified architectural historian.	Significant and Unavoidable
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Analysis of impacts from future development on known and those-not-yet-found archaeological resources would be required at the project level. Any vegetation clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, or excavation associated with future development that could expose buried prehistoric or historic-era archaeological resources would represent a significant impact to historical resources. Therefore, future projects would have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on historical resources, and impacts would be significant.	 CUL-2: Prior to issuance of any permit for a future site-specific project that would potentially have a direct or indirect affect an archaeological resource, the City shall require the following steps be taken to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological resources, and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which may be impacted by project development. The following steps would help determine the presence or absence of archaeologist shall conduct records and background research at the Eastern Information Center for a list of recorded resources and request a sacred lands file search from the Native American Heritage Commission. Step 2: After review of this data, a pedestrian survey shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist. Step 3: If through the research and the field survey, archaeological resources are identified, then an evaluation of significance shall be completed by a qualified archaeologist. 	Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-1			
Thrashold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Massure	Significance After Mitigation
Threshold	Impact Discussion	ImpactsMitigation Measureprogram generally will include excavation to determine depth, extent, integrity, and content of the subsurface cultural material.Step 4: The results of the excavation will be evaluated using the Thresholds above in Section 4.5.4.Step 5: If an archaeological resource is determined significant and avoidance through project redesign is not feasible, a data recovery and construction monitoring program must be implemented to reduce the impacts the archaeological resource to below a significant level. The data recovery program must be approved by the City.Step 6: A final data recovery and/monitoring report shall be completed in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Content and Format. Confidential attachments must be submitted under separate covers. Artifacts collected during the evaluation and data recovery phases must be curated at an appropriate facility consistent with state (California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for Curation of Archaeological Collection 1993) and federal curation standards	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Analysis of impacts from future development on human remains would be required at the project level. Any vegetation clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, or excavation associated with future development that would expose or disturb unknown human remains would represent a significant impact to human remains. Therefore, future projects would have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on historical resources, and impacts would be significant.	 (36 CFR 79 of the Federal Register) and that allows access to artifact collections. CUL-3: If human remains are unintentionally disturbed during archaeological excavations or construction activities, implementation of the procedures set forth in PRC Section 5097.98 and California State Health and Safety Code 7050.5 would be implemented in consultation with the MLD as identified by the NAHC. California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 dictates that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined by the County Coroner to be Native American, the NAHC shall be notified within 24 hours. The NAHC shall identify the MLD with whom consultation shall occur to determine in the treatment and disposition of the remains. 	Significant and Unavoidable
 Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: a) Listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k), or b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth 	Analysis of impacts from future development on tribal cultural resources would be required at the project level. Any vegetation clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, or excavation associated with future development that would affect tribal cultural resources represent a significant impact to Tribal cultural resources. Therefore, future projects would have the potential to result in a substantial adverse effect on tribal cultural resources, and impacts would be significant.	Refer to CUL-2 and CUL-3.	Significant and Unavoidable

Trach I Impact Disease Number of Excitonated at Dipots Nitgeton Massion Significant Massion	Table S-1			
Important Description Minguine Significance Affection With Minguine Mineary Significance Minguine Mineary Significance Affection With Minguine Mineary Interview Minguine Mineary Significance Minguine With Minguine Mineary Interview Minguine Mineary Significance Minguine Would Minguine Mineary Interview Interview Minguine Mineary Interview Would Minguine Mineary Interview		Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
In a solution (g) of MC 1. In spin (g) of MC 1. Solution Solution (g) of MC 1. The spin (g) of MC 1. Solution (g) of MC 1. Solutio	Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
b024.1. In spring the relation set further set fu	in subdivision (c) of PRC Section			
a set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section to degree of the measurement to a calibratic set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section to degree of the measurement to a calibratic set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section to degree of the measurement to a calibratic set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section to degree of the measurement to a calibratic set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section to the set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section (s) of PLOS Section (s) of PLOS Section the set Tyreson (s) of PLOS Section (s) of PLOS Sec	5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth			
Model the project reach an estimated sector where the observed in the sector of the	in subdivision (c) of PRC Section			
The sequence of the resource of a sequence of the sequence of t	5024.1, the lead agency shall consider			
Minimum Nulve American's Insertion of the product	the significance of the resource to a			
AD Daty Programmer with the patheticity Programmer with th	California Native American?			
Multiply project readiling inputed in the project readiling inputed in the proposed of the second in a second in a second in a second in the proposed of the project readiling in the readiling in the readiling in the project readiling in the readiling in the project re	4.6 Energy			I 1 0
agnizative environmental impact one to searching interfaces on the project would not result on a variability of the service of the service of the service project conduction or uperation? bc // LAU (New // Law	Would the project result in potentially	Energy conservation measures required by applicable energy conservation regulations	N/A	Less than Significant
Watedum, Lenticlerit, or unkeessary Self LOF 0 and the LaP work support to minimization of edge constraining of the project constraintion. If the edge constraining concerpt into the constraintion of edge constraining concerpt into a second with buildow of the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and or result in a second with buildow of the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and or result in a second with buildow of the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and or result in a second with buildow of the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and or result in a second with buildow of the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and or result in a second with an existing and the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and there are project work and the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and there are project work and the existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and there are project to allow work and the area development would be existing 2006 Goernal Plan. Therefore, the project work and there are project and the project dored to reduce the advectory monitories of the RPS, and in partice work and there are advectory and there are project and advectory of the area down and there are advectory and the advectory and there are advectory advectory and there are advectory and there are advectory and there are advectory advectory and there are advectory advecto	significant environmental impact due to	(e.g., CALGreen, Title 24) and energy conservation policies included in the proposed		
Ontering resolution operations also during the ordering resolution with number eques points. NA Would be project confittivities or operation? Puttine development allowed under the project would be less than the project would be project confittivities or operation? NA Would be project confittivities or operation? Puttine development allowed under the project would implement applicable regulation of concept would and research in a waterful, indificient or unnecessary concept would applement applicable regulation of the project would be project would be required to a concept would conce requirement would be required to concept	wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary	2021 GPU and the CAP would support the minimization of energy consumption from		
project construction of operation? isso chaded with online of the project would not set that the VAL that the VAL the Discrete State with solution of the set that the VAL the Discrete State with solution of the set that the VAL the Discrete State with solution of the State VAL the Discrete State With State	consumption of energy resources, during	operations associated with future development. VMT and building energy use		
would the project conflict with or obstruct in an use available in militation of new generation or an uncassary consumption of new generation of RPS, and impacts would be renergy efficiency consumption of new generation of RPS and impacts would be less than significant. N/A 4.7 Geology/Sola Future development would he required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and significant. N/A 4.7 Geology/Sola Future development would he required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and the set of a significant. N/A 4.7 Geology/Sola Future development would he required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and the set of a significant. N/A • Strutz swime ground halting, geologic morts are considered to have a substantial diverse finance construct of an developments would failure involving. N/A • Strutz swime ground halting, inpactection, in aubstantial adverse finance construct of an uncassary frequence for a substantial diverse finance for a substantial diverse finance for a substantial geologic reports has set of the set of a substantial diverse finance for a substantial geologic reports has set of the set of a substantial diverse finance for a substantial diverse finance for a substantial diverse finance for a substantial for a substantial set of the set of the set of a substantial geol enew and the set of the set of the set of the set of the se	project construction or operation?	associated with buildout of the project would be less than the VIVIT and building energy		
Would be project conflict with or obstruct a valuation, introduced or unincessary consumption of energy memory applicable energy of a service of the project served in the served project served in the project served in the served project served in the project served project served in the project served project served in the project served proje		use associated with buildout of the existing 2006 General Plan. Therefore, the project		
Would the project coeffict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy of coefficient. The project would be nergy of coefficient. The project would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and the project methods induces would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and adhere to get of all dove popure the safety of the safety of adhere to project would be required to adhere to project are required for an exceeding of a all dove popure builds ergurated to a development would be required to a development would be required to an exceeding of a adhere to project are required to a development would be required to an exceeding of a all dove popure poly with GPU software adhere to project would be required to a development would and adhere to every adhere to a deve		would not result in a wasterul, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy		
state or is all plots for renerable energy of energy efficiency? inter would enurse development would be neargy officient. The support would not energy efficiency? inter would enurse development would be neargy officient. The support would not energy efficiency? inter would enurse development would be neargy officient. The support would be less than or with SCB and MVUs implementation of SLFs and impacts would be less than supported incrtu or indirectly cause potential abstantial adverse effects, including the risk of lass, injury, or dath involving. Patter development would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Municipal Code to ensure the safety of inpacts. Support of a known earthquake foult. NA Less than Significant • Storag esimile ground shaking. Storag esimile ground shaking. Storag esimile ground shaking. NA • Londalides? Vould the project result in substantial soil ension or the loss of topool? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant induing the project result in substantial soil ension or the loss of topool? NA	Would the project conflict with or obstruct a	Future development allowed under the preject would implement applicable regulation	N/A	Loss than Significant
Sale wide pairs Index would basis that output wide outpu	state or level plan for renowable energy or	that would onsure development would be one regulation.	N/A	Less than Significant
energy endeducy. Control SCE on MWU's implementation of KES, itsn in implementation of KES, itsn in implementation of KES, and impacts would be less than significant. 4.7 Geology/Soils Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential advace effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving. Future development would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Trick S, Chapter 8.21 Orading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the skipt of involving. NA • Rupture of a known earthquake size staring focus involving. Seise size staring advace direct to have a substantial difect on casisfing facult direct or casisfing and/or future starbility. Butter development would be less than significant. NA • Strong seisnic ground shaking, including liquediations. Future development would be less than significant. NA Would the project result in substantial solid cross on the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the VER including the National Pollutant Discharge Generate (Reguments, Ching and Water PRincents (Reguments, Ching and Water PRincents (Reguments, Ching and Starbard Reguments, Ching and Chi	onorgy officioncy?	conflict with or obstruct implementation of CAL Groon and the California Energy Code		
47 Geology/Soils Future development would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Tick 8. Chapter 4.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of future showing potential adverse effects. NA including the project directly or indirectly cause three showing in the Planing Area, thereby minimizing potential development to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Tick 8. Chapter 4.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of future showing potential development to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Tick 8. Chapter 4.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of future showing potential development to millade sites where gooige conditions are considered to have a substantial effect on existing and/or future site showing potential development would be required to adhere to the value as used to be assert the safety of future sites where gooige conditions are considered to have a substantial effect on existing and/or future site stability. Future development would be less than significant. NA Would the project result in substantial soil eroson? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (PPUBS) Municipal Code resure Requirements Tick 8. Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Manegement and Discharge Controls and Title 8. Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Manegement and Discharge Controls and Title 9. Chapter 9.11 Andreape and Water Fifteenerge Requirements for the dose planting. Implementation of these required Requirements for the development would be requirements. The development would be requirements to react and Title 9. Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Effection Requirements to the dose of topsoil?	energy emclency:	or with SCF and MVII's implementation of RPS and impacts would be less than		
4.7 Geology/Solia Puture development would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Title 8. Chapter 8.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of fature land uses throughout the Planning Area, thereby minimizing potential adverse impacts. Figure 10 a substantial adverse offects. N/A Would the project result in substantial adverse offects. Title 8. Chapter 8.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of fature land uses throughout the Planning Area, thereby minimizing potential adverse impacts. Figure 10 as substantial effect on existing and/or future substantial effect on existing and/or future stability. Puture development would he requirements on billade to comply with GPU Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would he requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for goologic reports, which would ensure the stability. Puture development would here requirements for the second additional gool and induce including the National Politura to Exercise Stability. Puture development would here requirements for the second additional politura to Exercise Stability. Puture development would here requirements for the second Water Pffereone addite Stability. Puture Stability. Puture developm		significant		
Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential subtantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Puture development would be required to adhere to CPU Saftyr Element policies and Thite 8, Chapter 8.21 Grading Begulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of future land uses throughout the Planning Arca, thereby minimizing potential adverse imputers. Engineering geologic reports are required to a value a subtantial defect on existing and/or future site safety geologic reports are required to requirements for geologic reports are a subtantial effect on existing and/or future site safety geologic reports are required to requirements for geologic reports are subtantial effect on existing and/or future site safety Element policies and Municipal Code to equipment would be required to have a subtantial effect on existing and/or future site safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports which would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure and landslides would be less than significant. N/A Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Puture development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutural Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements frite 9, Chapter 9, 17 Landscape and Water Pficiency Requirements purvides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion or the loss of topsoil? N/A	4.7 Geology/Soils	Significant.		
potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death including the risk of loss, injury, or death fault. Title 8, Chapter 8.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of future land uses throughout the Planning Area, therough minimizing potential adverse inputs. Expineering geologic reports are required for all developments on hillside sites where geologic conditions are considered to have a substantial effect on existing and/or future site statility. Future development would be required to comply with GPU Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which would ensure that impacts. Future development would be less than significant. N/A Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm year standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements on system erosion or the loss of topsoil? N/A Less than Significant Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Controls and Title 8, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would ensure that future development would neare that future development would and result in substantial significant. N/A	Would the project directly or indirectly cause	Future development would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and	N/A	Less than Significant
including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Iture hand uses throughout the Planning Area, thereby minimizing potential adverse impacts. Engineering geologic reports are required for all developments on hillside sites where geologic conflictions are considered to have a substantial effect on existing and/or future site stability. Future development would be required to comply with GPU Satey Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, including liquefaction, N/A Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to stor where regulations and considered control and slope planting. N/A Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant. Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9, 17 Landsage and Water Efficiency Requirements. Municipal Code requirements of title 8, Chapter 9, 17 Landsage and Water Efficiency Requirements provides and allote should not prove that intro development would also pelanting. Implementation of these regulations avould ensure that future development would be less than significant. N/A	potential substantial adverse effects.	Title 8. Chapter 8.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of		
 involving: • Rupture of a known earthquake fault, • Strong seismic ground shaking, Steismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, • Landslides? Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Stytem (NPES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which would be less than significant. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? N/A 	including the risk of loss, injury, or death	future land uses throughout the Planning Area, thereby minimizing potential adverse		
 Rupture of a known earthquake fault, Strong seisnic ground shaking, Strong seisnic ground shaking, Strong seisnic ground shaking, Stissmic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, Landslides? Would the project result in substantial soil Puture development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the Vational Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements, soft control and dispe planting, Implementation of these regulations water fufficiency Requirements, provides additional guidance for storm water fufficiency Requirements, would be less than significant. 	involving:	impacts. Engineering geologic reports are required for all developments on hillside		
fault, and/or future site stability. Future development would be required to comply with GPU Strong seismic ground shaking, Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which under the stability. Future development would be required to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure, including liquefaction, Landslides? Landslides would be less than significant. Would the project result in substantial soil eroson or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8, 10 Komisel/ Permit requirements) movid ensure that future development would not specific and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would be less than significant.	Rupture of a known earthquake	sites where geologic conditions are considered to have a substantial effect on existing		
• Strong seismic ground shaking, Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure including liquefaction, Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure and landslides would be less than significant. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to charge Controls and Title 8, Charger 6 and Water Efficiency Requirements. Citle 8, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements provides and ditional guidance for storm water management. erosion or the loss of topsoil? N/A	fault,	and/or future site stability. Future development would be required to comply with GPU		
• Sciemic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure and landslides would be less than significant. • Landslides? would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure and landslides would be less than significant. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would be less than significant. N/A	• Strong seismic ground shaking,	Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which		
including liquefaction, • Landslides?and landslides would be less than significant.and landslides would be less than significant.and landslides would be less than significant.Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements.N/AVenuicipal Permit requirements.Future development would encorporate and Discharge Controls and Title 8, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements provides additional guidance for storm water management, and olsope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/A	• Seismic-related ground failure,	would ensure that impacts related to faults, seismic ground shaking, ground failure		
 Landslides? Landslides? Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Storm water Efficiency Requirements) provides and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements provides and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements provides and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements would hot result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than 	including liquefaction,	and landslides would be less than significant.		
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements (Policiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less thanN/ALess than Significant	• Landslides?			
Would the project result in substantial soilFuture development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than Significant				
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/vurban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/AAEss than Significant				
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements up rovides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/AA				
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than Significant				
LowSummationN/AWould the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Storm water fundance and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than Significant				
Less than SignificantWould the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not significant.N/ALess than Significant				
Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than Significant				
erosion or the loss of topsoil? storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.	Would the project result in substantial soil	Future development would incorporate long-term water quality controls pursuant to	N/A	Less than Significant
(NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8, Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.	erosion or the loss of topsoil?	storm water standards including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System		
Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title 9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.		(NPDES) Municipal Permit requirements. Municipal Code requirements (Title 8		
9, Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.		Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls and Title		
guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting. Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.		9. Chapter 9.17 Landscape and Water Efficiency Requirements) provides additional		
Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.		guidance for storm water management, erosion control and slope planting.		
result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than significant.		Implementation of these regulations would ensure that future development would not		
significant.		result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, and impacts would be less than		
		significant.		

Table S-1			
	Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Future development would be required to adhere to GPU Safety Element policies and Title 8, Chapter 8.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code to ensure the safety of future land uses throughout the Planning Area, thereby minimizing potential adverse impacts. Engineering geologic reports are required for all developments on hillside sites where geologic conditions are considered to have a substantial effect on existing and/or future site stability. Future development would be required to comply with GPU Safety Element policies and Municipal Code requirements for geologic reports, which would ensure that impacts related to unstable geological units would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Implementation of applicable building code regulations, Title 8, Chapter 8.21 Grading Regulations of the Municipal Code which requires a geotechnical investigation, in addition to other regulations and General Plan policies would ensure impacts related to expansive soils would not create a risk to life or property. Impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Construction-related ground-disturbing activities associated with future development could result in significant impacts (loss) of nonrenewable paleontological resources. Because site-specific details and locations of future development projects are not known at this program-level of analysis, impacts to paleontological resources would be potentially significant.	 PAL-1: Applications for future development, wherein the Community Development Director or his or her designee has determined a potential for impacts to paleontological resources, shall review the underlying geology and paleontological sensitivity of the site. If it is determined that the potential exists that sensitive paleontological resources are present, the applicant shall be required to comply with the following mitigation framework. A qualified paleontological monitor shall be present during grading in project areas where a project specific geological technical study has determined that such monitoring is necessary due to the potential for paleontological resources to reside within the underlying geologic formations. The geologic technical study shall also provide specific duties of the monitor, and detailed measures to address fossil remains, if found. 	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	1		
Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	The proposed CAP identifies strategies, measures, and actions that would be implemented to reduce GHG emissions consistent with State legislative requirements. Therefore, with the adoption and implementation of the proposed CAP, GHG emissions generated by the 2021 GPU would be reduced to meet State GHG reduction targets. Therefore, the project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs.	The proposed CAP identifies strategies, measures, and actions that would be implemented to reduce GHG emissions consistent with State legislative requirements. Therefore, with the adoption and implementation of the proposed CAP, GHG emissions generated by the 2021 GPU would be reduced to meet State GHG reduction targets. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
4.9 Hazards & Hazardous Materials			
Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Adherence with applicable federal, state, regional, and local plans and regulations, as well as 2021 GPU policies would ensure that the project would not result in potential hazards associated with the use, transport, storage, and sale of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant

Type hash Function Standard of Lay Conducted Megazion Meg	Table S-1			
Unclusion Uniform Uniform Support		Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
Wait the project Levis is spirate. Mathema with applicable balance difference dif	Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
name to the price of the remainment of all 2011 GPD prices would be loss that equify an element to be reprices would be loss that equify an element of the rest that applicable formation and regulations, regulatin regulations, regulations, regulations, regu	Would the project Create a significant	Adherence with applicable federal, state, regional, and local plans and regulations, as	N/A	Less than Significant
through investments produced Investments in produced is produced and under directions investments of the registion of the investments of the angulation. No Would be project be based out a star which and the encounter with applicable fiderup, set on the investments of the angulation. No Would be project be based out a star which and the encounter with applicable fiderup, set on the investments of the angulation in angulation is and under which and under which and under which and under which applicable fiderup, set on the investments of the angulation in angulation is angulated in the star of the investments of the angulated intervest of the star has angulated intervest of the angulated intervest of the star has angulated intervest of the star has angulated intervest of the star has angulated intervest of the angulated intervestin the angulated intervest of the angulated intervest of the an	hazard to the public or the environment	well as 2021 GPU policies would ensure that the project would not result in reasonably		
and definition integrants in the information and inputs would be test han approved. Include test approximation of the information and inputs would be test han approximation. Net would be provide test haraceless areas and below when has and result in a many haraceless and haraceless of haraceless and haraceless and haraceless of haraceless and haraceless and haraceless of haraceless and haraceless and haraceless and haraceless of haraceless of haraceless of haraceless of haraceless of haraceless and haraceless and haraceless and haraceless of har	through reasonably foreseeable upset and	foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials		
Parameter nutrine with money nutrine. Mathematic with money nutrine with applicable defared, stars, regional, and lead plane, and regulations of mathematic matemathmatematimatematic mathematic mathematic mathematic mathemati	accident conditions involving the release of	into the environment, and impacts would be less than significant.		
What the project orm houring is reasonable with the registerion of the project or and set of the project or a static or proposed schedule, and impacts and registerion is an registerion is and registerion is and registerion is and registerion is and registerion is an registerion is and registerion is and registerion is an registerion is and registerion is an registerio registerion is an registerion is an regis	hazardous materials into the environment.			
or functions or services are expressioned interactions on the end or maximum frame the project would be just as a statisticane theory and constrained in the end of the end	Would the project emit hazardous emissions	Adherence with applicable federal, state, regional, and local plans and regulations, as	N/A	Less than Significant
midning, publication, and status of the project according or proposed status of the instrument of the instrumen	or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous	well as 2021 GPU policies, would ensure that the project would not result in an		
Quality Control Control Control Valid by project report Control Contro Control Control	materials, substances, or waste within one-	accidental release of hazardous materials or emissions of hazardous substance near		
Big Data Althorne to upplicable location requirements our production NA Less than Significant Standard on this of disordown materials sites, and impacts would be less than significant. NA Less than Significant Would the project be located within an appert on shore samples and an average applicable. NA Less than Significant Would the project be located within an appert on shore samples and an average to sample appert on the project would not recease applicable. NA Less than Significant Would the project be located within an appert on shore samples and provide to shore to all would be less than significant. NA Less than Significant would be project would not recease applicable. How conserve to sample to shore the project would not recease the project would not	quarter mile of an existing or proposed	existing or proposed schools, and impacts would be less than significant.		
Would be project he based of an activation Addressent of the project he based of an activation Addressent of the project with a distribution of the project would be less than significant. NA Addressent of the project he based of the mark of the project would be less than significant. Would be project he based of the mark of the project would be less than significant. NA Addressent of the project he based of the mark of the project would be less than significant. NA Would be project he based of the mark of the project would be less than significant. NA Addressent of the project he based of the mark of the project would be less than significant. would be project he based of the mark of the project would be based of the mark of the project he project he based of the mark of the project he project	school.			
a in clude on all of infaminous materials alles, and impacts would be less than significant. Would the project mode that the project would be less than significant. Would the project be focused within an anyone that do administer of the project be focused within the AUCU is subject to development that would be been administer of the project be focused within an anyone that do administer of the project be focused within the AUCU is subject to development that would be been administer of the project to focuse a property of the project be been administer of the project be focused within the autor and the equivalent in the following working and the project administer of the project would be required to administer be administer of the project would be required to administer be administer	Would the project be located on a site which	Adherence to applicable clean-up and/or remediation requirements and regulations	N/A	Less than Significant
aide complice pursuant to dovernation continuement. Inform database ande, and impacts would ne less than significant. N/A would be project be located within the CUC2 is subject to development standards and restrictions as a report land use plan or, where such a plan so or to be and other within the ALCC2 is subject to development standards and restrictions as a driport land use plan or, where such a plan a strip where such a plan or, where such a plan a strip where such a plan or, where such a plan a driport land use plan or, where such a plan a strip where such a plan or, where such a plan a strip where such as a strip where such astrip where such as strip where such as a strip where suc	is included on a list of hazardous materials	would ensure that the project would not create a significant hazard associated with		
Cade section indica in addition an agrinform. There is the specific or	sites compiled pursuant to Government	known hazardous materials sites, and impacts would be less than significant.		
a significant initial to the project be located within any order to all special regulations. Including National Code Seasane 307,000, Patine development standards and restrictions as for born in Manifuel Code Seasane 307,000, Patine development standards and predictions are not born in Manifuel Code Seasane 307,000, Patine development standards and special regulations regulating prosession and standards and special regulations regulating prosession and standards and special regulations regulating prosession and the construction of the ALUCPs, the Manifuel Code standards and special regulations regulating prosession and the construction are development standards and special regulations regulating prosession and the construction and standards and special regulations regulating prosession and the construction and standards and special regulations regulating prosession and the project areas. NA Less than Significant Would he project areas. Would he project areas. Alberenees to appleable LIMP standards and 2021 GPU Safety Element policies, as order and the project areas. NA Less than Significant Would the project areas. Alberenees to appleable LIMP standards and 2021 GPU Safety Element policies, as order and the project areas and the appleable and the appleable and the project areas and the appleable and the project areas and the appleable and appleable and the appleable and the appleable and th	Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create			
controllerate. Development within the ARUUZ is subject to development standards and restrictions as an oper analyse. The due to plan or where such a such a plan or where suc	a significant hazard to the public or the			
Would the project be located within an application is provide the index of the project area. Development within the ALU is singlet to development within which be required to a singlet with the project area. SVA Less than Significant ard or phone with a maximum and phone is the project area. brow on project development within the ALU is singlet to development to which be required to a singlet area. SVA Less than Significant singlet area. Less than Significant singlet area. SVA Less than Significant singlet area. SVA Less than Significant singlet area. SVA Less than Significant singlet area. SVA Less than Significant singlet area. SVA Less than Significant singlet area.	environment.			
artport tame use plan or, where such a plan has not been adjorted, within the only on specific and use regulation as adjorted within the clay's specific and use regulations and plant in the ALU Cess multiplications in stating Manicipal Code as adjorts hand or execusive no sing for possible in a specific and use regulations are garding FAA horification as adjorts hand or execusive no sing for possible in the adjort contains and specific and use regulations regulations are garding FAA horification associated FAA requirements, the pricet working in the project area.NAWould the project impair implementation of a dynamic and adjort the pricet working in the project working and or exercise in construction.NALess than SignificantWould the project impair implementation of a dynamic and adjort and impair implementation of a dynamic and adjort and impair implementation and adjort adjort and impair implementation and adjort adjort and impair implementation and adjort adjort and and adjort adjort and impair implementation and adjort ad	Would the project be located within an	Development within the AICUZ is subject to development standards and restrictions as	N/A	Less than Significant
nas not been anopted, within two mites a public airport. result in a suddy haard or exsuessive noise for public exaiped a us suddy haard or exsuessive noise for public exaiped and experiments. Therefore, the project would be required to adhere to a working in the project sequences associated FAA requirements. Therefore, the project would not reguli in a sudgry hascad or exsuessive noise for public exaiped and experiments. Therefore, the project would not reguli to associated and associated fAA requirements. Therefore, the project would not reguli in a sudgry hascad or exsuessive noise for public exaiped and the inset of the experiments. Therefore, the project would not reguli to associated and associated fAA requirements of the project would not reguli in the project area, and miting the project would not reguli in the project area, and hand associated fAA requirements of the project would not reguli in the project area, and the project would not inpair implementation of physically interfere with an adopted entergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.NALess than SignificantWould the project caspose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than Significant4001 the project would are expectively to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury	airport land use plan or, where such a plan	set forth in Municipal Code Section 9.07.060. Future development that would be		
puncture amport or puncture and amport, required to almere to all special regulations, muturepart code asafety haard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. would here regureed to almere to all special regulations, regarding PAA holification imaginary surfaces, aircraft noise, and building heights. Consequently, the project would be consistent with adopted AUUCPs, as that we development would be treating to a show compatibility with the requirements of the AUUCPs, the Municipal Code, and associtated FAA requirements. Therefore, the project would be treating to a subject and show compatibility with the requirement of the AUUCPs, as the Municipal Code, and associtated FAA requirements. Therefore, the project would be treating to a subject and show compatibility with the requirement of the project area, and impacts would be less than significant. NA Less than Significant Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfore with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Adherence to applicable CHWD standards and 2021 GPU solities would ensure that the project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk associet of FAA to a significant. NA Would the project violation and water quality area do loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Compliance with MVPD regulations and log Cl GPU policies would be less than aignificant risk area do loss, neury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than aignificant risk or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. NA Less than Significant Alterence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as woll as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of	has not been adopted, within two miles of a	located within the city's special zone and/or within the ALUC compatibility zones		
a sirefy having in the project area. residing or working in the project area. insigning variances, strend mind use regulation highlys. Consequently, the project area, and associated FAA requirements in the ALU CPs, the Multicipal Code, and associated FAA requirements of the ALU CPs, the Multicipal Code, and associated FAA requirements of the ALU CPs, the Multicipal Code and the required the hazard or excessive noise for people residue on store the project would not result in a safety instance or excessive noise of project area, and impacts would be less than significant. Would the project expose plan or emergency evacuation plan. Would the project expose plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant risk of loss, injury or death involving whild and fires, and impacts would be less than significant. 100 HydrologyrWater quality. Auto HydrologyrWater quality involving whild and involving and any construction-related impacts would less than significant. Post-Development Autoreate to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as wall as Municipal Code requirements for proparation of a WQNP and anphicible GPU policies, would	public airport or public use airport, result in	would be required to adhere to all special regulations, including Municipal Code		
resulting or working in the project area. integration structure, and running neighbor of the ALUCPs, the Municipal Cade, and associated FAA requirements of the ALUCPs, the Municipal Cade, and associated FAA requirements in the project would not realist in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project would not realist in a safety material in a safety and the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency vacuation plan. N/A Would the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency vacuation plan. N/A Less than Significant will not excessive noise for energency vacuation of an adopted for emergency response plan or emergency vacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant is significant. Would the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted for significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted for significant is significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted for significant is significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project would not when adopted project would not water quality significant is significant is significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project vould and water quality significant is adopted project volute any water duality significant is of loss, pinyer death involving wild land fires, and impacts	a safety hazard or excessive noise for people	development standards and specific land use regulations regarding FAA notification		
Would be consistent with adopted ALOUPS, is full und evelopment would be require do biow constituity with the requirements of the ALUCPS, the Municipal Code, and associated FAA requirements. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or coxecsive noise for people residing or working in the project ran, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than SignificantWould the project impair implementation of a physically interfere with an adopted evence on physical HAP standards and 2021 GPU Safety Element policies, as well as increased traffic capacity in the project area, and impacts would be less than significant.N/ALess than SignificantWould the project strouge people or emergency response plan or emergency resp	residing or working in the project area.	imaginary surfaces, aircraft noise, and building neights. Consequently, the project		
Second ComparisonSecond ComparisonSe		would be consistent with adopted ALUCPs, as future development would be required to		
InstructionInstructio		snow compatibility with the requirements of the ALUCPS, the Municipal Code, and		
NoteNo		associated FAA requirements. I nerefore, the project would not result in a safety		
Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Adherence to applicable LHMP standards and 2021 GPU Safety Element policies, as well as increased traffic capacity in the proposed roadway network, would ensure that the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. N/A Less than Significant Would the project expose people or structures, either directly to in directly, to a significant. Compliance with MVPD regulations and 2021 GPU policies would ensure that project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project violate any water quality to or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Construction adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements would nesure that future development would not violate any water quality, and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. N/A Less than Significant Order evaluation or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would neares that future development N/A		impacts would be less then similiant		
Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Adherence to applicable LIMMF standards and 201 GFO Safety Lement plottes, as in a contrast of code and the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant. NA Less than Significant Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant. NA Less than Significant Would the project violate any water quality standards or or avere the forter or elevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements or ground water quality. NA Less than Significant Would the project violate any water quality. Construction adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements would be contrast or ground water quality. NA Horder evalue contrast of the structure or or programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or the forture development would not indicate any water quality. NA Less than Significant.	Waald the maintime in implementation of	Adhenenes to annihishing LUMD standards and 2021 CDU Cafata Flamant nalising as		I and the set of the set
We as increased train capacity in the resolution of the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency response plan expective response plan expective response plan experuplan expective response expective response	would the project impair implementation of	Adherence to applicable LHMP standards and 2021 GPU Safety Element policies, as	N/A	Less than Significant
energency response plan or energency the project would not impair implementation do or prystating interfere with an adopted evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant. Implementation do or prystating interfere with an adopted evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and impacts would be less than significant. N/A Less than Significant 4.10 Hydrology/Water Quality Construction Construction Implementation do not violate any water quality. Implementation do not violate any water quality. N/A standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Construction adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements would be less than significant. N/A Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or use that forture development would not is applicable GPU policies, would be less than significant. Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would be requirements or preparation of a wQMP and applicable GPU policies, would and code requirements or preparation of a wQMP and applicable GPU policies, would and code requirements or preparation of a wQMP and applicable GPU policies, would and code requirements or preparation of a wQMP and applicable GPU policies, would and code requi	or physically interfere with an adopted	the project would not imperimentation of an physically interfore with an edented		
evacuation prant entergency response plan or entergency evacuation prant, and impacts would be less indication indication <td>emergency response plan or emergency</td> <td>the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted</td> <td></td> <td></td>	emergency response plan or emergency	the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted		
Under the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fres. Ompliance with MVPD regulations and 2021 GPU policies would ensure that project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death isinoloxing wildland fres. N/A Less than Significant 4.10 Hydrology/Water Quality Onstruction significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project violate any water quality. Construction N/A Less than Significant would expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fres, and impacts would be less than significant. N/A Less than Significant Would the project violate any water quality Construction N/A Less than Significant would expose people or ground water quality. Construction N/A Less than Significant Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would Noncipient of the mode on preparation of a WQMP and applicable or preparation of a WQMP and applicable or preparation of a WQMP and applicable or preparation or a work to structure on the work of one preparation of a WQMP and applicable or preparation or preparation of a WQMP and applicable or preparation or preparation of a WQMP and applicable or preparation or preparation or preparation or	evacuation plan.	then significant		
Would the project expose people of structures, either directly or indirectly or indinter or indinter or indirectly or indirectly or indirec	Would the project expect people or	Compliance with MVED regulations and 2021 CDU policies would ansure that project		Loga than Significant
Substantially degrade surface Would not expose people of substant and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements or ground water quality. N/A Vould the project violate any water quality. Construction Adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements or ground water quality. N/A Vould water quality. Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would and programs, are quality to an exponent of the tot future dovelopment would not right to any water quality standards or between the tot relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or between the tot relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or between the tot relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or between the tot relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements or between the tot true dovelopment would not right to an exponent Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would are exponent or future to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable or prevent or angle is the dovelop are exponent or preparation of a WQMP and applicable core prevent or angle is the dovelop are exponent or preparation of a WQMP and applicable or prevent or angle is the dovelop are exponent or prevent or angle is the dovelop are exponent or prevent or preven	structures, either directly or indirectly to a	would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk		Less than Significant
Significant res. Significant Significant Significant Significant 4.10 Hydrology/Water Quality Image: Significant Significant Significant Image: Significant Significant Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or ground water quality. Construction Significant Image: Significant Image: Significant Image: Significant would ensure that future development would not violate any water quality. adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements would be less than significant. N/A Image: Significant Image: Significant Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would or programs during the IGPU policies, would or programs water would not programs water water worder or significant and pr	significant rick of loss injury or doath	of loss injury or doath involving wildland fires, and impacts would be loss than		
Introving withink inest. Significant. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Construction N/A Would ensure that future development would not violate any water quality standards or degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. N/A Less than Significant Post-Development Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would once wheth fiture davelopment unplicate any water quality compares and programs including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements to meeture unplicate any compares and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements to meeture unplicate any compares and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements to meeture unplicate any compares and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements to meeture unplicate any compares and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements to meeture unplicate any compares and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements to meeture unplicate any compares and programs and programs, and progr	involving wildland fires	significant		
Would the project violate any water quality Construction Less than Significant or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Construction N/A Joint College adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements would ensure that future development would not violate any water quality standards or degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. N/A Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would ensure that for the development application of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would	4 10 Hydrology/Water Quality	Significant.		
with the project violate any water quality construction test that organize and severate or ground water quality degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. test that organize and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements would be less than significant. Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would or ground water for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would ensure that future development would not	Would the project violate any water quality	Construction	N/A	Loss than Significant
adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements or ground water quality.	standards or wasta discharge requirements			Less than Significant
or ground water quality. address and programs, as well as Multicipal Code requirements would not violate any water quality standards or degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would construction of the tot the two development of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would construction of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies. Would construct on the tot be	or otherwise substantially degrade surface	adherence to relevant plans and programs, as well as Municipal Code requirements		
or degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction-related impacts would be less than significant. Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would	or ground water quality	would ansure that future development would not violate any water quality standards		
Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would	of ground water quanty.	or degrade surface or ground water quality, and construction related impacts would be		
Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would		loss than significant		
Post-Development Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would		less than significant.		
Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would		Post-Development		
Adherence to relevant plans and programs, including the IGP, as well as Municipal Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would				
Code requirements for preparation of a WQMP and applicable GPU policies, would		Adherence to relevant plans and programs including the IGP as well as Municipal		
oncure that future development would not visible any water evaluate on		Code requirements for preparation of a WOMP and applicable GPU policies would		
r ensure that juture development would not violate any water quanty standards or		ensure that future development would not violate any water quality standards or		

Table S-1			
	Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
	degrade surface or ground water quality, and long-term operational impacts would be less than significant.		
Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.	The project has been designed to minimize the increase in impervious surfaces by primarily focusing on future development and redevelopment within the proposed Concept Areas that consist of clusters of vacant and underutilized land within the city limit that would allow for continued groundwater recharge in substantial portions of the Planning Area. Additionally, adherence to applicable GPU policies would ensure that future development would neither substantially deplete groundwater supplies nor interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
 Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; iii) 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; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows. 	 significant. Erosion or Siltation Adherence to Municipal Code requirements and applicable GPU goals and policies would ensure that future development would not result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, and impacts would be less than significant. Increase Surface Runoff Pursuant to the SAR WQMP, some future development may be required to include BMPs to reduce flow velocity of storm water runoff. Such BMPs could include on-site drainage swales, bioretention features, use of permeable pavers in parking areas and streets, or infiltration basins which also serve as a means for pollutant removal. Additionally, applicable Priority Development Projects would be required to include LID BMPS to treat potentially polluted runoff prior to entering the public storm drain system. Project-specific studies would be required to ensure that volume-based treatment LID BMPs are properly sized to infiltrate, filter, or treat the remaining portion of the runoff volume that was not retained or treated by other BMPs. Furthermore, adherence to Municipal Code requirements and applicable GPU goals and policies would be less than significant. Exceed Capacity of Stormwater System Future development would be required to comply with future SWPPPs and the project-specific WQMP, which would identify BMPs to be incorporated into development plans to ensure that near-term construction activities and long-term post-development activities would not result in substantial amounts of polluted runoff. Therefore, adherence to regional and local plans and regulations would ensure that future development would ensure that future development activities would not create or contribute substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would elses than significant. 	N/A	Less than Significant
	Flood Flows Future development would be required to adhere to regional and local plans, programs and regulations relating to storm water runoff and volume flow. All future development would include BMPs to manage polluted runoff and minimize flow volume and velocity. Therefore, adherence to Municipal Code requirements and applicable GPU goals and policies would ensure that future development would not substantially impede or redirect flood flows, and impacts would be less than significant.		

Table S-1			
	Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones,	The Pacific Ocean is located more than 40 miles from the city. Therefore, there is no	N/A	Less than Significant
would the project risk release of pollutants	potential for tsunamis to impact the Planning Area. Future development would be		
due to project inundation.	required to comply with Municipal Code Chapter 8.12, Floodplain Ordinance, which		
	requires flood safe measures be included in development plans. Remediation measures		
	for Perris Dam described above would also serve to protect against a seiche. Therefore,		
	impacts associated with flooding due to dam failure and seiche would be less than		
	significant.		
Would the project conflict with or obstruct	future development would be required to comply with the SAR Basin Water Quality	N/A	Less than Significant
implementation of a water quality control	Control Program, which includes the requirement to complete and submit of a SWPPP		
plan or sustainable groundwater	for construction-related activities. Future development would also be required to		
management plan.	implement a WQMP to demonstrate compliance with the City's MS4 permit and to		
	minimize the release of potential waterborne pollutants. Therefore, the project would		
	not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan, and		
	impacts would be less than significant.		
	Domestic water supplies throughout the Planning Area are not reliant on groundwater		
	as a primary source. Furthermore, the OSRC Element includes the goals to preserve		
	and protect natural resources, and policies are identified to ensure groundwater		
	protection and improve groundwater infiltration measures. Therefore, the project		
	would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a groundwater management		
	plan, and impacts would be less than significant.		
4.11 Land Use and Planning			
Would the project physically divide an	Implementation of the project would not include new major infrastructure, such as a	N/A	Less than Significant
established community.	freeway, that could physically divide an established community. The changes		
	envisioned with the land use plan and supporting policies are designed to increase		
	community connections. I nerefore, the project would not physically divide the		
Waald the music stream a similar sut	Community, and impacts would be less than significant.	ΝΙΑ	
would the project cause a significant	The project would implement various City planning initiatives, identifies housing sites	N/A	Less than Significant
environmental impact due to a conflict with	necessary to meet KHNA goals and ensure consistency with the state housing targets,		
any applicable land use plan, policy, or	and would facilitate implementation of the CAP. Furthermore, the project would not		
regulation adopted for the purpose of	generate growth that would exceed 2040 SCAG projections. Therefore, the project		
avoiding of mitigating an environmental	applicable plana, policies, or regulation adopted for the purpose of evolding or		
enect.	mitigating an environmental effect, and impacts would be less than significant		
4 12 Mineral Resources	I mugaung an environmental enect, and impacts would be less than significant.		
Would the project result in the loss of	The majority of land within the Planning Area is designated as MRZ.3 land for which	N/A	Less than Significant
availability of a known mineral resource	the significance of mineral resources cannot be determined or MRZ-1 land for which		Less than Significant
that would be of value to the region and the	adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral denosits are		
residents of the stat?	present. Neither of these MRZ categories are considered significant mineral resources		
	The small amount of land designated as MRZ-2, areas underlain by mineral deposits		
	where geologic data indicates that significant measured or indicated mineral resources		
	are present is not located within any of the proposed Concept Areas Furthermore this		
	area is not currently used for mineral resource extraction. Therefore, the project would		
	not result in the loss of availability of regionally valuable mineral resources, and		
	impacts would be less than significant.		
Would the project result in the loss of	There are no active mineral resource extraction facilities within the Planning Area	N/A	No Impact
availability of a locally important mineral	The existing 2006 General Plan land use map, as well as the proposed GPU land use		r
resource recovery site delineated on a local	map do not delineate any mineral resource recovery sites. or designate any land for		
general plan, specific plan or other land use	mineral resource production. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result		
plan?	in the loss of a designated mineral recovery site and no impact would occur.		

	Table S-1	Imports
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure
4.13 Noise		
Would the project generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;	 Traffic Noise Increase in Ambient Noise: The increase in ambient noise levels adjacent to roadway segments listed in Section 4.13.5.1 would expose existing noise-sensitive receptors to a significant increase in ambient noise levels, and impacts would be significant. Land Use Compatibility: Future development proposals within the Planning Area would be required to conduct site-specific exterior and interior noise analyses to demonstrate that the proposed development would not place sensitive receptors in locations where the existing or future noise levels would exceed the land use compatibility standards. Impacts associated with future development would be less than significant. Railroad noise Railroad noise levels would not exceed 60 CNEL within the Planning Area, and impacts would be less than significant. Stationary Noise Through enforcement of the Noise Regulation of the Municipal Code and 2021 GPU policies and actions, impacts associated with stationary sources of noise would be less than significant. Construction Noise Construction activities associated with any individual development may occur near noise impacts would be considered potentially significant. 	 Traffic Noise Impacts associated with the increase in ambient noising inficant without mitigation. For existing noise significant without mitigation. For existing noise significant without mitigation. For existing noises is possible noise-reduction measures would include restructures with acoustically rated windows and do Sound Transmission Class ratings, which is a measureduction performance. However, there is no mechaimplementing such a retrofit program. Because the impacts would be to existing homes and other noise already urbanized area, there is no feasible mitigat to existing sensitive land uses would remain signific Construction Noise NOS-1: The Director of Community Development 4 shall require applicants to demonstrate whether the potential to exceed noise standards contained in Se 11.80.030(D)(7) of the Municipal Code. If a project or is located adjacent to sensitive receptors, the Cit applicant to prepare a Noise Analysis that estimate and identifies noise reduction measures that would with Municipal Code standards. Construction plans shall identify applicable measures on demolition, g construction plans submitted to the City. Noise redinclude, but are not limited to, the following: 1. Demolition, construction, site preparation, and would generate noise generating equipment us construction, site preparation, and reducing thready structure in cases of urgent nece health and safety will not be substantially impacts is limitation on hours in cases of urgent nece health and safety will not be substantially impact is limitation, construction, site preparation, and within 70 feet from the edge of properties with noise-sensitive uses shall incorporate all feasibly noise exposure for noise-sensitive uses, includir a. Provide written notice to all known occupie within 400 feet of the edge of the project sit weeks prior to the start of each construction construction schedule; b. Ensure that construction equipment is proje equipped with noise control components, sugre

Significance After Mitigation

oise would be sensitive land uses, retrofitting older oors featuring higher usure of exterior noise aanism in place for e significant noise re-sensitive uses in an tion. Therefore, impacts ficant and unavoidable.

or his or her designee he project has the ections 8.14.040(E) and may exceed standards ty may require the ces construction noise d ensure compliance hs submitted to the City grading, and duction measures can

I related activities that rty line of the subject a.m. to 7:00 p.m. from d from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 y issue an exception to essity where the public paired.

sed in demolition, vities shall be hen not in use or es.

l related activities existing, occupied ole strategies to reduce ng:

ed noise-sensitive uses ite boundary at least 2 on phase of the

operly maintained and uch as mufflers, in ions; Traffic Noise - Significant and Unavoidable

Construction Noise - Significant and Unavoidable

Mitigation Measure NOS-1 would reduce construction noise exposure. However, for construction sites that are adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, there still could be a substantial temporary increase in noise levels that could lead to adverse noise-related impacts. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Table S-1			
Threshold	Summary of Environmental I	Impacts Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Threshold Would the project generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Impact Discussion Construction details, locations, and equipment for future project-level developments under the 2021 GPU are not known at this time but may cause vibration impacts. Therefore, construction vibration impacts would be considered potentially significant. Vibration impacts due to railroad activities and stationary source would be less than significant.	 Mitigation Measure c. Re-route construction equipment away from adjacent noise-sensitive uses; d. Locate noisy construction equipment away from surrounding noise-sensitive uses; e. Use sound aprons or temporary noise enclosures around noise-generating equipment; f. Position storage of waste materials, earth, and other supplies in a manner that will function as a noise barrier for surrounding noise-sensitive uses; g. Use the quietest practical type of equipment; h. Use electric powered equipment instead of diesel or gasoline engine powered equipment; Use shrouding or shielding and intake and exhaust silencers/mufflers; and i. Other effective and feasible strategies to reduce construction noise exposure for surrounding noise-sensitive uses. 4. For construction of buildings that require the installation of piles, an alternative to installation of piles by hammering shall be used. This could include the use of augured holes for cast-in-place piles, installation through vibration or hydraulic insertion, or another lownoise technique. NOS-2: Prior to issuance of a building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction within 135 feet of fragile structures, such as historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings (e.g., most residential buildings), or within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); or a vibratory roller within 25 feet of any structure, the project applicant shall prepare a noise and vibration 	Significance After Mitigation
For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Adherence with the noise requirements of the ALUCP, the Municipal Code, and associated FAA requirements would ensure that future development would not expose people to excessive aircraft noise levels, and impacts would be less than significant.	 vibration analysis to assess and initigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 inches per second [in/sec] peak particle velocity [PPV] for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed this threshold, alternative uses such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving and static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure vibration thresholds are not exceeded. N/A 	Less than Significant

Table S-1			
	Summary of Environmental	Impacts	
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
4.14 Population/Housing			
Would the project induce substantial	The project would exceed the state RHNA requirements, would reduce future	N/A	Less than Significant
unplanned population growth in an area,	population and household growth compared to 2040 SCAG projections, and would		
either directly ((for example, by proposing	locate future infrastructure along major transit corridors that are already served by		
new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for	essential roads, utilities, and public services. Therefore, the project would not induce		
example, through extension of roads or other	substantial unplanned population growth, and impacts would be less than significant.		
infrastructure)?			
Would the project displace substantial	The project would exceed the state RHNA requirements, which would provide	N/A	Less than Significant
numbers of existing people or housing,	additional housing that would accommodate residents displaced by future		
necessitating the construction of	redevelopment projects, and ensure no net loss of housing. Furthermore, the project		
replacement housing elsewhere?	would result in a reduction of future population and household growth compared to		
	2040 SCAG projections. Therefore, the project would not displace substantial numbers		
	of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing		
	elsewhere, and impacts would be less than significant.		
4.15 Public Services and Recreation			
Would the project result in substantial	Fire Protection	N/A	Less than Significant
adverse physical impacts associated with the			
provision of new or physically altered	Future fire protection facilities would be subject to separate environmental review,		
governmental facilities, need for new or	2021 GPU goals and policies intended to protect the environment, and the		
physically altered governmental facilities,	programmatic mitigation framework established in this EIR, which would reduce		
the construction of which could cause	impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection		
significant environmental impacts, in order	facilities to a level less than significant.		
to maintain acceptable service ratios,			
response times or other performance	Police Protection		
objectives for any of the public services:			
• Fire Protection;	Future police protection facilities would be subject to separate environmental review,		
Police Protection;	2021 GPU goals and policies intended to protect the environment, and the		
• Schools;	programmatic mitigation framework established in this EIR, which would reduce		
 Parks/Recreational Facilities 	impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities to a		
• Other Public Facilities?	level less than significant.		
	Schools		
	Future schools would be subject to separate environmental review, 2021 GPU goals		
	and policies intended to protect the environment, and the programmatic mitigation		
	framework established in this EIR, which would reduce impacts associated with the		
	provision of new or physically altered schools to a level less than significant.		
	Other Public Facilities		
	Future libraries would be subject to separate environmental review, 2021 GPU goals		
	and policies intended to protect the environment, and the programmatic mitigation		
	tramework established in this EIR, which would reduce impacts associated with the		
	provision of new or physically altered libraries to a level less than significant.		
Would the project increase the use of	Future parks would be subject to separate environmental review, 2021 GPU goals and	N/A	Less than Significant
existing neighborhood and regional parks or	policies intended to protect the environment, and the programmatic mitigation		
other recreational facilities such that	framework established in this EIR. Therefore, the project would develop future park		
substantial physical deterioration of the	tacilities that would compensate that would address substantial increase in the use of		
facility would occur or be accelerated?	parks that would occur under project buildout.	1	

Table S-1			
Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Would the project include recreational	Implementation of the mitigation framework established in this EIR would reduce	N/A	Less than Significant
facilities or require the construction or	impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks to a level less		
expansion of recreational facilities which	than significant.		
might have an adverse physical effect on the			
environment?			
4.16 Transportation			
Would the project conflict with a plan,	The project would implement roadway and circulation improvements, new bicycle and	N/A	Less than Significant
ordinance, or policy addressing the	pedestrian facilities, as well as the polices and actions listed under goals C-1 through		
circulation system, including transit,	C-3 in order to improve the circulation network through project buildout in 2040.		
roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	Therefore, the project would not conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing		
	the circulation system, and impacts would be less than significant.		
Would the project conflict or be inconsistent	Compared to the existing 2006 General Plan, implementation of the project would	The project has incorporated VMT reducing goals and policies to the	Significant and Unavoidable
with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3.	result in lower VMT using several metrics, demonstrating a land use plan that would	extent feasible. No additional mitigation was identified that could reduce	
subdivision (b)?	increase per capita VMT efficiency. However, some metrics showed an increase in VMT	VMT impacts. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and	
	based on several metrics (shown in bold in Table 4 16-5). As a result of some metrics	unavoidable	
	that exceeded the significance criteria based on certain analysis methodologist impacts		
	would be significant. The project includes TDM goals, policies, and actions that would		
	support VMT reductions: however anticipated VMT reductions associated with		
	proposed TDM measures would be large enough to guarantee that significant impacts		
	could be fully mitigated. Therefore, projected VMT generated under buildout of the		
	project would be inconsistent with CEOA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)		
	This would be considered a significant impact		
Would the project substantially increase	The 2021 GPU includes policies and actions described above that would ensure future	N/A	Less Than Significant
hazards due to a geometric design feature	transportation facilities would not introduce hazards onto the circulation network and		
(e.g. sharn curves or dangerous	future development and redevelopment would also be designed consistent with all		
intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g.	safety requirements pertaining ingress and egress onto the circulation network		
farm equipment)?	Therefore the project would not substantially increase bazards, and impacts would be		
hum equipment).	less than significant		
Would the project result in inadequate	Adherence to applicable LHMP standards and 2021 GPU Safety Element policies as	N/A	Less than Significant
emergency access?	well as increased traffic canacity in the proposed roadway network, would ensure that		
emergency access.	the project would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less		
	than significant		
4 17 Iltilities/Service Systems	than organitant.		
Would the project require or result in the	Water	Ν/Δ	Less than Significant
relocation or construction of new or			
expanded water wastewater treatment or	Future water facilities would be subject to separate environmental review 2021 GPU		
stormwater drainage electrical nower	goals and policies intended to protect the environment and the programmatic		
natural gas or telecommunications	mitigation framework established in this EIR which would reduce impacts associated		
facilities, the construction or relocation of	with the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities to a level less		
which could cause significant environmental	than significant		
effects?			
	Wastewater		
	Future wastewater facilities would be subject to separate environmental review 2021		
	GPU goals and policies intended to protect the environment and the programmatic		
	mitigation framework established in this EIR, which would reduce impacts associated		
	with the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities to a level		
	less than significant.		

Table S-1			
Threshold	Summary of Environmental .	Impacts Mitigation Mossure	Significance After Mitigation
Threshold	Stormwater		Significance Alter Mitigation
	Future stormwater facilities would be subject to separate environmental review, 2021 GPU goals and policies intended to protect the environment and the programmatic mitigation framework established in this EIR, which would reduce impacts associated with the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater facilities to a level less than significant.		
	Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications Future facilities would be subject to separate environmental review, 2021 GPU goals and policies intended to protect the environment and the programmatic mitigation framework established in this EIR, which would reduce impacts associated with the relocation or construction of new or expanded electrical, natural gas, and		
	telecommunications facilities to a level less than significant.		
Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	The project would not exceed forecasted water demand projections for EMWD or BSMWC, because it would reduce future population and household growth compared to 2040 SCAG projections. Therefore, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	The project would not exceed forecasted wastewater demand projections for EMWD or ECSD, because it would reduce future population and household growth compared to 2040 SCAG projections. Therefore, EMWD and ECSD would have adequate capacity to provide wastewater treatment for the project, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	The project would not generate excessive solid waste that would exceed regional forecasted demand, because it would reduce future population and household growth compared to 2040 SCAG projections. Therefore, the project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, exceed the capacity of local infrastructure, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
Would the project comply with federal, state, or local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Future site-specific development under the project would be required to complete a Waste Management and Recycling Plan and a Diversion Plan, which would ensure consistency with local, state, and federal requirements regarding waste diversion. Therefore, the project would not conflict with federal, state, or local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant
4.18 Wildfire			
Would the project Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Future projects developed under the GPU would be designed in a manner that would not obstruct evacuation routes documented in the City's LHMP and would be required to adhere to the Municipal Code requirements and policies included in the GPU Safety Element that address disaster response and emergency evacuation. Compliance with Municipal Code regulations and local disaster prevention plans, as well as conformance with GPU policies, would ensure that the project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.	N/A	Less than Significant

Table S-1			
Summary of Environmental Impacts			
Threshold	Impact Discussion	Mitigation Measure	Significance After Mitigation
Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other	Compliance with Municipal Code regulations and local disaster prevention plans, as	N/A	Less than Significant
factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire	well as conformance with GPU policies, would ensure that the project would not result		
risks, and thereby expose project occupants	in the exacerbation of wildfire risk, nor increase the risk of exposure to pollutant		
to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire	concentrations associated with wildfire, and impacts related to pollutant		
or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	concentrations from a wildfire would be less than significant.		
Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other	The Planning Area is served by major roadways and located within existing built	N/A	Less than Significant
factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire	environments that are served by storm water, sewer, electricity, potable water		
risks, and thereby expose project occupants	distribution, and communications systems infrastructure.		
to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire			
or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			
Would the project expose people or	As the project focuses development within the existing developed areas of the City, the	N/A	Less than Significant
structures to significant risks, including	potential exposure of people or structures to flooding or landslides from post-fire slope		
downslope or downstream flooding or	instability would not increase due to project implementation. Therefore, the project		
landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire	would not increase risk associated with post-fire flooding or landslides, and impacts		
slope instability, or drainage changes?	would be less than significant.		